

Loughborough University
Institutional Repository

*Incorporating coopetition
into the entrepreneurial
marketing literature:
Directions for future
research*

This item was submitted to Loughborough University's Institutional Repository by the/an author.

Citation: CRICK, J.M., 2019. Incorporating coopetition into the entrepreneurial marketing literature: Directions for future research. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, doi:10.1108/JRME-01-2018-0001.

Additional Information:

- This paper was published in the journal *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship* and the definitive published version is available at <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRME-01-2018-0001>.

Metadata Record: <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/36327>

Version: Accepted for publication

Publisher: © Emerald

Rights: This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Please cite the published version.



Incorporating Coopetition Into The Entrepreneurial Marketing Literature: Directions For Future Research

Journal:	<i>Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship</i>
Manuscript ID	JRME-01-2018-0001.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Coopetition, entrepreneurial marketing, Marketing/entrepreneurship interface, Organisational performance, Competitive intensity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

INCORPORATING COOPETITION INTO THE ENTREPRENEURIAL MARKETING LITERATURE: DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to extend the entrepreneurial marketing literature to account for coopetition (the interplay between cooperation and competition). This paper is also designed to highlight the research gaps surrounding coopetition, so that academics, working at the marketing/entrepreneurship interface, can undertake more investigations linked with this topic.

Design/methodology/approach – The entrepreneurial marketing literature was reviewed to develop a conceptual framework, guided by three research propositions, examining the antecedents and consequences of coopetition, as well as the boundaries of the coopetition – organisational performance relationship.

Findings – Coopetition activities are driven by an organisation-wide coopetition-oriented mind-set - the degree to which managers and employees believe in the importance of cooperating with competitors. Also, coopetition can help entrepreneurs to access new resources and capabilities from their competitors; however, “too much” coopetition can lead to tensions between such rival firms. Additionally, it is proposed that the relationship between coopetition activities and organisational performance is moderated by competitive intensity (a facet of the competitive business environment). That is, with higher-levels of competitive intensity, entrepreneurs are less likely to improve their performance from coopetition activities. That is, the competitive business environment can affect the delicate balance between the forces of cooperativeness and competitiveness.

Originality/value – Entrepreneurial marketing research has concentrated on individualistic perspectives concerning how entrepreneurs operate their businesses. In this viewpoint, the competitive assumptions of the marketing/entrepreneurship interface are extended to account for coopetition. This paper also outlines the areas within the coopetition literature that entrepreneurial marketing scholars should appreciate. Specifically, entrepreneurial marketing scholars are recommended to examine the antecedents and consequences of coopetition, coupled with the moderating role of competitive intensity (a facet of the competitive business environment) in the coopetition – organisational performance relationship. This article ends a recommended methodology for academics to test the conceptual framework in future empirical research.

Key words – Coopetition, entrepreneurial marketing, marketing/entrepreneurship interface, organisational performance, competitive intensity.

Classification – Viewpoint.

Introduction

The objective of this viewpoint is to explore how coopetition (the interplay between cooperation and competition) can be incorporated into the entrepreneurial marketing literature. Entrepreneurial marketing (also known as the marketing/entrepreneurship

1
2
3 interface) is a cross-disciplinary domain that has expanded, in terms of research, over
4
5 the last thirty years (Davis, Hills and LaForge, 1985; Carson, 1990; Collinson and
6
7 Shaw, 2001; Hills, Hultman and Miles, 2008; Jones and Rowley, 2011; O'Cass and
8
9 Morrish, 2016; Thompson-Whiteside, Turnbull and Howe-Walsh, 2018).
10
11 Entrepreneurial marketing integrates the forces of market orientation and
12
13 entrepreneurial orientation (Miles and Arnold, 1991). Market orientation is the
14
15 implementation of the marketing concept, through the organisation-wide: generation
16
17 of, dissemination of, and responsiveness to market intelligence, whereas,
18
19 entrepreneurial orientation is the degree to which firms engage in: risk-taking,
20
21 innovative, and proactive behaviours (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Baker and Sinkula,
22
23 2009; Boso, Story and Cadogan, 2013). While there is some disagreement in the
24
25 extant literature concerning how entrepreneurial marketing should be defined and
26
27 conceptualised, it has been established that the marketing/entrepreneurship interface
28
29 is comprised of: risk-taking, proactive, and innovative behaviours that firms use to
30
31 create value for customers (Whalen, Uslay, Pascal, Omura, McAuley, Kasouf, Jones,
32
33 Hultman, Hills, Hansen, Gilmore, Giglierano, Eggers and Deacon, 2016).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Like other topics in the broader management literature, entrepreneurial marketing has
42
43 typically been examined from an individualistic perspective, whereby, authors have
44
45 examined various business strategies that are driven by the resources and capabilities
46
47 of entrepreneurs in their own companies (Duus, 1997; O'Donnell, Gilmore, Carson and
48
49 Cummis, 2002; Mort, Weerawardena and Liesch, 2012; Crick and Crick, 2015). The
50
51 marketing/entrepreneurship interface has scarcely considered the notion of
52
53 coopetition (also referred to as coopetition activities or strategies) (Alves and
54
55 Meneses, 2015; Crick and Crick, 2016; Crick, 2018a; Daidj and Egert, 2018), in which
56
57 entrepreneurs cooperate with their competitors to perform superiorly than if they
58
59
60

operated on an individualistic basis (see Chetty and Wilson, 2003; Ang, 2008; Rusko, 2011; Ritala, 2012). In this viewpoint, coopetition is explored to help entrepreneurial marketing scholars to appreciate how such theory could be better-served with insights into collaborative business strategies (Alves and Meneses, 2015; Crick and Crick, 2016; Crick, 2018a; Daidj and Egert, 2018).

Coopetition has been formally defined as “a dynamic and paradoxical relationship, which arises when two companies cooperate together in some areas, such as strategic alliances, but compete with each other in other areas” (Bengtsson and Kock, 2000, p. 411). Coopetition is a well-established topic in the broader management literature (Lechner and Leyronas, 2009; Mathias, Huyghe, Frid and Galloway, 2018). Scholars have found that by collaborating with competitors, entrepreneurs provide themselves with access to: resources, capabilities, and opportunities that would not be available if they operated on an individualistic-level (Park, Srivastava and Gnyawali, 2014). Through coopetition, entrepreneurs are likely to improve their organisations’ performance, due to possessing new ways of competing within their business environment (Ritala, Golnam and Wegmann, 2014; Le Roy and Czakon, 2016). Yet, limited research surrounds the antecedents of coopetition, namely, the factors that are likely to help entrepreneurs to engage in coopetition activities (see Crick, 2018a). Also, the nature of the relationship between coopetition and organisational performance has been scarcely studied (Ang, 2008; Ritala, 2012). Specifically, it is of interest to explore whether this link is non-linear and moderated by factors, like the competitive business environment.

Interestingly, there has been a recent body of entrepreneurial marketing research that has examined the role of network members (and collaboration) in helping entrepreneurs to compete within their markets and create superior value for their

1
2
3 customers. Specifically, in an entrepreneurial marketing-themed special issue of
4
5 *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, various papers examined how
6
7 entrepreneurs might be better-served by networking with certain stakeholders to
8
9 improve their performance (see Andersson, Evers and Gliga, 2018; Crick, 2018a;
10
11 Foster and Brindley, 2018). These papers examined different issues associated with
12
13 entrepreneurial networks, such as: firms cooperating with certain stakeholders in the
14
15 Far-East (Andersson *et al.*, 2018), cooperation in agricultural markets (Crick, 2018a),
16
17 and the networking of female entrepreneurs in the services sector (Foster and
18
19 Brindley, 2018). Consequently, this viewpoint addresses a current call for research,
20
21 examining the role of networks in entrepreneurial marketing strategies, with a focus
22
23 on cooperation activities.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 The aim of this paper is to highlight these under-researched areas surrounding the
31
32 cooperation literature and link them with entrepreneurial marketing theory. Guided by
33
34 a series of research propositions, some directions for future research are suggested.
35
36 Further, this viewpoint is designed to inform scholars, working at the
37
38 marketing/entrepreneurship interface, on how entrepreneurial marketing can
39
40 strengthen the cooperation literature (i.e., fill certain research gaps). As such, this study
41
42 is divided into the following four sections. First, the entrepreneurial marketing literature
43
44 is reviewed and linked with theory surrounding cooperation. Second, to explore the
45
46 research gaps pertaining to the cooperation literature, a conceptual framework, with
47
48 three research propositions, is developed to examine the antecedents and
49
50 consequences of cooperation activities, as well as the boundaries of the cooperation –
51
52 organisational performance relationship. Third, some directions for future research are
53
54 suggested to highlight how entrepreneurial marketing theory can be used to address
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the under-researched issues associated with the competition literature. Fourth, the
4
5 paper is concluded.
6
7

8 **Framing literature**

9 *Market orientation and entrepreneurial orientation*

10
11
12
13
14 Entrepreneurial marketing is positioned at the interface between the marketing and
15
16 entrepreneurship literature (Hills *et al.*, 2008; Miles, Gilmore, Harrigan, Lewis and
17
18 Sethna, 2015; O’Cass and Morrish, 2016). Underpinning these two strands of literature
19
20 is the forces of market orientation and entrepreneurial orientation (Miles and Arnold,
21
22 1991). Market orientation is the implementation of the marketing concept and the
23
24 organisation-wide creation of customer value (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993). Market
25
26 orientation has been conceptualised and operationalised in numerous respects, with
27
28 some authors describing it as a set of firm-level behaviours (e.g., Kohli and Jaworski,
29
30 1990; Cadogan, Souchon and Procter, 2008; Cadogan, Kuivalainen and Sundqvist,
31
32 2009), whereas, other academics have studied it as a corporate culture (e.g., Narver
33
34 and Slater, 1990; Slater and Narver, 1994; Homburg and Pflesser, 2000). Regardless
35
36 of how market orientation is conceptualised or operationalised, a consensus in the
37
38 extant body of knowledge is that it involves information-processing activities (Cadogan
39
40 and Diamantopoulos, 1995), in which firms obtain and react to information pertaining
41
42 to their customers and competitors and create superior forms of customer value (Crick,
43
44 2018b).
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 Entrepreneurial orientation is the “strategy-making processes that provide
53
54 organisations with a basis for entrepreneurial decisions and actions” (Rauch, Wiklund,
55
56 Lumpkin and Frese, 2009, p. 762). There have been different conceptualisations and
57
58 operationalisations of entrepreneurial orientation, but scholars have agreed that it is a
59
60

1
2
3 multi-dimensional construct, comprised of: risk-taking, innovative, and proactive
4 behaviours (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Boso *et al.*, 2013). Indeed, certain scholars
5 have considered competitive aggressiveness and autonomy as facets of
6 entrepreneurial orientation (George and Marino, 2011; Sundqvist, Kylaheiko,
7 Kuivalainen and Cadogan, 2012). Both market orientation and entrepreneurial
8 orientation have been found to help companies to improve their performance (e.g.,
9 sales) (Mentzer and Ozsomer, 2002; Baker and Sinkula, 2009). As mentioned earlier,
10 the forces of market orientation and entrepreneurial orientation are used to
11 conceptualise the marketing/entrepreneurship interface (Hills *et al.*, 2008; Miles *et al.*,
12 2015; O’Cass and Morrish, 2016). The dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing are
13 discussed in the following section.

24 *Dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing*

25
26 Entrepreneurial marketing has been conceptualised as a seven-component construct,
27 comprised of: a proactive orientation, opportunity-driven behaviours, customer
28 intensity factors, innovation-focused behaviours, risk management activities, resource
29 leveraging behaviours, and value creation factors (Morris, Schindehutte and LaForge,
30 2002). A proactive orientation is the degree to which entrepreneurs are prepared to
31 take bold steps when designing and executing their business strategies, so that they
32 influence their competitive business environment (Narver, Slater and MacLachlan,
33 2004; Eggers, Kraus, Hughes, Laraway and Snyckerski, 2013). The opportunity-driven
34 dimension of entrepreneurial marketing concerns the ways that entrepreneurs scan
35 their competitive business environment for new ways of achieving a competitive
36 advantage (Morrish, Miles and Deacon, 2010). Customer intensity refers to the extent
37 to which entrepreneurs develop and sustain relationships with their customers, such
38 as through collecting and responding to information about their wants and needs

(Miles and Darroch, 2006). This is something that compares with a customer orientation, a key dimension of the market orientation construct (see Narver and Slater, 1990; Cadogan and Diamantopoulos, 1995).

Innovation-focused behaviours involve the ways that entrepreneurs design and implement creative and technological processes within their operations, e.g., developing new products to fulfil their customers' wants and needs (Morrish and Deacon, 2011; Hallback and Gabrielsson, 2013). Risk management concerns entrepreneurs' awareness of the chances of success, vis-à-vis, failure of their business strategies, as well as the steps that they take to mitigate risk, like managing their resources and capabilities to reduce financial losses (O'Donnell *et al.*, 2002; Gilmore, Carson and O'Donnell, 2004; Morrish *et al.*, 2010). Further, resource leveraging activities are those that entrepreneurs use to utilise their financial and non-financial assets, so that they can implement their competitive strategies (Kraus, Harms and Fink, 2009; Gross, Carson and Jones, 2014). Often, entrepreneurs in small companies, have a limited array of resources (including cash) at their disposal (Chaston, 2000; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005; Gilmore, 2011). Resource leveraging activities help entrepreneurs to maximise their organisational performance through managing the correct resources in appropriate competitive strategies (Bjerke and Hultman, 2002; Morris *et al.*, 2002).

The value creation dimension of entrepreneurial marketing focuses on one of the most important issues in the broader marketing literature, namely, the ways that businesses can create value for their customers (Payne, Storbacka and Frow, 2008; Kumar and Reinartz, 2016). There are numerous methods to create customer value, like through market-oriented behaviours (generating, disseminating, and being responsive to market intelligence) (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Homburg and Pflesser, 2000; Cadogan

1
2
3 *et al.*, 2008); hence, entrepreneurs must engage in customer **value-oriented** activities
4 that match their available resources and capabilities (Hills *et al.*, 2008; Guercini, 2012;
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

et al., 2008); hence, entrepreneurs must engage in customer **value-oriented** activities that match their available resources and capabilities (Hills *et al.*, 2008; Guercini, 2012; Krisjanous and Carruthers, 2018). These seven dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing condense the marketing/entrepreneurship interface into a set of activities used to integrate the forces of market orientation and entrepreneurial orientation (Morris *et al.*, 2002; Whalen *et al.*, 2016; Crick, 2018a). In this **current** study, **the** theory surrounding the marketing/entrepreneurship interface is linked with some under-researched issues pertaining to the coopetition literature. Such conceptualisations are discussed as follows.

Coopetition and entrepreneurial marketing

As highlighted earlier, the entrepreneurial marketing domain has been approached using individualistic assumptions, such as entrepreneurs depending upon their own resources and capabilities to create value for **their** customers and not collaborating with their competitors (see Duus, 1997; Stokes, 2000; Gilmore, 2011; Mort *et al.*, 2012). For instance, Crick, Chaudhry and Crick (2018) examined a case study of a small business in tourism sector in the United Kingdom. In their paper, they found that the owner-manager was attempting to run a lifestyle-oriented firm, but due to: poor planning, changes to the local competitive business environment, and social factors, the business model was unsuccessful and firm-level performance suffered. Specifically, the owner-manager had not undertaken **enough** planning, as resources were scarce. **This meant** that the business model was not sustainable and may have been assisted by networking with the correct stakeholders. Although it is **common** for entrepreneurs to plan through using their own resources and capabilities (Crick and Crick, 2015), the coopetition literature suggests that companies are likely to improve

1
2
3 their performance if the owner-managers collaborate with their competitors (Rusko,
4 2011; Ritala *et al.*, 2014; Le Roy and Czakon, 2016).
5
6

7
8 In certain instances, collaborating with competitors is a positive **business** strategy for
9 entrepreneurs, due to providing them with: resources, capabilities, and opportunities
10 that would not exist under an individualistic business model (Ritala, 2012; Bengtsson
11 and Johansson, 2014; Mathias *et al.*, 2018). Collaborating with competitors could be
12 a risky strategy for entrepreneurs, **as there is** potential for tensions between rival firms,
13 as well as the chance of losing unique selling points that owner-managers might have
14 worked very hard to develop (Raza-Ullah, Bengtsson and Kock, 2014; Tidstrom,
15 2014). As the marketing/entrepreneurship interface deals with the ways that
16 entrepreneurs assess risk and engage in competitive strategies intended to create
17 value for customers (along other innovative and proactive behaviours) (Jones and
18 Rowley, 2011; Foster and Brindley, 2018), it is of interest to link coopetition with the
19 entrepreneurial marketing literature. By bridging the theoretical gap between these two
20 strands of literature, the prior-mentioned individualistic assumptions of the
21 entrepreneurial marketing perspective (as per Duus, 1997; Stokes, 2000; Miles and
22 Darroch, 2006; Gilmore, 2011) can be extended, so that the theory can account for a
23 collaborative business strategy (namely, coopetition) dimension.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 One of the few studies to link coopetition activities with entrepreneurial marketing was
47 written by Crick and Crick (2016), who used the empirical context of a Taekwondo
48 organisation in New Zealand to examine the multiple levels of coopetition. These
49 authors found that entrepreneurs can engage in three types of coopetition activities,
50 namely: local-level coopetition (where collaboration occurs with competitors within a
51 close geographic proximity), national-level coopetition (where collaboration occurs
52 with competitors across multiple regions of the same country), and organisation-level
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cooperation (where collaboration occurs with competitors across different sectors and
4 is not restricted to a certain country). Albeit examined in the context of a sporting
5 organisation, Crick and Crick (2016) argued that cooperation is a highly-suitable topic
6 for entrepreneurial marketing research, as it concerns the delicate balance between
7 the forces of competitiveness and cooperativeness. Henceforth, there is evidence to
8 suggest that cooperation can be theoretically-related to the entrepreneurial marketing
9 literature (supplementing Alves and Meneses, 2015; [Crick, 2018a](#); Daidj and Egert,
10 2018).

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Cooperation is likely to help entrepreneurs to improve their performance (e.g., sales),
23 as it allows them to access: resources, capabilities, and opportunities that would not
24 be available if they competed on an individualistic-level (Ritala, 2012; Bengtsson and
25 Johansson, 2014; Le Roy and Czakon, 2016). In the entrepreneurial marketing (and
26 entrepreneurship) literature, there is the underpinning assumption that the owner-
27 managers of small firms have limited resources and capabilities to invest into their
28 business strategies (Chaston, 2000; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005; Gilmore, 2011;
29 [Crick and Crick, 2018a](#)). Due to their resource-disadvantages, entrepreneurs must find
30 dynamic ways to create value for their customers and make effective use of their
31 limited resource base (Westhead, Wright and Ucbasaran, 2001). If owner-managers
32 have access to limited resources and capabilities, cooperation (or similar collaborative
33 business strategies) could be highly-effective [activities](#) to help them [to](#): achieve their
34 objectives, maximise their performance (e.g., sales), and compete within the
35 competitive business environment (Chetty and Wilson, 2003; Andersson *et al.*, 2018).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 professional reasons and manage assets with strategic alliances, through utilising the
4 skills of the cooperation partners (namely, rival firms). Alves and Meneses (2015)
5 highlighted the importance of cooperating with competitors, so that entrepreneurs can
6 be provided with new: resources, capabilities, and opportunities. Network members
7 are critical stakeholders for entrepreneurs, as they might help them to operate
8 successfully in their market(s) (Hill, McGowan and Drummond, 1999; Rocks, Gilmore
9 and Carson, 2005; Andersson *et al.*, 2018; Foster and Brindley, 2018). It appears that
10 competitors can also be effective network members in the correct circumstances
11 (depending on firm-level and industry-level contingencies). Therefore, collaborating
12 with rivals should be incorporated into the research positioned at the
13 marketing/entrepreneurship interface (building upon Alves and Meneses, 2015; Crick
14 and Crick, 2016; Crick, 2018a; Daidj and Egert, 2018). The: facets, antecedents, and
15 consequences of cooperation are explored in the next section.

16 *Facets, antecedents, and consequences of cooperation*

17 Crick (2018a) explored the: facets, antecedents, and consequences of cooperation,
18 using three dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing, namely: a proactive orientation,
19 resource leveraging behaviours, and innovation-focused behaviours. While Crick
20 (2018a) highlighted that it would have been interesting to apply all seven dimensions
21 of entrepreneurial marketing to cooperation activities (Morris *et al.*, 2002; Whalen *et al.*,
22 2016), the three that were selected explained: how cooperation can be managed (the
23 facets of cooperation), the factors that motivate entrepreneurs to cooperate with their
24 competitors (the antecedents of cooperation), and the performance outcomes that such
25 strategies might yield (the consequences of cooperation). Crick (2018a) selected these
26 three dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing, as they were conceptually-related to
27 the cooperation literature (Bjerke and Hultman, 2002; Hills *et al.*, 2008; Morrish *et al.*,

2010). Consequently, as noted in the previous section, coopetition activities have been linked with the marketing/entrepreneurship interface (Alves and Meneses, 2015; Crick and Crick, 2016; Crick, 2018a; Daidj and Egert, 2018), but more research is needed to integrate these two strands of literature.

Crick's (2018a) study examined the link between coopetition, under an entrepreneurial marketing perspective, using qualitative insights from the New Zealand wine industry. This sector was chosen, as it manages high-degrees of cooperativeness and competitiveness, a key factor needed to study coopetition (Rusko, 2011; Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014). Regarding the facets of coopetition, the construct can occur in three forms, namely: resource-sharing activities (the lending and borrowing of equipment between competitors), capability-sharing activities (rival firms sharing their knowledge and experience), and regional-level coopetition (a combination of resource and capability-sharing activities within a certain geographic region) (Ritala *et al.*, 2014; Granata, Lasch, Le Roy and Dana, 2018). By managing such facets, owner-managers should be able to develop and implement performance-driving forms of coopetition, mainly, those that help them to achieve their business objectives (Crick, 2018a). By not engaging in coopetition, small businesses might struggle to create value for their customers, due to possessing a limited resource base (Crick, 2015).

Concerning the antecedents of coopetition, Crick (2018a) found that an industry-wide cooperative mind-set and having access to competitors' resources and capabilities are necessary factors to help entrepreneurs to engage in coopetition activities. An industry-wide cooperative mind-set was described as when a large proportion of the competitors (or managers and employees in these entities) within a certain sector share the view that collaborating with competitors is likely to improve organisational performance. These findings support the argument that coopetition can only exist in

1
2
3 certain competitive business environments, where rivals are prepared to cooperate
4 with one another (Gnyawali and Park, 2011; Bengtsson, Raza-Ullah and Vanyushyn,
5 2016; Granata *et al.*, 2018). If owner-managers can foster these drivers of coopetition,
6 they should be able to add value to such collaborative arrangements, by sharing
7 resources and capabilities with competing organisations to mutually-benefit all parties
8 (Crick, 2018a). That said, Crick (2018a) stressed that the antecedents of coopetition
9 remains an under-researched area.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 In terms of the consequences of coopetition, Crick (2018a) found that coopetition
21 activities are likely to help entrepreneurs to perform better than if they operated an
22 individualistic business model. However, Crick (2018a) highlighted that entrepreneurs
23 have different performance objectives, such as market-level survival and sustainable
24 competitive advantages (as per Katsikeas, Morgan, Leonidou and Hult, 2016), for
25 which coopetition activities can yield various performance outcomes. Crick (2018a)
26 found that coopetition is only likely to drive sustainable competitive advantages if
27 entrepreneurs manage larger organisations, with more resources and capabilities to
28 invest in their various competitive strategies (Westhead *et al.*, 2001; Miles and
29 Darroch, 2006). Hence, although research has begun to examine the: facets,
30 antecedents, and consequences of coopetition under an entrepreneurial marketing
31 perspective (Alves and Meneses, 2015; Crick and Crick, 2016; Crick, 2018a; Daidj
32 and Egert, 2018), further studies are required to strengthen such theory. The role of
33 entrepreneurs in managing coopetition activities is explored in the following section.

34 *Role of entrepreneurs in managing coopetition activities*

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Coopetition is often studied at the firm-level, whereby, two or more businesses
collaborate to perform in ways that they would not be able to achieve if they had

operated individually (Chetty and Wilson, 2003; Ang, 2008; Le Roy and Czakon, 2016). However, within the companies engaging in coopetition strategies are entrepreneurs, who are the ones that are involved in: risk-taking, proactive, and innovative behaviours when collaborating with rival firms (Granata *et al.*, 2018). Entrepreneurs are the individuals that typically make the decision to collaborate with their competitors, so they need to be confident that they are working with correct rival firms (the ones that can provide them with superior assets and can be trusted in the short-term and long-term future) (Gnyawali and Park, 2011; Ritala, 2012; Mathias *et al.*, 2018). Yet, if entrepreneurs have a team of employees, they should ensure that the collaborative values that they possess (as owner-managers) are infused throughout their companies, so that such strategies are fully-implemented (Crick, 2015). In the next section, a series of research propositions are developed to examine some of the under-researched areas associated with the coopetition literature.

Research propositions

Conceptual framework

While there are certain issues surrounding the coopetition literature that are well-established (e.g., the performance consequences of coopetition) (Ang, 2008; Ritala, 2012; Le Roy and Czakon, 2016), there are other areas that are under-researched. In this viewpoint, three issues are highlighted, as important topics that have been scarcely studied. These issues are developed into a conceptual framework, guided by three research propositions (Figure 1). That is: an organisation-wide coopetition-oriented mind-set is anticipated to be a driver of coopetition activities (proposition 1), coopetition activities are expected to have a non-linear (inverted U-shaped) relationship with organisational performance (proposition 2), and competitive intensity

(a facet of the competitive business environment) is evaluated as a moderator in the competition – organisational performance relationship (proposition 3). These research propositions are developed as follows.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

An organisation-wide cooperation-oriented mind-set and cooperation activities

Most research surrounding the cooperation literature has focused on the performance consequences of such strategies, rather than their antecedents (see Ang, 2008; Ritala, 2012; Le Roy and Czakov, 2016). The few studies that have examined the factors that motivate entrepreneurs to engage in cooperation activities have explored the mind-set driving these collaborative behaviours (e.g., Gnyawali and Park, 2011; Bengtsson *et al.*, 2016). An organisation-wide cooperation-oriented mind-set is the firm-level beliefs surrounding the importance of collaborating with competitors (Crick and Crick, 2018b). If entrepreneurs (and their employees) believe that they will improve their performance (e.g., sales) if they share resources and capabilities with rival firms, they *might* engage in behavioural forms of cooperation (Crick, 2015). As such, cooperation activities, like resource and capability-sharing activities (see Crick, 2018a), are likely to be manifestations of an organisation-wide cooperation-oriented mind-set (Gnyawali and Park, 2011; Bengtsson *et al.*, 2016). It is important that all members of a business share this organisation-wide cooperation-oriented mind-set (not just the owner-managers), as this may limit the extent to which cooperation-oriented behaviours are implemented (Crick and Crick, 2018b).

Outside of the cooperation literature, other studies have examined the link between organisation-wide mind-sets and firm-level behaviours. For instance, Kor and Mesko (2013) examined the notion of the firm's dominant logic (comparable with an

1
2
3 organisation-wide mind-set), namely, the ways that management teams conceptualise
4
5 their businesses and have assumptions about how their companies should be
6
7 managed (Prahalad and Bettis, 1986; Obloj, Obloj and Pratt, 2010). If managers and
8
9 employees believe that a certain activity is an important driver of organisational
10
11 performance, they are likely to engage in firm-level behaviours that are in-sync with
12
13 their dominant logic (Kor and Mesko, 2013). These authors discussed how resource
14
15 investments (for instance, to certain departments of an organisation) are a behavioural
16
17 manifestation of a dominant logic, whereby, a corporate culture directs firm-level
18
19 behaviours (as per Homburg and Pflesser, 2000). Returning to the coopetition
20
21 literature, if entrepreneurs and their employees believe that coopetition is a
22
23 performance-driving business strategy, coopetition activities could be a behavioural
24
25 manifestation of such an organisation-wide coopetition-oriented mind-set (Gnyawali
26
27 and Park, 2011; Bengtsson *et al.*, 2016).

28
29
30
31
32
33 To stress a vital point, an organisation-wide coopetition-oriented mind-set is
34
35 conceptualised as a firm-level construct, meaning that all members of a company
36
37 should believe that coopetition is a positive driver of organisational performance (Crick
38
39 and Crick, 2018b). If entrepreneurs (as owner-managers) possess assumptions about
40
41 the importance of collaborating with competitors, but these assumptions are not
42
43 infused throughout the company, it is argued that an organisation-wide coopetition-
44
45 oriented mind-set does not exist. Although entrepreneurs are key individuals in
46
47 managing coopetition strategies (see Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014; Granata *et al.*,
48
49 2018), functional-level employees also engage in certain forms of coopetition.
50
51 Specifically, members of staff, that have an interface with customers, might
52
53 recommend rival firms' offerings, if they cannot supply a good or service (demanded
54
55 by a customer) themselves (Crick and Crick, 2018b). It would be interesting to test
56
57
58
59
60

whether an organisation-wide coopetition-oriented mind-set drives coopetition activities (building upon Gnyawali and Park, 2011; Bengtsson *et al.*, 2016).

Henceforth, it is anticipated that:

P1. An organisation-wide coopetition-oriented mind-set has a positive relationship with coopetition activities.

Non-linear relationship between coopetition activities and organisational performance

To emphasise a previous point, various authors have examined the performance consequences of coopetition activities (Ang, 2008; Ritala, 2012; Le Roy and Czakon, 2016). Once again, prior work has highlighted that to overcome certain resource-disadvantages, entrepreneurs in small businesses, can access new: resources, capabilities, and opportunities from their competitors, meaning that coopetition activities can improve organisational performance (Lechner and Leyronas, 2009; Rusko, 2011; Ritala *et al.*, 2014). Furthermore, a commonly-used theory surrounding the marketing/entrepreneurship interface is the resource-based view of the firm (also known as resource-based theory) (see Kocak and Abimbola, 2009; Gross *et al.*, 2014; Khizindar and Darley, 2017; Crick, 2018a). This theoretical perspective suggests that organisational performance (conceptualised in numerous capacities) is driven by business' resources and capabilities (Nason and Wiklund, 2018). Therefore, resource-based theory has the key assumption that larger companies, with more assets at their disposal, are more likely to have higher-levels of performance than smaller firms, with fewer resources and capabilities (Westhead *et al.*, 2001).

Under the resource-based view, the resource and capability-sharing activities that comprise coopetition strategies are likely to help entrepreneurs, managing small companies, to perform in ways that would not be possible if they operated an

1
2
3 individualistic business model (Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014; Le Roy and Czakon,
4
5 2016). That said, most authors examining the performance consequences of
6
7 competition have only considered the linear relationship between these two constructs
8
9 (e.g., Ritala, 2012). That is, while cooperation activities may provide entrepreneurs will
10
11 a range of benefits, it is suggested that collaborating with competitors is only a positive
12
13 competitive strategy up to a certain point. Specifically, if entrepreneurs collaborate with
14
15 their competitors, they could reach a stage, in which they share “too many” resources
16
17 and capabilities with rival firms, creating tensions between such competing entities
18
19 (Raza-Ullah *et al.*, 2014). Tensions surrounding cooperation activities could include
20
21 conflict and power imbalances, whereby, “too much” cooperation could create a
22
23 diminishing-returns effect in the link with organisational performance (Tidstrom, 2014).
24
25
26 With “too little” cooperation, entrepreneurs are forced to compete with a potentially
27
28 limited volume of: resources, capabilities, and opportunities (Crick, 2015). As
29
30 discussed throughout the entrepreneurial marketing literature, often, small firms do not
31
32 have large-scale assets that can be invested into their business strategies (Carson,
33
34 1990; O'Donnell *et al.*, 2002; Gilmore, 2011; Gross *et al.*, 2014). As such, if little
35
36 networking occurs with competing companies, an individualistic business model can
37
38 reduce the opportunities that entrepreneurs can strive for (Bengtsson and Johansson,
39
40 2014; Granata *et al.*, 2018). Yet, with “too much” cooperation, as mentioned above,
41
42 entrepreneurs risk creating tensions (e.g., conflict and power imbalances) with their
43
44 competitors (Raza-Ullah *et al.*, 2014; Tidstrom, 2014). Thus, entrepreneurs are faced
45
46 with the difficult task of engaging in the “optimal-level” of cooperation activities. If
47
48 entrepreneurs exceed this inflection point, they risk becoming dependent on
49
50 competitors' resources and capabilities - affecting the degree of conflict and power
51
52 imbalances that are at play (Crick and Crick, 2018b). Consequently, it is expected that:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 P2. Coopetition activities have a non-linear (inverted U-shaped) relationship
4
5 with organisational performance.
6
7

8 *Moderating role of competitive intensity* 9

10
11 In addition to scholars [predominately](#) examining the linear relationship between
12
13 coopetition activities and organisational performance, such studies have scarcely
14
15 considered the contingencies that could affect this link (Crick and Crick, 2016; Le Roy
16
17 and Czakon, 2016; Granata *et al.*, 2018). While numerous contingencies could be
18
19 explored, a limited area of research surrounds whether the competitive business
20
21 environment affects the relationship between coopetition activities and organisational
22
23 performance, with very few authors having examined this factor (e.g., Ang, 2008;
24
25 Ritala, 2012). The competitive business environment concerns external (outside of the
26
27 firm) market-level forces that shape how companies operate in their industries
28
29 (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; [Ferrier, 2001](#); Chung and Kuo, 2018). Moreover, there are
30
31 different facets of the competitive business environment, such as: technological
32
33 turbulence, market dynamism, and competitive intensity (Slater and Narver, 1994;
34
35 Cadogan, Cui and Li, 2003). The latter is the area of focus in this viewpoint, as
36
37 competitive intensity (the degree to which rivals are competitively fierce in their
38
39 markets) (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993) is linked with coopetition activities (see Ang,
40
41 2008).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 As a non-coopetition illustration, the competitive business environment has been a
50
51 topic of great interest in the market orientation literature, whereby, scholars have
52
53 debated over its moderating effect in the market orientation – organisational
54
55 performance relationship (e.g., Slater and Narver, 1994; Murray, Gao and Kotabe,
56
57 2011). The authors that have found a significant moderating effect have suggested
58
59
60

1
2
3 that with lower-levels of environmental turbulence (which can include competitive
4 intensity), market orientation is more likely to lead to improvements in organisational
5 performance – due to fewer competitive distortions in the market, allowing companies
6 to create value for their customers (see Cadogan *et al.*, 2009). Yet, with higher-levels
7 of environmental turbulence (again, including competitive intensity), businesses might
8 struggle to differentiate their products and services from the increased magnitude of
9 rivals in the market (Cadogan *et al.*, 2003). Linking with the themes of this current
10 study, it is of interest to explore whether competitive intensity moderates the
11 cooperation – organisational performance relationship.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 As firms become competitively fierce within their markets, it could be that they become
26 less likely to share resources and capabilities with their rivals (Ang, 2008; Ritala,
27 2012). That is, cooperation involves the paradoxical relationship between the forces of
28 cooperativeness and competitiveness (Gnyawali and Park, 2011; Le Roy and Czakon,
29 2016; Granata *et al.*, 2018; Mathias *et al.*, 2018). Thus, even in the most cooperative
30 forms of cooperation, there will always be a rivalrous factor, influencing the networks
31 that are being managed by competing entities (Bengtsson and Kock, 2000). Therefore,
32 as the degree to which entrepreneurs exhibit competitive behaviours (through
33 competitive intensity) increases, they might reduce the cooperativeness within
34 cooperation activities, creating less-effective cooperation strategies. As such, it is
35 suggested that higher-degrees of competitive intensity could weaken the relationship
36 between cooperation activities and organisational performance. Yet, this moderating
37 effect has scarcely been studied (Ang, 2008; Ritala, 2012), creating scope for
38 additional investigations.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 Returning to the conceptualisation of the non-linear (inverted U-shaped) relationship
58 between cooperation activities and organisational performance (proposition 2), the
59
60

reason that such a link occurs between two constructs is that a third variable is affecting the dynamics (see Cadogan *et al.*, 2009). As cooperation concerns the interplay between cooperation and competition (Chetty and Wilson, 2003; Rusko, 2011; Mathias *et al.*, 2018), it is likely that the competitiveness between two or more firms that engage in cooperation strategies, determines the non-linear link with organisational performance (Park *et al.*, 2014; Bengtsson *et al.*, 2016). Hence, a third variable that underpins the non-linear relationship between cooperation activities and organisational performance could be competitive intensity (a facet of the competitive business environment). It is argued that with an excessive magnitude of competitive intensity, explanations can be made surrounding the potentially non-linear relationship between cooperation activities and organisational performance. **Nevertheless, there is evidence to suggest that:**

P3. Competitive intensity **negatively** moderates the relationship between cooperation activities and organisational performance.

In the following section, these three research propositions are shaped into some directions for future research.

Directions for future research

Despite cooperation being a well-studied issue in the broader **management** literature, there are some important areas that need to be investigated. As cooperation activities have **scarcely** been incorporated into the entrepreneurial marketing literature (Alves and Meneses, 2015; Crick and Crick, 2016; **Crick, 2018a**; Daidj and Egert, 2018), it is proposed that scholars, exploring this field, can use their expertise to fill such research gaps. Further, the marketing/entrepreneurship interface is far from being a saturated research domain (i.e., there are plenty of issues that need to be addressed) (O'Donnell

1
2
3 *et al.*, 2002; Gilmore, 2011; Mort *et al.*, 2012; Gross *et al.*, 2014; Miles *et al.*, 2015;
4
5 O’Cass and Morrish, 2016; Whalen *et al.*, 2016). Entrepreneurial marketing scholars
6
7 should investigate cooperation activities, as well as their: antecedents, consequences,
8
9 and boundaries to study how collaborating with competitors helps entrepreneurs to
10
11 overcome certain resource-disadvantages by accessing new: resources, capabilities,
12
13 and opportunities from their competitors (as per Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014;
14
15 Granata *et al.*, 2018; Mathias *et al.*, 2018). Entrepreneurial marketing scholars should
16
17 investigate the following issues when applying the marketing/entrepreneurship
18
19 interface to the cooperation literature.
20
21
22

23
24 First, entrepreneurial marketing scholars should examine whether an organisation-
25
26 wide cooperation-oriented mind-set has a positive relationship with cooperation
27
28 activities (building upon the work of Gnyawali and Park, 2011; Bengtsson *et al.*, 2016;
29
30 Crick, 2018a). Second, research positioned at the marketing/entrepreneurship
31
32 interface should also address whether the relationship between cooperation activities
33
34 and organisational performance is non-linear (inverted U-shaped) (extending research
35
36 by Park *et al.*, 2014; Raza-Ullah *et al.*, 2014; Tidstrom, 2014). Third, entrepreneurial
37
38 marketing scholars should examine the boundaries of cooperation activities; that is,
39
40 whether the performance consequences of cooperation are negatively influenced by
41
42 the degree of competitive intensity (see Ang, 2008; Ritala, 2012). Indeed, these
43
44 directions for future research can only be studied through theory-testing quantitative
45
46 research. Thus, entrepreneurial marketing scholars should use effective
47
48 operationalisations and high-quality (reliable and valid) statistical data to test these
49
50 conceptual assertions.
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 Specifically, if entrepreneurial marketing scholars choose to test this paper’s
58
59 conceptual framework, they should undertake a methodology that is based on the
60

1
2
3 following data collection and data analysis techniques¹. In terms of an empirical
4
5 context, it is important to study coopetition an industry (or industries) that is both highly-
6
7 cooperative and highly-competitive (Bengtsson and Kock, 2000; Rusko, 2011;
8
9 Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014). That is, coopetition is the interplay between
10
11 cooperation and competition, meaning that it is important to investigate such activities
12
13 where cooperative and competitive forces are at play (Crick, 2018c). For example,
14
15 academics have studied coopetition in agricultural markets, such as the wine industry
16
17 (see Crick, 2015; Granata *et al.*, 2018). Once researchers have selected an
18
19 appropriate empirical context to study coopetition, a survey-based is recommended.
20
21 Surveys could be used to collect data on the operationalisations of the constructs
22
23 depicted within this paper's conceptual framework (e.g., coopetition activities,
24
25 competitive intensity, and organisational performance).

26
27
28
29
30
31 When operationalising the constructs used within the conceptual framework, scholars
32
33 should attempt to use established measures, such as Ritala's (2012) adopted
34
35 measurement scale of coopetition activities. Further, when developing a survey,
36
37 academics are recommended to pre-test its content with a sample of academics and
38
39 practitioners to ensure that it is readable and addresses the correct issues (Crick,
40
41 2018b). Then, if researchers decide to test the conceptual framework that was
42
43 developed within this viewpoint, they are recommended to do so using structural
44
45 equation modelling (SEM). SEM is a combination of multiple regression and factor
46
47 analyses that addresses the quality of measurement scales, alongside testing
48
49 hypothesised relationships (Sundqvist *et al.*, 2012). SEM is an appropriate technique,
50
51 as the conceptual framework is relatively complex, as it involves multiple hypothesised
52
53 paths and a moderation effect (in addition to any control variables that scholars might
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ¹ The author would like to thank one anonymous reviewer for raising this issue.

1
2
3 wish to use, e.g., firm size). SEM allows researchers to test such models (Cadogan *et*
4 *al.*, 2008) and would be a suitable data analysis technique to employ in future
5
6
7
8 research.

9
10
11 Scholars, working at the marketing/entrepreneurship interface, should address the
12
13 following areas of reliability and validity. Reliability is the extent to which researchers
14
15 will obtain similar (or identical) results if they were to repeat their study in the same
16
17 setting, whereas, validity to the degree to which researchers have measured what they
18
19 intended to measure (Crick, 2015). Reliability can be addressed through using
20
21 Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α), whereby, a reliable measure should yield a score of
22
23 greater than 0.70 (see Eggers *et al.*, 2013). Moreover, academics can use the
24
25 composite reliabilities (which should be above 0.60) and the average variance
26
27 extracted (ideally, should be greater than 0.50) to assess the reliabilities of their
28
29 measures (Cadogan *et al.*, 2008). Validity can be checked in multiple capacities. Face
30
31 validity can be evaluated through pre-testing surveys with knowledgeable academics
32
33 and practitioners (Crick, 2018b). Convergent validity can be checked through having
34
35 high-quality measures, as indicated by the results in SEM software (e.g., high factor
36
37 loadings and low error variances) (Murray *et al.*, 2011). Discriminant validity can be
38
39 tested through Fornell and Larcker's (1981) tool to ensure that variables are not too
40
41 highly-correlated to the extent where they are measuring the same construct.
42
43 Researchers should also consider testing for common method variance in future
44
45 research (see Boso *et al.*, 2013). This paper is concluded as follows.

52 53 **Conclusions**

54
55
56 The objective of this viewpoint was to explore how coopetition (the interplay between
57
58 cooperation and competition) can be incorporated into the entrepreneurial marketing
59
60

1
2
3 literature. This objective was achieved through reviewing the respective literature
4
5 associated with coopetition activities and entrepreneurial marketing. From this
6
7 investigation, the following three conclusions are made. First, it is concluded that
8
9 limited research surrounds the antecedents of coopetition, for which academics should
10
11 examine whether an organisation-wide coopetition-oriented mind-set is a driver of
12
13 coopetition activities. Second, it is also concluded that scholars should test the non-
14
15 linear (inverted U-shaped) relationship between coopetition activities and
16
17 organisational performance. Third, it is finally concluded that competitive intensity (a
18
19 facet of the competitive business environment) has minimally been examined as a
20
21 moderator in the link between coopetition activities and organisational performance.
22
23 Thus, academics should test this [moderating relationship](#) in future research. In closing,
24
25 it is argued that entrepreneurial marketing scholars are studying an appropriate
26
27 domain that can be used to fill these research gaps surrounding the coopetition
28
29 literature. Such academics should integrate these strands of literature to add a
30
31 collaborative business strategy dimension into research positioned at the
32
33 marketing/entrepreneurship interface.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Alves, J. and Meneses, R. (2015), "Partner selection in co-opetition: a three-step model", *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 23-35.
- Andersson, S., Evers, N. and Gliga, G. (2018), "Entrepreneurial marketing and born global internationalisation in China", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 202-231.
- Ang, S.H. (2008), "Competitive intensity and collaboration: impact on firm growth across technological environments", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 29 No. 10, pp. 1057-1075.
- Baker, W.E. and Sinkula, J.M. (2009), "The complementary effects of market orientation and entrepreneurial orientation on profitability in small businesses", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 443-464.
- Bengtsson, M. and Johansson, M. (2014), "Managing coopetition to create opportunities for small firms", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 401-427.
- Bengtsson, M. and Kock, S. (2000), "Coopetition in business networks: to cooperate and compete simultaneously", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 411-426.
- Bengtsson, M., Raza-Ullah, T. and Vanyushyn, V. (2016), "The coopetition paradox and tension: the moderating role of coopetition capability", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp. 19-30.
- Boso, N., Story, V.M. and Cadogan, J.W. (2013), "Entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation, network ties, and performance: study of entrepreneurial firms in a developing economy", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 28 No. 6, pp. 708-727.
- Bjerke, B. and Hultman, C.M. (2002), *Entrepreneurial Marketing: The Growth of Small Firms in the New Economic Era*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham: United Kingdom.
- Cadogan, J.W. and Diamantopoulos, A. (1995), "Narver and Slater, Kohli and Jaworski and the market orientation construct: integration and internationalization", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 41-60.
- Cadogan, J.W., Cui, C.C. and Li, E.K.Y. (2003), "Export market-oriented behavior and export performance: the moderating roles of competitive intensity and technological turbulence", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 493-513.
- Cadogan, J.W., Kuivalainen, O. and Sundqvist, S. (2009), "Export market-oriented behavior and export performance: quadratic and moderating effects under differing degrees of market dynamism and internationalization", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 71-89.
- Cadogan, J.W., Souchon, A.L. and Procter, D.W. (2008), "The quality of market-oriented behaviors: formative index construction", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 61 No. 12, pp. 1263-1277.
- Carson, D. (1990), "Some exploratory models for assessing small firms' marketing performance (a qualitative approach)", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 11, pp. 8-51.

- 1
2
3 Chaston, I. (2000), *Entrepreneurial Marketing: Competing by Challenging Convention*,
4 MacMillan, London: United Kingdom.
5
- 6 Chetty, S.K. and Wilson, H.I.M. (2003), "Collaborating with competitors to acquire
7 resources", *International Business Review*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 61-81.
8
- 9 Chung, H.F.L. and Kuo, T. (2018), "When and how managerial ties matter in
10 international competitive strategy, export financial and strategic performance
11 framework: a standardized or customized approach?", *European Journal of*
12 *Marketing*, Vol. 52 Nos. 11/12, pp. 260-278.
13
- 14 Collinson, E. and Shaw, E. (2001), "Entrepreneurial marketing: a historical perspective
15 on development and practice", *Management Decision*, Vol. 39 No. 9, pp. 761-766.
16
- 17 Crick, D. and Crick, J.M. (2015), "Learning and decision-making in marketing planning:
18 a study of New Zealand vineyards", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 33 No.
19 5, pp. 707-732.
20
- 21 Crick, D. and Crick, J.M. (2016), "Coopetition at the sports marketing/entrepreneurship
22 interface: a case study of a Taekwondo organisation", *Marketing Intelligence &*
23 *Planning*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 169-187.
24
- 25 Crick, D., Chaudhry, S. and Crick, J.M. (2018), "Risks/rewards and an evolving
26 business model: a case study of a small lifestyle business in the UK tourism
27 sector", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp.
28 143-165.
29
- 30 Crick, J.M. (2015), "Bridging the gap between threshold and dynamic capabilities: a
31 qualitative study of the collaboration strategies in the New Zealand wine industry",
32 unpublished Master of Business Studies thesis, Massey University, Wellington,
33 New Zealand.
34
- 35 Crick, J.M. (2018a), "The facets, antecedents and consequences of coopetition: an
36 entrepreneurial marketing perspective", *Qualitative Market Research: An*
37 *International Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 253-272.
38
- 39 Crick, J.M. (2018b), "The antecedents and consequences of a customer value-oriented
40 dominant logic: a dynamic managerial capabilities perspective", unpublished Doctor
41 of Philosophy thesis, Loughborough University, United Kingdom.
42
- 43 Crick, J.M. (2018c), "Studying coopetition in a wine industry context: directions for future
44 research", *International Journal of Wine Business Research* (Forthcoming).
45
- 46 Crick, J.M. and Crick, D. (2018a), "Angel investors' predictive and control funding
47 criteria: the importance of evolving business models", *Journal of Research in*
48 *Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 34-56.
49
- 50 Crick, J.M. and Crick, D. (2018b), "The dark-side of coopetition-oriented business
51 models: Entrepreneurial marketing strategies in the New Zealand wine industry",
52 *Global Research Symposium in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Boston: United
53 States.
54
- 55 Daidj, N. and Egert, C. (2018), "Towards new coopetition-based business models? The
56 case of Netflix on the French market", *Journal of Research in Marketing and*
57 *Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 99-120.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Davis, C.D., Hills, G.E. and LaForge, R.W. (1985), "The marketing/small enterprise
4 paradox: a research agenda", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 3,
5 pp. 31-42.
6
7 Duus, H.J. (1997), "Economic foundations for an entrepreneurial marketing concept",
8 *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 287-305.
9
10 Eggers, F., Kraus, S., Hughes, M., Laraway, S. and Snyckerski, S. (2013), "Implications
11 of customer and entrepreneurial orientations for SME growth", *Management
12 Decision*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 524-546.
13
14 Ferrier, W.J. (2001), "Navigating the competitive landscape: the drivers and
15 consequences of competitive aggressiveness", *Academy of Management Journal*,
16 Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 858-877.
17
18 Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Structural equation models with unobservable
19 variables and measurement error: algebra and statistics", *Journal of Marketing
20 Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 382-388.
21
22 Foster, C. and Brindley, C. (2018), "Female entrepreneurial networking in the marketing
23 services sector", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 21 No.
24 2, pp. 182-201.
25
26 George, B.A. and Marino, L. (2011), "The epistemology of entrepreneurial orientation:
27 conceptual formation, modelling, and operationalization", *Entrepreneurship Theory
28 and Practice*, Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 989-1024.
29
30 Gilmore, A. (2011), "Entrepreneurial and SME marketing", *Journal of Research in
31 Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 137-145.
32
33 Gilmore, A., Carson, D. and O'Donnell, A. (2004), "Small business owner-managers
34 and their attitude to risk", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 349-
35 360.
36
37 Gnyawali, D.R. and Park, B.J.R. (2011), "Co-opetition between giants: collaboration
38 with competitors for technological innovation", *Research Policy*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp.
39 650-663.
40
41 Granata, J., Lasch, F., Le Roy, F. and Dana, L-P. (2018), "How do micro-firms manage
42 coopetition? A study of the wine sector in France", *International Small Business
43 Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 331-355.
44
45 Gross, N., Carson, D. and Jones, R. (2014), "Beyond rhetoric: re-thinking
46 entrepreneurial marketing from a practice perspective", *Journal of Research in
47 Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 105-127.
48
49 Guercini, S. (2012), "New approaches to heuristic processes and entrepreneurial
50 cognition of the market", *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*,
51 Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 199-213.
52
53 Hallback, J. and Gabrielsson, P. (2013), "Entrepreneurial marketing strategies during
54 the growth of international new ventures originating in small and open economies",
55 *International Business Review*, Vol. 22 No. 6, pp. 1008-1020.
56
57 Hill, J., McGowan, P. and Drummond, P. (1999), "The development and application of
58 a qualitative approach to researching the marketing networks of small firm
59
60

- entrepreneurs", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 71-81.
- Hills, G.E., Hultman, C.M. and Miles, M.P. (2008), "The evolution and development of entrepreneurial marketing", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 99-112.
- Homburg, C. and Pflesser, C. (2000), "A multiple-layer model of market-oriented organizational culture: measurement issues and performance outcomes", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 449-462.
- Jaworski, B.J. and Kohli, A.K. (1993), "Market orientation: antecedents and consequences", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 No. 3, pp. 53-70.
- Jones, R. and Rowley, J. (2011), "Entrepreneurial marketing in small businesses: a conceptual exploration", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 25-36.
- Katsikeas, C.S., Morgan, N.A., Leonidou, L.C. and Hult, G.T.M. (2016), "Assessing performance outcomes in marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 80 No. 2, pp. 1-20.
- Khizindar, T.M. and Darley, W.K. (2017), "A study of female Middle Eastern entrepreneurs: a resource-based view", *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 42-58.
- Kocak, A. and Abimbola, T. (2009), "The effects of entrepreneurial marketing on born global performance", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 26 Nos. 4/5, pp. 439-452.
- Kohli, A.K. and Jaworski, B.J. (1990), "Market orientation: the construct, research propositions, and managerial implications", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 1-18.
- Kor, Y.Y. and Mesko, A. (2013), "Dynamic managerial capabilities: configuration and orchestration of top executives' capabilities and the firm's dominant logic", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 233-244.
- Kraus, S., Harms, R. and Fink, M. (2009), "Entrepreneurial marketing: moving beyond marketing in new ventures", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 19-34.
- Krisjanous, J. and Carruthers, J. (2018), "Walking on the light side: investigating the world of ghost tour operators and entrepreneurial marketing", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 232-252.
- Kumar, V. and Reinartz, W. (2016), "Creating enduring customer value", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 80 No. 6, pp. 36-68.
- Lechner, C. and Leyronas, C. (2009), "Small-business group formation as an entrepreneurial development model", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 645-667.
- Le Roy, F. and Czakon, W. (2016), "Managing coopetition: the missing link between strategy and performance", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp. 3-6.

- 1
2
3 Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (1996), "Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation
4 construct and linking it to performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21
5 No. 1, pp. 429-451.
6
7 Mathias, B.D., Huyghe, A., Frid, C.J. and Galloway, T.L. (2018), "An identity perspective
8 on cooperation in the craft beer industry", *Strategic Management Journal*
9 (Forthcoming).
10
11 Miles, M.P. and Arnold, D.R. (1991), "The relationship between marketing orientation
12 and entrepreneurial orientation", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 15 No.
13 4, pp. 49-66.
14
15 Miles, M.P. and Darroch, J. (2006), "Large firms, entrepreneurial marketing processes,
16 and the cycle of competitive advantage", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 40
17 Nos. 5/6, pp. 485-501.
18
19 Miles, M.P., Gilmore, A., Harrigan, P., Lewis, G. and Sethna, Z. (2015), "Exploring
20 entrepreneurial marketing", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 94-
21 111.
22
23 Morrish, S.C. and Deacon, J.H. (2011), "A tale of two spirits: entrepreneurial marketing
24 at 42Below vodka and Penderyn whiskey", *Journal of Small Business &*
25 *Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 24 No. 11, pp. 113-124.
26
27 Morrish, S.C., Miles, M.P. and Deacon, J.H. (2010), "Entrepreneurial marketing:
28 acknowledging the entrepreneur and customer-centric interrelationship", *Journal of*
29 *Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 303-316.
30
31 Morris, M.H., Schindehutte, M. and LaForge, R.W. (2002), "Entrepreneurial marketing:
32 a construct for integrating emerging entrepreneurship and marketing perspectives",
33 *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 1-19.
34
35 Mort, G.S., Weerawardena, J. and Liesch, P. (2012), "Advancing entrepreneurial
36 marketing: evidence from born global firms", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.
37 46 Nos. 3/4, pp. 542-561.
38
39 Murray, J.Y., Gao, G.Y. and Kotabe, M.W. (2011), "Market orientation and performance
40 of export ventures: the process through marketing capabilities and competitive
41 advantages", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 252-
42 269.
43
44 Narver, J.C. and Slater, S.F. (1990), "The effect of a market orientation on business
45 profitability", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 4, pp. 20-35.
46
47 Narver, J.C., Slater, S.F. and MacLachlan, D. (2004), "Responsive and proactive market
48 orientation and new-product success", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*,
49 Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 334-347.
50
51 Nason, R.S. and Wiklund, J. (2018), "An assessment of resource-based theorizing on
52 firm growth and suggestions for the future", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 44 No. 1,
53 pp. 32-60.
54
55 Obloj, T., Obloj, K. and Pratt, M.G. (2010), "Dominant logic and entrepreneurial firms'
56 performance in a transition economy", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol.
57 34 No. 1, pp. 151-170.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 O’Cass, A. and Morrish, S.C. (2016), “Anatomy of entrepreneurial marketing”, *Journal*
4 *of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 2-4.
5
6 O’Donnell, A., Gilmore, A., Carson, D. and Cummis, D. (2002), “Competitive advantage
7 in small to medium-sized enterprises”, *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 10 No.
8 3, pp. 205-223.
9
10 Park, B.J.R., Srivastava, M.K. and Gnyawali, D.R. (2014), “Walking the tight rope of
11 coopetition: impact of competition and cooperation intensities and balance on firm
12 innovation performance”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 210-
13 221.
14
15 Payne, A.F., Storbacka, K. and Frow, P. (2008), “Managing the co-creation of value”,
16 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 83-96.
17
18 Prahalad, C.K. and Bettis, R.A. (1986), “The dominant logic: a new linkage between
19 diversity and performance”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 6, pp. 485-
20 501.
21
22 Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G.T. and Frese, M. (2009), “Entrepreneurial orientation
23 and business performance: an assessment of past research and suggestions for
24 the future”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 761-787.
25
26 Raza-Ullah, T., Bengtsson, M. and Kock, S. (2014), “The coopetition paradox and
27 tension in coopetition at multiple levels”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43
28 No. 2, pp. 189-198.
29
30 Ritala, P. (2012), “Coopetition strategy – when is it successful? Empirical evidence on
31 innovation and market performance”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 23 No. 3,
32 pp. 307-324.
33
34 Ritala, P., Golnam, A. and Wegmann, A. (2014), “Coopetition-based business models:
35 the case of Amazon.com”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp.
36 236-249.
37
38 Rocks, S., Gilmore, A. and Carson, D. (2005), “Developing strategic marketing through
39 the use of marketing networks”, *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp.
40 81-92.
41
42 Rusko, R. (2011), “Exploring the concept of coopetition: a typology for the strategic
43 moves of the Finnish forest industry”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 40 No.
44 2, pp. 311-320.
45
46 Slater, S.F. and Narver, J.C. (1994), “Does competitive environment moderate the
47 market orientation-performance relationship?”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58 No. 1,
48 pp. 46-55.
49
50 Stokes, D. (2000), “Entrepreneurial marketing: a conceptualisation from qualitative
51 research”, *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp.
52 47-54.
53
54 Sundqvist, S., Kylaheiko, K., Kuivalainen, O. and Cadogan, J.W. (2012), “Kirznerian
55 and Schumpeterian entrepreneurial-oriented behavior in turbulent export markets”,
56 *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 203-219.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Thompson-Whiteside, H., Turnbull, S. and Howe-Walsh, L. (2018), "Developing an
4 authentic personal brand using impression management behaviours: exploring
5 female entrepreneurs' experiences", *Qualitative Market Research: An International*
6 *Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 166-181.
7
8 Tidstrom, A. (2014), "Managing tensions in coopetition", *Industrial Marketing*
9 *Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 261-271.
10
11 Westhead, P., Wright, M. and Ucbasaran, D. (2001), "The internationalization of new
12 and small firms: a resource-based view", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16 No.
13 4, pp. 333-358.
14
15 Whalen, P., Uslay, C., Pascal, V.J., Omura, G., McAuley, A., Kasouf, C.J., Jones, R.,
16 Hultman, C.M., Hills, G.E., Hansen, D.J., Gilmore, A., Giglierano, J., Eggers, F. and
17 Deacon, J.H. (2016), "Anatomy of competitive advantage: towards a contingency
18 theory of entrepreneurial marketing", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 1,
19 pp. 5-19.
20
21 Wiklund, J. and Shepherd, D.A. (2005), "Entrepreneurial orientation and small business
22 performance: a configurational approach", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 20
23 No. 1, pp. 71-91.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Conceptual framework

