PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Entrepreneurial marketing on MSMEs as a socio-economic development for sustainable competitive advantage

To cite this article: M Jannah and R G H Pranjoto 2025 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **1441** 012041

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

Entrepreneurial marketing on MSMEs as a socio-economic development for sustainable competitive advantage

M Jannah[1]* and R G H Pranjoto[1]

[1] Management Department, Universitas Trunojoyo Madura, Bangkalan, Indonesia

*E-mail: miftahul.jannah@trunojoyo.ac.id

Abstract. The Covid-19 pandemic has adversely affected various sectors, including the creative economy. Nevertheless, micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) have demonstrated resilience in these challenging conditions. This resilience highlights the role of MSMEs in socio-economic development and their competitive advantage for future sustainability. MSMEs require not only conventional marketing strategies but also entrepreneurial marketing (EM). This study utilized purposive sampling. The findings indicated that all EM variables derived from the ENMAR Scale, such as Proactive Marketing and Network Attention, have positively influenced MSME performance. Conversely, Innovative Marketing has shown a negative impact, while Opportunity Resource Leveraging and Acceptable Risk have not significantly affected MSME performance. Future research is encouraged to explore firm performance more comprehensively, focusing specifically on marketing, innovation, and financial performance.

1. Introduction

Indonesia is one of the countries affected by Covid-19. All sectors were down except for the creative economy sector, which was able to rise. The COVID-19 pandemic proves that Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) have survived Indonesia's economic downturn. MSMEs are a tool that can be empowered. Triatmanto et al. [1] stated that an effort must be made to motivate the community to explore and develop MSMEs. In general, MSMEs are used as business activities to expand employment opportunities to the community so that they play a role in the process of equity and community income, encourage economic growth, and play a role in realizing national stability [2]. Furthermore, regarding unemployment, MSMEs contribute to employment growth and increased community income [3]. Data from the Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Kadin) showed that MSMEs contribute approximately 61% to Indonesia's total Gross Domestic Product (GDP), around IDR 9,580 trillion, highlighting the sector's substantial impact on the nation's economic output.

In addition to the vital role of MSMEs, problems have been found [4]. Capital is the main focus of the problem because the number of MSMEs that have not accessed formal capital is still deficient [5]. Furthermore, it was found that the complexity of MSME problems is known as an internal factor inhibiting MSME growth. Apart from being weak in capital, it turns out that MSMEs have weaknesses in production, product marketing, and human resources. Capital is usually only obtained from the individual money of the business owner, while production and marketing are carried out only to the extent of their knowledge. Marketing relies on word of mouth, so its development is not rapid.

ICGTASE-2024

IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science **1441** (2025) 012041

IOP Publishing

doi:10.1088/1755-1315/1441/1/012041

[2] Older Study explains the need for empowerment today to face the challenges of global MSME competition with increased innovation through technology. Furthermore, the main objectives of MSMEs are sustainability and having a competitive advantage. Both are believed to be important areas of strategic management with a primary focus on competitive advantage [6]. Competitive advantage can be achieved by configuring the value chain or the activities involved in creating, producing, selling, delivering, and supporting its products or services [7].

Competitive advantage can be achieved if the company has good performance and can attract customer attention to reduce operating costs. Competitive advantage is a collection of various advantages, including differentiation, cost leadership, and company performance [8]. MSMEs' performance is the most critical measurement for survival in global competition. Furthermore, competitive advantage can also be achieved with innovation as a strategy [9]. The increasingly fierce competitive environment makes innovation important for companies to increase competitiveness and maintain a sustainable competitive advantage [10]. Innovation is a fundamental growth strategy to enter new markets and increase market share. In the product life cycle, the product will only succeed if the company has innovation.

Conventional marketing concepts (marketing mix) have limitations when used by MSMEs. Conventional marketing broadly targets marketing techniques, focusing on structured strategies and only on the marketing mix /4P (Product, Price, Location, Promotion) [11]. One way to uncover marketing challenges and barriers for MSMEs is with the Entrepreneurial Marketing (EM) approach [12]. This approach can solve all the challenges of MSMEs [13]. It complements this, [14] older research stated that entrepreneurial marketing is most appropriate for smaller organizations with limited resources that focus on combining entrepreneurship and marketing science concepts.

EM is a unique research area that merges relevant insights from marketing and entrepreneurship [15]. According to this research, entrepreneurial marketing is a series of abilities owned by entrepreneurs to take advantage of opportunities and processes carried out by entrepreneurs to communicate, create value, and establish relationships with consumers [16]Research related to EM has developed over the past thirty years. Prior research said that EM deals with several conditions: narrow economic scale, low resources, low human resources, limited market, reduced market image, and low brand loyalty[17]. This condition is similar to that of MSMEs, so EM is considered a solution, not traditional marketing. EM has a specific target market and uses bottom-up strategies that are flexible, adaptable, and innovative [11]. EM can operate on limited resources and provide creative solutions with the ease of building long-term customer relationships [18]. This statement straightforwardly stated the importance of the EM concept for MSMEs. Conceptually, EM was introduced in 1982 [19]. Research related to this concept has proliferated in the last three decades [20]. It was found that quite a lot of previous research defined EM to build EM dimensions. The summary related to the EM scale will be displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Dimensions of Entrepreneurial. Marketing

No.	Source	EM Dimensions
1	Morris et al. (2002); Berherer et al. (2012); Hacioglu et al. (2012); Astuti et al. (2018); Dushi et al. (2019); and Hanayasha et al. (2019).	Proactiveness, Opportunity Focus, Innovativeness, Resource leveraging, calculated risk-taking, customer intensity, and value creation.
2.	Adam et al. (2017).	Proactiveness, Risk Taking, Innovativeness
3.	Alqahtani & Uslay (2020).	Innovation, Proactiveness, value co-creation, Opportunity Focus, Resource leveraging, Networking, Acceptable Risks, Inclusive Attention
4.	Eggers et al. (2020); Suandi et al. (2022).	Risk, Proactiveness, Innovativeness, Customer orientation, Resource leveraging, Market driving
5.	Alqahtani et al. (2022).	Innovative market, Proactive market, Opportunity Focus, Resource leveraging, Network attention, Acceptable Risks

Based on Table 1, it is found that the EM dimension was first developed by previous research [21]. So far, older research EM dimension is still widely used in researching EM [19], [22], [23]. These dimensions are considered the most suitable for capturing EM and comprehensive for MSMEs [23]. The four dimensions of EM (calculated risk-taking, Proactiveness, Opportunity Focus, and Innovativeness) are derived from previous studies on entrepreneurial orientation. Meanwhile, the three Elements emphasize the marketing aspect. Previous research explained that EM is measured based on entrepreneurial orientation (EO)[24]. EO with innovative, proactive, and risk-taking characteristics can increase the dynamic capability needed by MSMEs [25]. This is the basis for [24] measuring EM based on EO. Furthermore, Alqahtani and Uslay developed an EM scale: Innovation, Proactiveness, value co-creation, Opportunity Focus, Resource leveraging, Networking, Acceptable Risks, and Inclusive Attention. This scale has dimensions that emphasize the importance of networking in MSMEs [26].

The development of EM dimensions was also carried out by Eggers et al., including risk, proactiveness, innovativeness, customer orientation, resource leveraging, and market driving as dimensions [27]. The Scale development is based on empirical gaps related to EM. So, the development of the EM scale as a measurement needs to be done [28]. Finally, this study discusses the dimensions of Alqahtani et al.[29]. This EM dimension improves Alqahtani and Uslay's scale [26]. This scale lists the Innovative Market, Proactive Market, Opportunity Focus, Resource leveraging, Network attention, and Acceptable Risks as dimensions that measure EM [29]. These dimensions are known as ENMAR SCALE. They claim that this scale can measure EM thoroughly. Furthermore, ENMAR SCALE provides the latest developments in EM and is most relevant to current business conditions.

This research tried to fill the GAP by making ENMAR SCALE a representative dimension of EM. Empirically, the use of ENMAR SCALE is still limited. Previous research related to ENMAR SCALE was studied on company performance with a US sample. We fill in using MSME objects from developing countries, Indonesia, Sampang-Madura, and West Java. EM is considered more effective in creating value when innovation creates products, processes, and strategies more responsive to customer and stakeholder needs and improves business performance [30]. So, our hypotheses: H1 is Innovative marketing (IM) influence on MSMEs performance (PF); H2 is Proactive marketing (PM) influence on MSMEs performance (PF); H3 is Opportunity Focus (OF) influence on MSMEs performance (PF); H4 is Resource Leveraging (RL) influence on MSMEs performance (PF); H5 is Network attention (NA) influence on MSMEs performance (PF); and H6 is Acceptable Risk (AR) influence on MSMEs performance (PF).

2. Method

2.1 Data collection
The data was collected from online participation. We provided a questionnaire via Google Forms and then distributed it to MSMEs that matched our characteristics or criteria. The sampling technique used by the researcher was purposive, with several criteria [31] including: (1) Business actors must be at least 17 years old; (2) MSMEs that have been running for at least one year; and (3) If an MSME is domiciled in Sampang Regency, it may operate in any field, not limited to food and beverages. From the spread questionnaire, we got 202 MSMEs that filled out the questionnaire, but 2 MSMEs could not be respondents because they needed to meet the requirements.

2.2 Measurement scale
The measurement scale for emotional management adaptation is derived from the ENMMAR Scale [29]. There were 6 Independent variables in this study, including Innovative Marketing (3 items); Proactive marketing (3 items), Opportunity Focus (4 items), Resource Leveraging (3 items), Network Attention (3 items), and Acceptable Risk (3 items). The Independent variables were to measure the overall MSMEs performance with a scale of 15 items [19]. A summary of the measurement items can be seen in Table 2. This study used established measures with five-point Likert-type scales (1 = "strongly disagree," 5 = "strongly agree").

Table 2. Items Scale

No.	Variables	Items scale
1	Innovative Marketing	- We are known for our innovative marketing programs - Our marketing communications (e.g., advertising) are very innovative. - Our pricing strategies are very innovative.
2.	Proactive marketing	- We are very good at identifying customer needs that other MSMEs must know. - We are very good at predicting future customer needs. - We are more adaptable to market changes than our competitors.
3.	Opportunity Focus	- We quickly recognize new opportunities due to our active involvement in the market. - Our MSMEs are known for always looking for opportunities - Our MSMEs are known for being agile and taking advantage of new opportunities in the market. - We are very good at taking advantage of new opportunities.
4.	Resource Leveraging	- MSMEs work with partners to increase the productivity of MSME resources - We are very good at getting the resources they need. - Understanding the needs of our partners is our competitive advantage.
5.	Network attention	- When developing our marketing programs, we seek insights from all parties, including customers. - Compared to competitors, Our MSMEs are better at building partnerships with stakeholders in our environment. - We get timely assistance from our network partners when we need it.
6.	Acceptable Risks	- We balance the potential losses of risky investments with the expected returns. - We routinely invest resources that we can afford to take on to stay ahead of the competition. - In developing products or services, we only invest resources that we can afford to take on.
7.	MSMEs performance	- My MSME is satisfied with the return on investment so far. - My MSME is satisfied with the return on equity. - My MSME is satisfied with the return on assets.

No.	Variables	Items scale
		- I am satisfied with the sales growth of my MSME.
		- I am satisfied with the growth in market share experienced by my MSME.
		- My MSME is satisfied with the growth in the number of employees.
		- My MSME is satisfied with the net profit margin.
		- My MSME is satisfied with the gross profit margin.
		- I am satisfied with my financial situation.
		- My status in society has increased.
		- My standard of living has increased.
		- My MSME has a high reputation.
		- My MSME is very serious about serving customers.
		- Many followers on social media follow my MSME.
		- I am proud to be part of this company.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Measurement validity and reliability
Validity is measured by knowing the correlation level [32]. They suggest that the correlation value is 0.30-0.50 (low), 0.50-0.70 (moderate), 0.70-0.90 (high), and 0.90-1.00 (very high). However, >0.3 is considered valid. Data on measurement validity will be shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Measurement Validity and Reliability

Items	Correlations	Cronbach α	Items	Correlations	Reliability
IM1	0.773		FP1	0.718	
IM2	0.832		FP2	0.611	
IM3	0.767	0.748	FP3	0.685	
PM1	0.829		FP4	0.731	
PM2	0.899		FP5	0.700	
PM3	0.831	0.860	FP6	0.807	
OF1	0.779		FP7	0.807	
OF2	0.902		FP8	0.614	
0F3	0.880		FP9	0.838	
0F4	0.840	0.906	FP10	0.833	
RL1	0.870		FP11	0.805	
RL2	0.870		FP12	0.761	
RL3	0.867	0.883	FP13	0.573	
NA1	0.798		FP14	0.672	
NA2	0.864		FP15	0.671	0.950
NA3	0.807	0.801			
AR1	0.864				
AR2	0.906				
AR3	0.878	0.895			

Table 3 explains that the level of instrument validity is acceptable. All items have a correlation value >0.3, so it is valid. The average correlation value is between 0.70 -0.90, so the validity is high. Meanwhile, six items have moderate validity (0.50-0.70). Others, as many as two items, have very high validity (0.90-1.00), namely OF2 and AR2 items. The lowest validity values are for items FP2, FP3, FP8, FP13, FP14, and FP15. Regarding reliability, all groups of items are reliable. FP has the highest reliability (0.905), while IM has low reliability (0.748), but the level of reliability is accepted [33].

3.2 Descriptive analysis
Descriptive analysis is needed to determine the distribution of questionnaires when viewed from the demographic side, such as age, gender, and education level. The results of the descriptive test will be shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Result

Descriptive	Frequency	%	Total
Age:			
>46	40	20	
37-46	10	5	100%
27-36	80	40	
17-26	70	35	
Gender:			
Man	41	20.5	100%
Woman	159	79.5	
Education:			
Not in school yet	14	7	
Elementary School	7	3.5	
Junior high School	16	8	100%
Senior High School	70	35	
Graduates	93	46.5	
UMKM Sector			
Food and Beverage	162	81	
Agriculture	6	3	
Fashion	8	4	100%
Craft	10	5	
Others (Laundry and IT)	14	7	

Table 4 explains that the age of respondents who filled out this questionnaire as MSME owners had the most significant number of 27-36 years, totaling 80 respondents (40%). 35% of respondents were aged 17-36, 20% were aged >46, and 37-47 as much as 5%. This indicates that the MSME owners are at a productive age. Table 3 also explains about gender. The majority of entrepreneurs in this study were women (79.5%). Furthermore, related to education, there are still entrepreneurs who have never been educated (7%), while most are graduates (46.5%).

3.3 Hypotheses testing

3.3.1 EM on MSMEs performance
This study used SPSS tools to analyze independent variables on dependent variables, either partially or simultaneously. The goodness of fit can be seen from the Adjusted R2 analysis, F Test, and results-test. In this result, each independent variable, namely IM, PM, OF, RL, NA, and AR, will be tested on the dependent variable MSMEs performance (PF). The test results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Goodness of Fit EM on MSMEs Performance

Variable	Coefficient	t	Sig.	Hypothesis Testing Result
IM → PF	-0.196	-3.004	0.003	Supported
PM → PF	0.202	2.466	0.015	Supported
OF → PF	0.099	0.903	0.368	Not Supported
RL → PF	0.145	1.759	0.080	Not Supported
NA → PF	0.249	3.572	0.000	Supported
AR → PF	0.129	1.405	0.162	Not Supported
Adjusted R^2 = 0.462				
Sig= 0.000				

Table 5 explains the results of the goodness of fit test as seen from the Adjusted R2, F test, and t-test values. Based on Table 4, the Adjusted R2 value is 0.462, with a significance of 0.00. This proves that IM, PM, OF, RL, NA, and AR determined 46.2% of MSMEs' performance as an independent variable. Other variables determined the Remaining 53.8%. Furthermore, Table 4 explains the t-test value and significance of each variable. IM has a coefficient of -0.196, t-value -3.004, and sig. 0.003, so H1 is supported. This shows that IM harms MSME's performance. The presence of IM tends to decrease MSME's performance. The PF variable has a coefficient of 0.202, a t value of 2.466, and sig. 0.015, so H2 is supported. This shows that PF positively affects MSMEs' Performance, so the presence of PF increases MSMEs' Performance. In contrast to OF, it was found that the relationship between OF and PF had a coefficient of 0.099, t value of 0.903, and sig. 0.368. This shows that OF does not affect MSMEs Performance (Sig. > 0.05), so H3 is not supported. RL also shows no effect on MSME's Performance with a coefficient result of 0.145, t value of 1.759, and sig. 0.080 (sig.> 0.05), so H4 is not supported. Meanwhile, a positive relationship is shown in the NA variable towards MSMEs performance with a coefficient of 0.248, t value of 3.572, and sig. 0.000 (Sig. < 0.05), so H5 is supported. Of all the variables, the N.A. variable strongly influences MSME's performance. Furthermore, something different was found in the AR variable regarding MSMEs' performance. No influence was found between the two with a sig. 0162 (> 0.05); t value 1.405, and coefficient 01.29, so H6 is not supported.

In this case, several different results were found compared to previous studies. The important point is that innovative marketing harms the performance of MSMEs. An interesting thing was found from the test results. This shows that the more MSMEs have good marketing innovation, the lower their performance. Previous research stated that innovation would increase operational costs, thus affecting short-term performance and even sacrificing it and causing a decline [34]. This research was in line with states that a negative relationship exists between innovation and MSME performance [35].

Meanwhile, MSME's performance did not influence OF, RL, and AR. Regarding Resource Leveraging, this aligns with the opinion of Sirmon et al., who stated that sometimes resources are not always in line with company goals, so they do not affect increasing MSMEs performance. PM and NA both have a positive influence on MSME's performance [36]. In PM, this is because MSME owners identify customer needs very well. This is adjusted to the majority of those who fill in are MSMEs engaged in the culinary sector (food and beverages). We know culinary businesses are experiencing rapid menu changes related to FOMO[37], so MSMEs rapidly meet consumer needs. This study aligned with previous studies that stated that PM positively influences MSMEs' performance [38]–[40]. So, this enriched the empirical results of PM. The findings in this study added to the increasingly rich empirical research related to EM. Moreover, we researched using the ENMAR Scale, which is quite new because few are still researching EM with the ENMAR Scale.

4. Conclusions

Based on the study results above, not all EMs affect the increase in MSMEs' performance. For example, IM harms MSMEs' performance. OF, RL, and AR do not affect MSMEs' Performance. Meanwhile, PM and NA have a positive effect on MSME's performance. This study certainly has various limitations. The study used questionnaires, and a short time was one of them. Therefore, longitudinal research needs to be done. There needs to be a control variable for further research related to gender. This study has almost all female genders who filled out the questionnaire, so future research requires this variable as a control variable. This study was conducted in a developing country, in an area still lagging, namely Sampang-Madura Regency, so this study cannot be generalized. Different locations will have different results. In the future, this research needs to be conducted in developing countries, but more broadly. The ENMAR scale is good enough to reflect EM and can be used as a re-tested scale. Lastly, future research is expected to Be

more broadly related to firm performance that is viewed more specifically, for example, marketing, innovation, and financial performance separately.

References

[1]   Triatmanto B Sanusi A and Siswati A, 2021 Strategi Mempertahankan Usaha Dan Meningkatkan Peran Masyarakat Dimasa Covid-19 Pada Kegiatan Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Batik Zheng *JAST : Jurnal Aplikasi Sains dan Teknologi* **4**, 2 p. 142–152.

[2]   Sedyastuti K, 2018 Analisis Pemberdayaan UMKM Dan Peningkatan Daya Saing Dalam Kancah Pasar Global *INOBIS: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis dan Manajemen Indonesia* **2**, 1 p. 117–127.

[3]   Chusmeru C and Kuncoro B, 2020 Pengembangan Desa Ketahanan Pangan Menjadi Desa Eduwisata *Prosiding* **6**, November p. 37–50.

[4]   Amri F, 2014 Pluralisme Dalam Ekonomi Dan Pendidikan *Permasalahan Umkm: Strategi Dan Kebijakan* **1**, 2 p. 368–380.

[5]   Lussak A Abdurachman E Gautama I and Setiowati R, 2020 The influence of financial performance and innovation of services and products on the survival of small businesses in food and beverage in the Jakarta city with mediation of operational improvement *Management Science Letters* **10**, 2 p. 463–468.

[6]   Amankwah-Amoah J Danso A and Adomako S, 2019 Entrepreneurial orientation, environmental sustainability and new venture performance: does stakeholder integration matter? *Bus Strategy Environ* **28**, 1 p. 79–87.

[7]   Porter M E and Kramer M R, 2011 Creating shared value *Harv Bus Rev* **89**, 1–2.

[8]   Novitasari M and Agustia D, 2023 Competitive advantage as a mediating effect in the impact of green innovation and firm performance *Business: Theory and Practice* **24**, 1 p. 216–226.

[9]   Chatzoglou P and Chatzoudes D, 2018 The role of innovation in building competitive advantages: an empirical investigation *European Journal of Innovation Management* **21**, 1 p. 44–69.

[10]   Gunday G Ulusoy G Kilic K and Alpkan L, 2011 Effects of innovation types on firm performance *Int J Prod Econ* **133**, 2 p. 662–676.

[11]   Tolossa A T Singh M and Gautam R K, 2024 Unveiling the Nexus: the crucial role of competitive advantage in bridging entrepreneurial marketing practices and sustainable firm performance in small and medium enterprises *J Innov Entrep* **13**, 1.

[12]   Khouroh U Sudiro A Rahayu M and Indrawati N K, 2020 The mediating effect of entrepreneurial marketing in the relationship between environmental turbulence and dynamic capability with sustainable competitive advantage: An empirical study in Indonesian MSMEs *Management Science Letters* **10** p. 709–720.

[13]   Kraus S Harms R and Fink M, 2010 Entrepreneurial marketing: Moving beyond marketing in new ventures *Int J Entrep Innov Manag* **11**, 1 p. 19–34.

[14]   Collinson E and Shaw E, 2001 Entrepreneurial marketing – a historical perspective on development and practice *Management Decision* **39**, 9 p. 761–766.

[15]   Whalen P *et al.*, 2016 Anatomy of competitive advantage: towards a contingency theory of entrepreneurial marketing *Journal of Strategic Marketing* **24**, 1 p. 5–19.

[16]   Sari D Kusuma B A Sihotang J and Febrianti T, 2023 The role of entrepreneurial marketing & innovation capability in the performance of SMEs during covid-19 pandemic: Evidence of MSMEs in West Java *Cogent Business and Management* **10**, 1.

[17]   Hills G E Hultman C M and Miles M P, 2008 The evolution and development of entrepreneurial marketing *Journal of Small Business Management,* **46** p. 99–112.

[18]   Adam N A and Alarifi G, 2021 Innovation practices for survival of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the COVID-19 times: the role of external support *J Innov Entrep* **10**, 1.

[19]   Sadiku-Dushi N Dana L P and Ramadani V, 2019 Entrepreneurial marketing dimensions and SMEs performance *J Bus Res* **100**, March p. 86–99.

[20]   Pranatasari F D and Wadyatenti M A D V, 2022 Entrepreneurial Marketing Dan Kinerja Organisasi Pada Umkm Di Tengah Ketidakpastian Faktor Lingkungan *Modus* **34**, 1 p. 100–114.

[21]   Morris M H Schindehutte M and LaForge R W, 2003 The emergence of entrepreneurial marketing: Nature and meaning *Entrepreneurship: The Way Ahead* July 2001 p. 91–104.

[22]   Astuti A M I and Ratnawati S, 2020 Analisis SWOT Dalam Menentukan Strategi Pemasaran (Studi Kasus di Kantor Pos Kota Magelang 56100) *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen* **17**, 2 p. 58–70.

[23]   Hanaysha J R, 2024 An Exploration of Entrepreneurial Marketing Dimensions and Competitive Advantage in Small and Medium Enterprises.

[24]   Adam S Mahrous A A and Kortam W, 2017 The relationship between entrepreneurial orientation, marketing innovation and competitive marketing advantage of female entrepreneurs in Egypt *International Journal of Technology Management and Sustainable Development* **16**, 2 p. 157–174.

ICGTASE-2024

IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science **1441** (2025) 012041

IOP Publishing

doi:10.1088/1755-1315/1441/1/012041

[25] Jiao H Wei J and Cui Y, 2010 An empirical study on paths to develop dynamic capabilities: From the perspectives of entrepreneurial orientation and organizational learning *Frontiers of Business Research in China* **4**, 1 p. 47–72.

[26] Alqahtani N and Uslay C, 2020 Entrepreneurial marketing and firm performance: Synthesis and conceptual development *J Bus Res* **113**, October 2017 p. 62–71.

[27] Eggers F Niemand T Kraus S and Breier M, 2020 Developing a scale for entrepreneurial marketing: Revealing its inner frame and prediction of performance *J Bus Res* **113**, October 2017 p. 72–82.

[28] Suandi E Herri Yulihasri and Syafrizal, 2023 Evaluating the relationship between entrepreneurial marketing, competitive advantage, and Islamic banks performance *Journal of Financial Services Marketing* **28**, 3 p. 599–614.

[29] Alqahtani N Uslay C and Yeniyurt S, 2022 Entrepreneurial marketing and firm performance: scale development, validation, and empirical test *Journal of Strategic Marketing* **00**, 00 p. 1–22.

[30] Kilenthong P Hills G E and Hultman C M, 2015 an Empirical Investigation of Entrepreneurial Marketing Dimensions *Journal of International Marketing Strategy* **3**, 1 p. 1–18.

[31] Cooper, D. and Schindler P, 2011 *Business Research Methods. 11th Edition,* Boston.: McGraw Hill.

[32] Hinkle D E Wiersma W and Jurs S G, 2003 *Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences.* Boston: MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

[33] Bagozzi R and Yi Y, 1988 On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences* **16** p. 74–94.

[34] Visnjic I Wiengarten F and Neely A, 2016 Only the Brave: Product Innovation, Service Business Model Innovation, and Their Impact on Performance *Journal of Product Innovation Management* **33**, 1 p. 36–52.

[35] Damanpour F Walker R M and Avellaneda C N, 2009 Combinative effects of innovation types and organizational Performance: A longitudinal study of service organizations *Journal of Management Studies* **46**, 4 p. 650–675.

[36] Sirmon, D.G. Hitt M A and Ireland R D, 2007 Managing Firm Resources in Dynamic Enviroments to Create Value : Looking inside on the Balck Box *Academy of Management Journal* **32**, (1) p. 273–292.

[37] Kurniadi S Mulyana A and Komaladewi R, 2024 The Influence of FOMO Leading to Purchase Intention *Journal of Innovation in Management, Accounting and Business* **3**, 2 p. 71–83.

[38] Zhang E M, 2010 Understanding the Acceptance of Mobile SMS Advertising among Young Chinese Consumers *Psychol Mark* **30**, 6 p. 461–469.

[39] Ichwan A F and Nursyamsiah S, 2019 The Effect of Responsive and Proactive Market Orientation on Product Innovation and Company Performance: A Case Study on MSMEs in the Culinary Field in D.I. Yogyakarta *Integrated Journal of Business and Economics* **3**, 1 p. 32.

[40] Ngatno, 2015 Proactive Market Orientation, Radical Service Innovation, and Performance: Moderating Effects of Size and Competitive Intensity *International Journal of Management Sciences* **5**, 1 p. 68–84.