

# The Role of Transactional versus Relational Data in IMC Programs: Bringing Customer Data Together

**DEBRA ZAHAY**  
Northern Illinois  
University  
zahay@niu.edu

**JAMES PELTIER**  
University of  
Wisconsin-Whitewater  
peltierj@uww.edu

**DON E. SCHULTZ**  
Northwestern University  
Dschultz@lulu.acns.nwu.edu

**ABBIE GRIFFIN**  
University of Illinois at  
Urbana-Champaign  
abbieg@uiuc.edu

In this exploratory study of integrated marketing communications (IMC), we bring together relational and transactional data, and sales and marketing views, to investigate whether firms can enhance their position in the market in terms of both marketing-oriented and sales-based performance benchmarks. This article examines, in a business-to-business services context, the relationships between collecting various types of customer transaction and relational data, customer data quality, and two types of business unit performance. The first type of performance is a more traditional sales-oriented metric of sales-oriented business growth, growth in sales, and net income. The second type is a less traditional marketing-oriented metric, called marketing-oriented customer performance, a summed measure of retention rate, share of wallet, lifetime customer value, and return on investment (ROI). An extensive review of different types of transaction and relational data produced two different categories of transaction and relationship information.

## INTRODUCTION

The theoretical and strategic consequences of Integrated Marketing Communications (IMC) have received considerable attention in both the academic and advertising communities. In general terms, IMC planning evaluates the strategic and synergistic roles of a variety of communications disciplines and how this integration can or should be optimized for the firm. The increased conceptual and strategic interest in developing the IMC paradigm is in part a function of the natural evolution from mass communication advertising to more targeted and personalized messages (Schultz, 1999). Advocates contend that IMC is the crucial first step in transitioning from primarily out-bound, product-driven communication to the more interactive, consumer-oriented, and behavior-oriented approaches of the 21st century (Kitchen and Schultz, 1999). Importantly, IMC is viewed as having considerable outcome-based advantages via its ability to achieve synergy in advertising plan-

ning and execution, thereby generating greater efficiency, productivity, and performance (Phelps, Harris, and Johnson, 1996).

Just as IMC has impacted the way advertisers communicate with target audiences, the explosive growth of new electronic media is changing the boundaries and strategic use of IMC (Bezjian-Avery, Calder, and Iacobucci, 1998). Undeniably, traditional and electronic media integration is changing the competitive landscape in how advertisers view marketing and marketing communication (e.g., Lavidge, 1999), most notably with regard to IMC planning efforts (Low, 2000). As a consequence, one of the greatest challenges facing marketing organizations is developing IMC plans that maximize the effectiveness of a multitude of data, media, customers, and messages (Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Schultz, 2003). This increasingly important area of "cross-media platforms" is receiving great attention by firms seeking to implement an IMC approach.

The transition from a mass-oriented IMC approach to one that blends traditional and electronic media requires a change in how “buyer-seller relationships” are viewed. In the traditional exchange-oriented model, marketing is viewed as a series of discrete and at arms-length transactions. Historically, data on these have been collected as part of the sales organization to assist in developing its on-going revenue generation programs (Vence, 2002). Because firms traditionally have focused on transactional data, firms have been biased toward a product-centric view rather than a customer-centric marketing orientation (Ceolin, 2000).

In contrast, firms engaging in relationship marketing, marketing activities directed toward establishing, developing, and maintaining successful relational exchanges (Morgan and Hunt, 1994), treat customers as valuable organizational assets and focus on developing strategies for attracting, retaining, and developing customer purchases and loyalty (Berry, 1983). Though a relatively new phenomenon, relationship-oriented data are likely under the control of marketing and advertising personnel and are used to engender loyalty.

More recently, the information revolution combined with advancing media technologies is placing a premium on research focusing on “interactive” buyer-seller relationships (Peltier, Schibrowsky, Schultz, and Davis, 2002). An extension of relationship marketing, interactive marketing uses customer data captured from multiple information sources to create individualized exchanges and longitudinal contact strategies (Kestnbaum, Kestnbaum, and Ames, 1998).

Although studied most frequently in consumer settings, conceptual and empirical research investigating ways to enhance buyer-seller relationships in business-to-business markets, especially interactive relationships, is receiving

increased attention (Friman et al., 2002). The importance of adopting an interactive IMC focus in managing business-to-business relationships is due in part to emerging technologies that allow customers to choose their preferred methods of interaction, increasing the avenues through which companies can interact with their customers (Baier, Ruf, and Chakraborty, 2002). For example, transactions can be conducted in-person, by fax, online, over the phone, via mail, and through any number of developing wireless technologies. Information generated from these “transactional-based” encounters (what the customer did) then can be stored in the firm’s in-house database.

Other buyer-seller interactions and data “touchpoints” are more relationship-oriented. Customer emails and phone calls, web-based contacts and information exchanges, satisfaction surveys, and other interactions or “moments of truth” from a service standpoint can provide relational information to enhance the nature and scope of desired relationships and the extent to which these relationships are evolving. In combination, expanded customer touchpoints and data capture abilities, along with commercially available enhancement data, greatly expand the power of marketing databases to capture, store, and utilize transactional and relational customer information to approach the ever-more elusive goal of one-on-one business relationships (Peltier, Schibrowsky, Schultz, and Davis, 2002).

Despite the need to better understand the nature and scope of effective interactive IMC programs, a myriad of challenges are on the horizon. Specifically, although the interrelated concepts of relationship marketing, customer relationship management (CRM), and one-to-one marketing are receiving increased focus in the academic and popular press, few firms have programs in place that provide a

360° view of their customers (Peppers, Rogers, and Dorf, 1999). Even fewer firms are able to determine the impact their relationship marketing programs have on customer retention and long-term profitability (Jacobs, Johnston, and Kotchetova, 2001). Research is needed that explores the dynamic nature of relationships, particularly in terms of how customer information can be leveraged to form IMC programs (Hansotia, 2002).

To overcome these obstacles, organizations seeking to implement interactive IMC approaches for enhancing customer retention and profitability must simultaneously engage in a cultural shift in organizational philosophies and structure, most notably with regards to the sharing of customer-level data between different functional areas, decision makers, and data users (Martin and Grbac, 2003). Unfortunately, cross-functional information sharing is where most organizations fail in their quest to become more customer-centric, causing intra-organizational conflict between sales and marketing departments (Manning and Reece, 2002).

At one extreme, sales personnel focus on customer behavior data, most commonly those at the transactional level that will assist them in reaching targeted quotas and quarterly benchmarks (Shoemaker, 2001). At the other, marketing and advertising departments are increasingly relying on relational data with the belief that “knowing” customers is better than merely “describing” past behaviors (Peltier, Schibrowsky, Schultz, and Davis, 2002). Because these functional areas, and individuals within these departments, have different goals and time horizons, firms have great difficulty in bringing transactional and relational data together to provide a cohesive and interactive view of the customer or prospect. Clearly, alone, neither type of data can adequately solve the relationship puzzle. As a consequence,

organizations might understand what their customers buy or how they feel, but do not have a clear understanding of how various transactional and relational data can be used jointly to define both or the "total" customer relationship (Schultz, 2002; Schultz and Bailey, 2000).

Research in a business-to-business setting that has studied how transactional and relational data differentially impact how customers value the relationship, the likelihood of their remaining in the relationship, and relationship performance is virtually nonexistent. Importantly, little is understood regarding whether transactional data are more valuable in generating revenue (a sales orientation), whether relational data are better for establishing relationships (a marketing orientation), and the extent to which their integration impacts customer lifetime value. A recent study by Coviello, Brodie, Danaher, and Johnston (2002) supports what many scholars and practitioners have echoed over the past decade, that although it is possible for firms to engage simultaneously in transactional- and relational-based marketing relationships, many continue to focus exclusively on transaction information and thus fail to achieve the true potential of buyer-seller interactivity. It is only through a better understanding of which forms of interactive IMC data are better suited for achieving varied organizational- and customer-oriented objectives that the sales versus marketing dilemma can be resolved (Hultman, 2003; Leigh and Marshall, 2001).

In this exploratory study of IMC in business-to-business services firms, we bring together relational and transactional data, and sales and marketing views to investigate whether firms can enhance their position in terms of both marketing-oriented customer and sales-based performance benchmarks. Although the melding of marketing and sales to form IMC strat-

egies has received little attention to date (Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Schultz, 2003), we view the transition from a transactional to a more relational orientation, and from marketing and sales as isolated entities to one of a shared customer interface, as the next step in developing information-intensive strategies to help produce (a) the types of interactive relationships organizational customers seek (Da Silva, Davies, and Naude, 2002), (b) to better meet value-based expectations of the business-to-business buyer (Flint, Woodruff, and Gardial, 2002), (c) to enhance long-term loyalty (Eriksson and Vaghult, 2000), and (d) ultimately to generate increased revenue streams and customer profitability (Jacobs, Johnston, and Kotchetova, 2001).

It is important to recognize that the firm's activities do not take place in a vacuum. Each company has an overall set of goals and strategies that information collection supports and enhances. As such, firms have different levels of commitment to the quality of captured and/or acquired customer information. We thus also investigate the differential impact that perceived information quality contained in an organization's customer database has on various measures of organizational performance. A deeper understanding of the efficacy of transactional and relational data from both a sales and marketing orientation is clearly a prerequisite in evolving from a static organization to one that adheres to the principles of interactive IMC.

We first present a brief review of conceptual orientations of the sales and marketing functions. We then discuss the different types of transactional and relational data that organizations could capture and/or acquire about their organizational buyers. We then present and empirically test an exploratory model of the relationship that various transactional and relational data and data quality have

with sales and marketing performance outcomes. We conclude with a discussion of the findings and future research directions

## THEORY DEVELOPMENT

### Market orientation versus sales orientation

To date, the roles that marketing and sales play in creating and maintaining a customer-centric organizational focus has received little exposure in academic literature (Foss et al., 2002) and has been virtually ignored in the advertising field. Of interest is how to identify and define the type of organizational structure and culture needed to sustain an interactive approach to IMC (Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Schultz, 2002, 2003). Critical to the success of customer-centric firms is an internal culture whereby both the marketing and sales organizations are responsive to customer needs (Homburg, Workman, and Jensen, 2000). In organizations that have separate formalized marketing and sales organizations or competencies, cross-department "fit" and the matching of objectives are especially critical. Even when marketing and sales functions are lodged within the same department, the unique specialties and perspectives involved in the normal day-to-day tasks create opportunities and barriers to organizational performance (Brown, 1999). Presented below is a brief discussion of these potentially disparate role functions.

**Market orientation.** Market orientation has been defined in a number of ways. Kohli and Jaworski (1990) view market orientation as an organization-wide philosophy of generating market intelligence about the needs of current and future customers. Driving this perspective is the belief that the "integrated marketing organization" disseminates its customer in-

telligence across departments and that goal attainment is contingent upon the degree to which the organization is responsive to this intelligence. Narver and Slater (1990) posited that inter-functional coordination, the coordinated utilization of company resources in creating superior value for customers, is the most critical aspect of market orientation. Importantly, market orientation has evolved from being viewed as a functional task within an organization to a set of values and processes that all functions participate in implementing (Moorman and Rust, 1999). A market orientation requires link all of the activities needed to be customer-centric, including advertising, marketing research, customer service, product development, and sales.

Support for a market orientation can be found in a significant body of research suggesting that being customer-centric provides avenues for generating sustainable competitive advantages and increased profitability (Day, 2000). More recently, market orientation and customer-centricity have been studied in terms of the types of customer data needed to create mutually beneficial and interactive buyer-seller relationships, especially in terms of forming interactive IMC strategies (Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Schultz, 2003). A consensus is emerging that using customer data to form an interactive and consumer-centric focus enhances the scope and power of the marketing organization (Workman, Homburg, and Gruner, 1998). As we discuss later, a myriad of data collection and interaction opportunities exist through which the organization can interact with customers, learn about needs, disseminate information, and create transactions.

**Sales orientation.** Ridnour, Lassk, and Shepherd (2001) define a sales culture as a "growth oriented facet of the market in which all employees are expected to con-

tribute to the creation of value for customers by actively participating in the selling process. In a sales culture the process of selling is highly valued and practiced throughout the firm" (p. 248). The preceding discussion of market orientation and the requirements for being customer-centric highlight the importance of having an adaptive and responsive selling and sales culture (Moorman and Rust, 1999). As the liaison between buyers and sellers, salespeople are in a position to form strong connections with customers and can play a crucial role in establishing and preserving customer relationships. However, much of this promise is unfulfilled given the transactional nature of many sales encounters and compensation systems that favor selling over relationship building (Day, 2000). Similarly, salespeople are responsible for recording transactional data (e.g., product purchased, amount, date, etc.), but typically are not required to collect nor are they compensated for collecting data of a more relational nature. As a consequence, much of the crucial marketing information needed to form more customer-centric relationships is either locked in the heads of salespeople or is nonexistent (Choo, 1996).

Although the sales force as a communication medium has received relatively little attention in the IMC literature, the electronic age has fostered an environment through which customers have a multitude of salesperson-related touchpoints, including face-to-face contact, phone, fax, websites, extranets, Voice-over-Internet Protocol (VOIP), wireless text, and a host of other emerging technologies. However, little academic research has investigated how the sales force can effectively handle the ever-growing information it receives and which information is most useful for managing relationships (Srivastava, Shervani, and Fahey, 1999). Clearly, research is needed that investigates how

customer data, information technology, and multiple touchpoints can be integrated across the organization.

#### **Transactional versus relational data**

In general, firms collect and share customer data across the firm in an attempt to gain a competitive advantage in the marketplace (Slater and Narver, 1995). Information, as an intangible asset that contributes to firm learning, might be one of the only true sources of inimitable sustainable competitive advantage (Itami and Roehl, 1987). Just as one can categorize customer relationships as transactional versus relational, one can also categorize customer information as that collected for use by the sales force or the information that marketing is able to acquire over the course of the relationship.

**Transactional data.** Transaction-based marketing focuses on details of specific customer transactions without regard to a future relationship (Roberts, 2002). Transactional data, which can be captured internally or commercially acquired, most commonly have been divided into five (not exhaustive) categories: (1) Demographic and Geographic, (2) Customer Purchase History, (3) Response Lists (e.g., commercially purchased data of response to various product offers), (4) Magazine Subscriptions, and (5) Association Lists. Using data-analytic procedures such as lifetime value (LTV), recency-frequency-monetary (RFM), and scoring models, database marketers have attempted to define relationships and predict response behavior by disaggregating markets into specific transactional segments, even down to segments of one (Hughes, 2000). Given the nature of transactional data, marketers have typically focused on sales- and profit-oriented measures of performance in their analyses.

**Relational data.** Although capturing relational data is a recent phenomenon, from a relationship building perspective these relational data are necessary to explore structural reasons why the relationship may or may not be important to customers. In addressing this issue, Peltier, Schibrowsky, Schultz, and Davis (2002) conceptualized the nature and scope of relational data as "interactive psychographics," a "combination of interrelated psychosocial customer-specific information, including values, motivations, beliefs, attitudes, and lifestyles, captured via database technology for the purpose of nurturing individualized buyer-seller relationships" (p. 8). While these are some of the most useful data marketing can provide to add value to the sales force, they are rarely available in a form they can use (Leigh and Marshall, 2001).

Uncovering motivations and the subtext behind the transaction allows the firm to develop interactive marketing efforts that listen to customers and to tailor logically the offers and communications they receive (Deighton, 1996). Prior research has shown that, in the consumer arena at least, consumers can be segmented by attitudinal data likely to be uncovered in a relational rather than in a transactional marketing setting (Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Davis, 1998). Conceptually, providing customer-specific psychographic data to the sales force offers greater opportunities for effective adaptive selling techniques.

**Transactional and relational data continuum.** In the past, transactional and relational data have been conceptualized as lying on opposite poles of the relationship-marketing continuum (Webster, 1992) and can be mapped to the sales versus marketing debate. However, in many instances the distinction between transactional and relational data is less clear. For example, psychographic cus-

tom profiles can be inferred by magazines received or subscribed to, products and services purchased, and associations belonged to (transaction data). Similarly, customer satisfaction surveys, loyalty programs, and personal contacts, generally sources of relational data, all provide an opportunity to learn about the transactional nature of customers as well. Indeed, Coviello, Brodie, Danaher, and Johnston (2002) suggest that firms can effectively engage in both types of marketing simultaneously. Their analysis of 308 firms in five countries found that business-to-business services firms were primarily relational, engaging in one-to-one customer contact. However, many of these same firms also engaged in practices considered more transactionally oriented, such as mass-market communication. Anderson (2002) suggests that it might be financially infeasible for mass marketers to engage in relational partnerships with all customers, raising the question of when relational versus transactional approaches most benefit the specific firm (Hultman, 2003).

A review of the direct and database marketing literature, including practitioner sources, reveals a broad range of business-to-business information that can be captured in creating a basic customer database. Database marketers typically enhance identification-based customer information with additional transactional information of a financial nature (purchasing, credit and payment history, etc.) and with other externally available information (magazine subscriber lists, association memberships, commercial databases, news sources, etc).

Relational data can be collected at contact points where company personnel or automated interface devices interact one-to-one with customers. These are "interactions" (Peppers and Rogers, 2001) or customer "touchpoints" (Hair, Bush, and

Ortinou, 2003). The direct marketing literature identifies a broad range of customer "touchpoints," including those related to web and email inquiries, information from market research, customer satisfaction surveys, customer-initiated phone calls, and customer loyalty programs (Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Schultz, 2003), most of which the sales force never knows or hears about.

Table 1 summarizes the conceptualization and operationalization of the four categories of customer interaction sources used in developing our model.

#### **Model and hypothesis development**

This study brings together relational and transactional IMC data with performance measures to investigate whether it is beneficial for business-to-business firms to build transactional databases and/or focus on collecting data that might facilitate relational exchanges. We empirically explore the relationships among collecting various types of customer information, data quality, and performance. Given the lack of research in this area, our hypotheses are exploratory in nature. As such, multiple data analytic techniques will be used to uncover important relationships.

Firms that collect and use customer information are expected to have superior performance (Peppers and Rogers, 2002). Two performance outcomes are included in our model. First, in accordance with the resource-based view of the firm, we investigate impacts on measures of sales-oriented business growth. Sales-oriented business growth has commonly been viewed as a key sales-based organization goal (Ridnour, Lassk, and Shepherd, 2001). However, as customer information should generate a deeper understanding of customers, we would also expect to see improvements in marketing-based customer outcomes through more successful individual-level interactions. Marketing-oriented customer performance can be

**TABLE 1**  
Classification and Sources of Constructs

	Conceptualization	Operationalization	Literature Source(s)
1. Transactional Data			
<i>Independent variables</i>			
Financial information	Information on purchase history typically stored in financial records	Purchasing, credit, payment history	Jackson and Wang (1995); Hughes (2000)
External information	Data external to the company, often purchased	Magazine subscriber lists, association memberships, commercial databases, news sources	Jackson and Wang (1995); Hughes (2000); Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Schultz (2002, 2003); Freytag and Clarke (2001)
2. Relational Data			
<i>Independent variables</i>			
Breadth of customer touchpoints	Customer interaction information	Market research surveys, customer-initiated phone calls, responses to web inquiries, emails	Mehta, Gewal, and Sivadas (1996); Schlaphoff (1996); Peppers and Rogers (2001); Hair, Bush, and Ortinau (2003); Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Schultz (2003)
Customer loyalty and satisfaction	Customer purchase information in the form of a loyalty program and customer satisfaction studies	Loyalty programs, customer satisfaction surveys	Jackson and Wang (1995)
Quality	Extent to which data as stored represent reality	Accuracy, consistency, timeliness, overall quality	Foss et al. (2002); Wang and Strong (1996); Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Malhotra (2000)
<i>Dependent variables</i>			
Marketing-oriented customer performance	The extent to which the customer relationship is developed/increased	Customer lifetime value, share of wallet, retention rate, ROI, versus competition	Dorrington and Goodwin (2002); Lemon, White, and Winer (2002); Yu (2001); Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Davis (1998); Peltier, Schibrowsky, Schultz, and Davis (2002)
Sales-oriented business growth	Increases in sales, net income	Sales and net income growth	Penrose (1959)

thought of as a more tactical or marketing level measure of performance than sales-oriented business growth, which is a more strategic level measure. We are interested

in determining whether transactional and relational data differentially impact business- and marketing-oriented customer performance outcomes.

Information from purchase histories and other transactional data should allow the company to focus its marketing efforts in a more targeted way. By collecting and using

financial information, firms can determine more and less profitable customers. Additionally, bringing in information from other external sources will allow the firm to identify customers most likely to grow and therefore lead to growth through additional purchases. Thus, both financially oriented and purchase history transaction information are expected to contribute to sales-oriented business growth because these data can be used to target customers that have the highest profit potential for the firm. Merging both types of information is an especially important question as sales people generally have a good idea of who buys the most, but not necessarily who are the most profitable (Churchill, Walker, Johnston, and Tanner, 2000).

In general, relational data are expected to relate to increase marketing-oriented customer performance measures such as share of wallet, lifetime customer value, and retention rate. Relational data are collected from many different touchpoints with customers—when they call, email, or contact them or interact with a sales representative. Different types of information are likely to result from different touchpoints. Thus, the more information touchpoints they collect data from, the more they are likely to know about that customer. Additionally, by analyzing satisfaction and loyalty program data, marketers should be able to market to customers in new, more effective ways, which in turn would add value for the sales group (Shoemaker, 2001). Also important, because of the nature of propriety databases, specific pieces of relational information about customers are generally not available to competitors. Use of information of this type can help build stronger customer relationships, which should facilitate marketing-oriented customer performance (Moon, 2000).

Relational data are likely to be more difficult to collect than transactional data,

as they are based on individual interactions with the firm, and not information that is publicly available. This data collection challenge also means that relational information is harder to imitate, which in turn should provide the firms that collect more of these data with a competitive advantage (Peltier, Schibrowsky, and Davis, 1998). Thus, relational data in the aggregate are expected to relate to performance more strongly than transactional data. As a consequence, the value that marketing data brings to the organization should be substantially increased. Based on the above discussion, we suggest the following exploratory hypotheses:

- H1: (a) Marketing-oriented performance increases and (b) sales-oriented business performance increases as the amount of relational data collected by the firm increases.
- H2: (a) Marketing-oriented performance increases and (b) sales-oriented performance growth increases as the amount of transactional data collected by the firm increases.
- H3: Relational data will contribute to (a) marketing-oriented performance and (b) sales-oriented performance growth more than transactional data.

Collecting customer-level data is no guarantee for success. Transactional and relational information contained in the organization's database must be of sufficient quality to be useful to the firm. Data quality long has been a concern in the context of information processing as it directly impacts both cost and learning potential. On the one hand, higher qual-

ity data generally are more expensive. On the other hand, "garbage in, garbage out" is clearly indicative of poor database marketing efforts. Firms must therefore make strategic trade-offs between spending levels and data quality. Quality has been found to be important in the context of services marketing (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Malhotra, 2000) and in evaluating the utility of marketing research data (Moorman, Deshpande, and Zaltman, 1993). Because of the importance of data quality as the means by which we can interact accurately with the customer, we expect data quality to have a strong relationship with marketing- and sales-oriented measures of performance.

In addition to a direct relationship with marketing-oriented customer performance, we expect quality to attenuate the effects of collecting customer information. In theory, marketing and sales data should be available to cross-functional parties when they want it in the format best for each group. Yet, it is common for businesses to have problems with the quality and "fitness for purpose" of their customer data. Moreover, because the electronic age has spawned the need to move faster than ever before, the ability of marketing and sales personnel to access data quickly is critical to success. Perceptions of low quality could be a function of data that are missing or incomplete, unnecessarily duplicated, or have inconsistencies in their use and definition. Additionally, collecting large amounts of low-quality information will likely provide no benefit to the firm and may in fact be a net negative in terms of costs and performance. This is especially true when marketing asks the sales force to spend too much time collecting data at the expense of selling, and when the data that they do collect are not relevant to their individual selling needs or not easy to access when needed (Foss et al., 2002). It is only as the

quality of the information collected increases that the data can provide any benefit to the firm. Following the discussion above we suggest the following exploratory hypotheses:

- H4: Increases in information quality are associated with increased (a) marketing-oriented performance and (b) sales-oriented performance growth.
- H5: As information quality increases, collecting more relational data increases (a) marketing-oriented performance and (b) sales-oriented performance growth.
- H6: As information quality increases, collecting more transactional data increases (a) marketing-oriented performance and (b) sales-oriented performance growth.
- H7: Higher quality relational data will contribute to (a) marketing-oriented customer and (b) sales-oriented performance growth more than higher quality transactional data.

## METHOD

### Subjects and procedure

While existing scales were used when possible, the dearth of previous studies required that most had to be developed for this research. Table 1 contains conceptualizations, operationalizations, and literature sources useful for understanding the scales. After a telephone pretest, the instrument was pretested by 47 business-to-business marketing executives from several industries. The results were analyzed by exploratory factor analysis (Principal Components Method, Varimax rotation) and supported initial scale validity and reliability.

Company names of business-to-business property and casualty insurers and software publishing companies were selected from publicly available business directories. Service industries generally emphasize customer information management more than product industries. This might mean that transactional and relational data collection would be more developed in these industries than others. One mature (insurance) and one growing industry (software) were used to increase scale validity and generalizability.

The final survey was administered by telephone to 209 marketing executives in the software (109) and insurance (100) industries. A business-to-business marketing research firm prescreened respondents to identify those in the business unit knowledgeable about relationships with customers, and how information to manage those relationships is collected and processed. The survey achieved a response rate of 48 percent on a company basis (209 of 433 companies) and 31 percent on a per contact basis (209 of 684 mailed contacts), equivalent across industries. There were no differences between those who did and did not respond based on year of firm start, total employees, or sales ( $p > .05$ ). This result was the same by industry and for the pooled data.

### Measures

Missing data were recoded as "1's" to use the full sample while avoiding biasing the correlation matrix upward, which might occur by replacing them with means. A "1" corresponded to a missing capability in the firm. Thus, all 209 observations could be retained, exceeding the 150 minimum recommended for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (Hinkin, 1998). We removed six outliers, three each from the relationships between our independent and dependent variables.

Final constructs were developed through correlation analysis and EFA. EFA results are reported in Table 2. This EFA of all eight constructs demonstrates convergent and discriminant validity at the item and construct level and met reliability criteria of Cronbach's  $\alpha > .6$  for exploratory research. Each of the transactional and relational data scales loaded as predicted.

Table 1 provides all of the independent and dependent variables used in the analysis. The transactional and relational independent variables (financial data, external data relational touchpoints, loyalty programs/satisfaction surveys) used the scale "extent to which your unit acquires the following customer feedback from the following sources (5-point scale from 1 = Never to 5 = 100 percent of the time) and were summed measures. Overall data quality was rated on a 5-point scale from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent. Two dependent variables were used. Marketing-Oriented Customer Performance was a summed four-item scale: customer retention, share of wallet, lifetime value, and return on investment (all 7-point scales from 1 = Low to 7 = High). Sales-Oriented Business Growth Performance was a two-item scale: sales growth and net income growth (13-point scale from -30 percent to +30 percent).

## RESULTS

Because of the exploratory nature of our hypotheses, both correlation and regression analyses were conducted to test the hypotheses. Overall, the picture that emerges is consistent with our hypotheses that different types of performance rely on different types of data, that data quality is an important consideration, and that when jointly considered, relational data are more powerful than transactional data.

The correlation analysis in Table 3 reveals support for 10 of our 13 individual hypotheses. Especially noteworthy is that

**TABLE 2**

Final Transaction Construct PCA (Varimax Rotation) N = 209, Coefficient Alphas

	Quality	Relational Touchpoints	Marketing- Oriented Customer Performance	Finance	Sales- Oriented Business Growth	External	Loyalty Program/ Satisfaction Surveys
Quality accuracy	.838						
Quality consistency	.839						
Quality timeliness	.796						
Quality overall	.881						
Response to web hits/inquiries		.855					
Response to emails		.831					
Marketing research surveys		.496					
Customer initiated phone calls		.656					
Purchasing history				.510			
Credit history				.908			
Payment history				.910			
Sales growth					.917		
Net income growth					.928		
Customer retention			.790				
Share of wallet			.678				
Lifetime value			.783				
ROI			.637				
Magazine subscription lists						.659	
Association memberships						.737	
Commercial databases						.682	
Other news sources						.399	
Loyalty programs							.770
Customer satisfaction surveys							.770
Coefficient alpha	.87	.77	.74	.74	.85	.62	.68
Eigenvalue	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.1	1.98	1.89	1.70
% variance explained	11.15%	9.62%	9.18%	7.61%	7.34%	7.00%	6.33%
Cumulative	11.15%	20.77%	29.95%	37.56%	44.90%	51.90%	65.18%

**TABLE 3**  
Construct Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

	<b>Summed Customer Performance 5.03 (.97)</b>	<b>Summed Business Growth 26 (32.45)</b>
Touchpoint	n.s.	.296**
Loyalty	.163*	.136*
External	n.s.	.175*
Financial	n.s.	.147*
Overall quality	.285**	n.s.
Quality × touchpoint	.225**	.231**
Quality × loyalty	.254**	n.s.
Quality × external	n.s.	n.s.
Quality × financial	.170*	n.s.

*N* = 203, mean ( $\sigma$ ) in boldface type.

Correlations: 2-tailed significance, \*.05 level, \*\*.01 level

Range on all independent variables is 1–5, where 5 is highest level.

Range on dependent variable marketing oriented customer performance is 1–7, where 7 is highest level.

Range of dependent variable sales-oriented business growth is –30% to +30%.

marketing oriented customer and sales-oriented business growth performance is enhanced when the amount of relational data collected via customer touchpoints and loyalty/satisfaction increases, especially when there is a corresponding increase in data quality. In contrast, although neither of the transactional data types are correlated with marketing-oriented customer performance, higher quality financial data are correlated with increased marketing-oriented customer performance. Moreover, both external and financial transactional data were correlated with business performance growth, although the quality by transactional data interactions were not informative.

Table 4 summarizes the significant findings from the regression analyses. A number of control variables also were tested,

including size of firm, sales, and number of employees. None of the control variables were statistically significantly related to our dependent variables and all regression assumptions were met. Depending on whether marketing-oriented customer performance or sales-oriented business growth was the dependent variable, tests of Hypotheses H1 and H2 utilized two-factor regression using either relational or transactional data. Hypotheses H3a and H3b combined transactional and relational data. Hypotheses H4a and H4b only included the overall quality variable and are consistent with the correlation test. The remaining hypotheses utilized the quality × data type interaction variables and were tested individually (H5 and H6) or jointly (H7).

Like the correlation findings, the regression results show support for a number of hypotheses. Of interest, relational touchpoints and loyalty/satisfaction data are more important for explaining marketing-oriented customer performance and sales-oriented business growth, respectively. Additionally, external data, and to a lesser extent financial data, positively impacted sales-oriented business growth performance. When all data sources were considered jointly, loyalty/satisfaction data contributed to enhanced marketing-oriented customer performance, while cus-

**Especially noteworthy is that marketing-oriented customer and sales-oriented business growth performance is enhanced when the amount of relational data collected via customer touchpoints and loyalty/satisfaction increases, especially when there is a corresponding increase in data quality.**

**TABLE 4**  
Test of Hypotheses Regression Analyses

Dependent Variable	H1a	H1b	H2a	H2b	H3a	H3b	H4a	H4b	H5a	H5b	H6a	H7a	H7b
Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Customer Performance Growth	Business Growth
Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.
Relational													
touchpoints	n.s.	<b>.000</b>			n.s.	<b>.001</b>							
Loyalty and													
satisfaction	<b>.04</b>	n.s.			<b>.01</b>	n.s.							
Finance													
transactions			n.s.	<b>.09</b>	n.s.	n.s.							
External													
transactions			n.s.	<b>.03</b>	n.s.	n.s.							
Quality							<b>.000</b>	n.s.					
Quality x									n.s.	<b>.001</b>		n.s.	<b>.01</b>
touchpoints													
Quality x												<b>.02</b>	n.s.
loyalty													
Quality x												<b>.03</b>	n.s.
finance											<b>.06</b>	n.s.	n.s.
Quality x													
external											n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

N = 203. Significant relationships are in boldface type. Hypothesis H4 results reported although results will be identical to correlation matrix in this case. Only significance of t-statistics reported.

customer touchpoint data increased perceived business performance growth. Except for business performance growth, the quality  $\times$  data type interactions had similar results.

Overall, the majority of our hypotheses were supported at some level by the correlation and regression analyses. When different support via correlation and regression analyses is noted. The types of data analysis conducted are noted for each hypothesis.

### DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

These results provide relatively strong support for our exploratory hypotheses, signal future research opportunities, and underscore some interesting strategic implications. We first consider the relationships with marketing-oriented customer performance, then move to those for sales-oriented business growth performance, and end with the overall effects of relational versus transactional customer information.

Our correlation and regression results clearly show that marketing-oriented customer performance is positively related to the increased collection of customer loyalty and satisfaction data (Hypothesis H1a). The inclusion of a quality  $\times$  loyalty/satisfaction interaction intensifies this relationship (Hypothesis H5a). Although customer touchpoint data were not initially correlated with increased marketing-oriented customer performance, the quality  $\times$  touchpoint interaction was highly correlated. Although not directly tested, it seems apparent that because relational data are relatively new phenomena in terms of conceptualization and collection, especially those generated via customer touchpoints, the quality of these data greatly impact marketing-oriented customer successes (Hypothesis H4). In contrast, transactional data played no role in contributing to marketing-oriented customer performance (Hypothesis H2a). However, the

**When all data sources were considered jointly, loyalty/satisfaction data contributed to enhanced marketing-oriented customer performance, while customer touchpoint data increased perceived business performance growth.**

quality  $\times$  financial data interaction (Hypothesis H6a) from the correlation analysis suggests that the effective use of behavioral data such as purchase and payment history can contribute to increased customer performance.

The correlation and regression analysis of sales-oriented business growth indicate that increased performance in this area is related to the collection of all types of relational and transactional information (Hypotheses H1b and H2b), although customer loyalty and satisfaction data did not contribute to increased business performance when regressed along with customer touchpoint data. Interestingly, except for touchpoint quality (Hypothesis H5b), sales-oriented business growth performance is not related to overall data quality (Hypothesis H4) or to the other quality interactions (Hypothesis H5b for loyalty/satisfaction and Hypothesis H6b). Strategically, enhancing the quality of customer touchpoint data has the potential for increased sales and income growth.

The preceding discussion highlighted the findings when the performance effects pertaining to the four types of data were examined individually (correlations) or when relational and transactional data were isolated from each other (regression). The findings also highlight the fact that when combined, relational data contribute more marketing-oriented customer performance and sales-oriented

business growth performance than do transactional data. Specifically, loyalty and satisfaction data were most important for predicting marketing-oriented customer performance regardless of whether quality was considered (Hypotheses H3a and H7a). When attempting to develop personal relationships with customers, listening to how the relationship can be improved and providing programs that motivate repeat buying were perceived to be most effective. Similarly, customer touchpoint data were most important when business performance growth was considered (Hypotheses H3b and H7b). The use of the internet, email-based communications, and the handling of customer phone calls, were viewed as having the greatest opportunity to generate sales and profits.

In combination, the results from this exploratory study are consistent with recent research in consumer settings expounding on the need to collect and use many types of relationship-oriented data in the creation and management of buyer-seller interactions (Peltier, Schibrowsky, Schultz, and Davis, 2002). Our findings in a business-to-business setting add to this literature and show support for relational data dominating transactional data in enhancing business and marketing-oriented customer performance. However, relational data collected by *both* marketing and sales are important. Activities associated with marketing departments, loyalty

and satisfaction programs and initiatives usually conducted at the corporate level, are related to marketing-oriented customer performance. In contrast, phone calls and emails, the types of interactions commonly associated with sales force interactions with the customer on a day-to-day basis, are more likely to be associated with business growth.

It is dangerous, however, from these findings to conclude that transactional data are unimportant. Coviello, Brodie, Danaher, and Johnston (2002) demonstrated that many firms are engaged in transactional marketing practices but that analysis did not include a performance variable. In fact, these findings clearly show that transactional data are of importance for enhancing the economic performance of the firm. As a consequence, we advocate continuing and improving direct response programs such as lifetime value, scoring models, recency-frequency-monetary, and others that attempt to better understand the behavioral patterns of different customer groups and individuals within these groups. Most importantly, improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the multitude of ways that firms touch customers and how their loyalty is earned, along with the increased use of transactional data, provides the greatest opportunity for reaching the long sought goal of one-to-one marketing.

To the manager we say, "beware." Firms are beginning to report that they have too

much information that they cannot use effectively. Before implementing turnkey systems to collect megabytes of data, managers may need to consider potential applications for the information and the industry in which they operate. Focusing on the quality control processes underlying critical customer relational data collection might be the best way to realize improved performance. In addition, managers might consider encouraging both marketing and sales to share critical customer information that is collected outside of the transaction-based processing systems of the organization. It appears that both marketing and sales information contributes to the success of an IMC-based strategy in business-to-business services firms.


In fact, the managers in this sample appear to be engaging at least somewhat in behavior to optimize performance. These managers are focusing less attention on transactional information than on relational data, as the lower (and statistically significantly different) overall means in Table 3 suggest. This group has focused on collecting the relational data that are more likely to have a performance implication.

#### LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This research has several limitations. First, the measures focus more on the collection of transactional and relational data about

current customers than former or prospective customers. Second, these measures focus more on the collection of the information than how it is used in the organization. Finally, the generalizability of these scales beyond these particular business-to-business services markets is not known. Given the exploratory nature of the work, other industries should be studied to refine further the measures and scales.

Finally, in spite of research that indicates that self-reports of managerial performance, if the managers are at the right level in the organization, are highly consistent with actual performance (Robinson and Pearce, 1988), the self-reports used here mean that the research cannot be triangulated by an outside source. A more robust study with outside sales-oriented business growth measures would be a natural extension of this work.

This research raises many questions that can serve to direct future research efforts. Because only the collection and not the use of the information was considered, more work as to how the information is used in the organization might uncover a stronger link between both relational and transactional data and performance. Control variables included in the research were not explanatory in a positive way. A series of case studies of a sample of those involved in this study as well as those distinguished for their use of customer information is underway to identify underlying factors that might also contribute to performance. Finally, given the exploratory nature of our study, research directed toward the development of additional scales that look at integrative relationships (i.e., structural equation modeling) is warranted. 

DEBRA ZAHAY is the Acxiom Corporation Professor of Interactive Marketing at Northern Illinois University, where she teaches direct and database marketing, internet marketing, and customer relationship man-

**...[I]mproving the efficiency and effectiveness of the multitude of ways that firms touch customers and how their loyalty is earned, along with the increased use of transactional data, provides the greatest opportunity for reaching the long sought goal of one-to-one marketing,**

## BRINGING CUSTOMER DATA TOGETHER

agement. Dr. Zahay researches using information to create customer relationships for competitive advantage. She has published in *Decision Sciences*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, the *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *Interactive Marketing*, and the *Journal of Database Marketing*. Professor Zahay is active in the Chicago Association for Direct Marketing, the Business Marketing Association, and the Direct Marketing Association, and is on the Advisory Board for the Customer Relationship Management Association.

**JAMES (JIMMY) PELTIER** is the Arno Kleimenhagen Professor of Marketing at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. He is also director of research for Knupp & Watson Advertising, Marketing, and Public Relations, Inc. of Madison, Wisconsin and is president of APR Research. Dr. Peltier has many award-winning papers in the area of databased communications and is a past recipient of the Outstanding Educator Award sponsored by the Direct Marketing Association Educational Foundation (DMEF). He is also on the Board of Trustees for the DMEF. He has published articles in the *Journal of Advertising Research*, the *International Journal of Advertising*, the *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, among many others. He has authored over 45 journal publications, including how to harness the power of databases for developing longitudinal communications, personalizing relationships, increasing customer value, and enhancing profitability through successful cross-selling.

**DON E. SCHULTZ** is professor (emeritus) of integrated marketing communication, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. He is also president of the global marketing consultancy Agora, Inc., also located in Evanston. He holds a Ph.D. in mass media and an MS in advertising from Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, and a BBA from the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. He is the author of 10 books, the latest being *Raising the Corporate Umbrella*. He has published over 100 articles on marketing, advertising branding, sales promotion, and integrated communication in most of the leading trade and academic journals around the world. Prior to his academic career, Dr. Schultz spent 15 years in media and advertising agency management, the last 10

years at Tracy-Locke Advertising and Public Relations, Dallas, Texas, where he was a senior vice president and management supervisor on a number of national accounts. Schultz lectures, conducts seminars and conferences, and consults on five continents. His current research and teaching focuses on communication integration, branding, and the financial measures of marketing and communication. He was named one of the *80 Most Influential People* in sales and marketing in the world by *Sales & Marketing Management Magazine* in 1998.

**ABBIE GRIFFIN** is a professor of business administration at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign College of Commerce, where she teaches new-product development, business-to-business marketing, and internet marketing and e-commerce. Professor Griffin's research investigates means for measuring and improving the process of new-product development. She is a director of Navistar (International Truck and Engine) and was the editor of the *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, the leading academic journal in the areas of product and technology development, from 1998–2003.

## REFERENCES

ANDERSON, ERIC T. "Sharing the Wealth: When Should Firms Treat Customers as Partners." *Management Science* 48, 8 (2002): 955–71.

BAIER, MARTIN, KURTIS M. RUF, and GOUTAM CHAKRABORTY. *Contemporary Database Marketing*. Evanston, IL: Raycom Communications Inc., 2002.

BERRY, LEONARD L. "Emerging Perspectives on Services." In *Relationship Marketing*, Leonard L. Berry, Lynn G. Shostack, and Gregory Upah, eds. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association, 1983.

BEZJIAN-AVERY, ALEXA, BOBBY CALDER, and DAWN IACOBUCCI. "Interactive Advertising vs.

Traditional Advertising." *Journal of Advertising Research* 38, 4 (1998): 23–32.

BROWN, STANLEY A. *Strategic Customer Care: An Evolutionary Approach to Increasing Customer Value and Profitability*. Toronto, Canada: John Wiley and Sons, 1999.

CEOLIN, DAVID. "CRM Systems Need Not Be Separate Entity from Research." *Marketing News* 34, 19 (2000): 33–34.

CHOO, C. W. "The Knowing Organization: How Organizations Use Information to Construct Meaning, Create Knowledge, and Make Decisions." *International Journal of Information Management* 16, 5 (1996): 329–40.

CHURCHILL, GILBERT A., JR., ORVILLE C. WALKER, JR., MARK W. JOHNSTON, and JOHN F. TANNER. *Sales Force Management*, 6th ed. Boston, MA: Irwin-McGraw-Hill, 2000.

COVIELLO, NICOLE E., RODERICK J. BRODIE, PETER J. DANAHAN, and WESLEY J. JOHNSTON. "How Firms Relate to Their Markets: An Empirical Examination of Contemporary Marketing Practices." *Journal of Marketing* 66, 3 (2002): 33–46.

DA SILVA, VINHAS RUI, GARY DAVIES, and PETE NAUDE. "Assessing Customer Orientation in the Context of Buyer/Supplier Relationships Using Judgmental Modeling." *Industrial Marketing Management* 31, 3 (2002): 241–52.

DAY, GEORGE S. "Managing Market Relationships." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 28, 1 (2000): 18–32.

DEIGHTON, JOHN. "The Future of Interactive Marketing." *Harvard Business Review* 74, 6 (1996): 151–60.

DORRINGTON, PETER, and JASON GOODWIN. "The Role of Lifetime Value in Customer Relationship Management." *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 4, 1 (2002): 7–18.

- ERIKSSON, KENT, and ANNA LOFMARCK VAGHULT. "Customer Retention, Purchasing Behavior and Relationship in Professional Services." *Industrial Marketing Management* 29, 4 (2000): 363-72.
- FLINT, DANIEL, ROBERT B. WOODRUFF, and SARAH FISHER GARDIAL. "Exploring the Phenomenon of Customers' Desired Value Change in a Business-to-Business Context." *Journal of Marketing* 66, 4 (2002): 102-17.
- FOSS, BRYAN, IAIN HENDERSON, PETER JOHNSON, DON MURRAY, and MERLIN STONE. "Managing the Quality and Completeness of Customer Data." *Journal of Database Marketing* 10, 2 (2002): 139-58.
- FREYTAG, PER VAGN, and ANN CLARKE. "Business to Business Market Segmentation." *Industrial Marketing Management* 30, 6 (2001): 473-86.
- FRIMAN, MARGARETA, TOMMY GARLING, BRUCE MILLET, JAN MATTSSON, and ROBERT JOHNSTON. "An Analysis of International Business-to-Business Relationships Based on the Commitment-Trust Theory." *Industrial Marketing Management* 31, 5 (2002): 403-9.
- HAIR, JOSEPH F., ROBERT P. BUSH, and DAVID J. ORTINAU. *Marketing Research within a Changing Information Environment*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin, 2003.
- HANSOTIA, BEHRAM. "Gearing Up for CRM: Antecedents to Successful Implementation." *Journal of Database Marketing* 10, 2 (2002): 121-32.
- HINKIN, TIMOTHY A. "Brief Tutorial for the Development of Measures for Use in Survey Questionnaires." *Organizational Research Methods* 1, 1 (1998): 104-21.
- HOMBURG, CHRISTIAN, JOHN P. WORKMAN, JR., and OVE JENSEN. "Fundamental Changes in Marketing Organization: The Movement Toward a Customer-Focused Organizational Structure." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 28, 4 (2000): 459-78.
- HUGHES, ARTHUR M. *Strategic Database Marketing: The Masterplan for Strategy and Managing a Profitable, Customer-Based Marketing Program*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 2000.
- HULTMAN, CLAES M. "The Interface between Transactional and Relational Orientation in Small Services Firm's Marketing Behaviors: A Study of Scottish and Swedish Small Firms in the Service Sector." *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 11, 1 (2003): 36-51.
- ITAMI, HIROYUKI, and THOMAS WILHELM ROEHL. *Mobilizing Invisible Assets*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- JACKSON, ROB, and PAUL WANG. *Strategic Database Marketing*. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Publishing, 1995.
- JACOBS, FRED A., WESLEY JOHNSTON, and NATALIA KOTCHETOVA. "Customer Profitability: Prospective vs. Retrospective Approaches in a Business-to-Business Setting." *Industrial Marketing Management* 30, 4 (2001): 353-63.
- KESTNBAUM, ROBERT D., KATE T. KESTNBAUM, and PAMELA W. AMES. "Building a Longitudinal Contact Strategy." *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 12, 1 (1998): 56-62.
- KITCHEN, PHILIP J., and DON E. SCHULTZ. "A Multi-Country Comparison of the Drive for IMC." *Journal of Advertising Research* 39, 1 (1999): 21-38.
- KOHLI, AJAY K., and BERNARD J. JAWORSKI. "Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications." *Journal of Marketing* 54, 2 (1990): 1-18.
- LAVIDGE, ROBERT J. "Mass Customization is not an Oxy-moron." *Journal of Advertising Research* 39, 4 (1999): 70-72.
- LEIGH, THOMAS W., and GREG W. MARSHALL. "Research Priorities in Sales Strategy and Performance." *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 21, 2 (2001): 83-93.
- LEMON, KATHERINE N., TIFFANY BARNETT WHITE, and RUSSELL S. WINER. "Dynamic Customer Relationship Management: Incorporating Future Considerations into the Service Retention Decision." *Journal of Marketing* 66, 1 (2002): 1-14.
- LOW, GEORGE S. "Correlates of Integrated Marketing Communications." *Journal of Advertising Research* 40, 3 (2000): 27-39.
- MANNING, GERALD L., and BARRY L. REECE. *Selling Today: An Extension of the Marketing Concept*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2002.
- MARTIN, JAMES H., and BRUNI GKBAC. "Using Supply Chain Management to Leverage a Firm's Market Orientation." *Industrial Marketing Management* 32, 1 (2003): 25-49.
- MEHTA, RAI, RAJDEEP GEWAL, and EUGENE SIVADAS. "International Direct Marketing on the Internet: Do Internet Users Form a Global Segment?" *Journal of Direct Marketing* 10, 1 (1996): 45-58.
- MOON, YOUNGME. "Intimate Self-Disclosure Exchanges: Using Computers to Build Reciprocal Relationships with Consumers." *Journal of Consumer Research* 26, 4 (2000): 323-39.
- MOORMAN, CHRISTINE, ROHIT DESHPANDE, and GERALD ZALTMAN. "Factors Affecting Trust in Market Research Relationships." *Journal of Marketing* 57, 1 (1993): 81-101.
- , and ROLAND T. RUST. "The Role of Marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 63 (special issue) (1999): 180-97.

- MORGAN, ROBERT M., and SHELBY D. HUNT. "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 58, 3 (1994): 20-38.
- NARVER, JOHN C., and STANLEY F. SLATER. "The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability." *Journal of Marketing* 54, 4 (1990): 20-35.
- PELTIER, JAMES W., JOHN A. SCHIBROWSKY, and JOHN DAVIS. "Using Attitudinal and Descriptive Database Information to Understand Buyer-Seller Relationships." *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 12, 2 (1998): 32-45.
- , ———, and DON E. SCHULTZ. "Leveraging Customer Information to Develop Sequential Communication Strategies: A Case Study of Charitable-giving Behavior." *Journal of Advertising Research* 42, 4 (2002): 23-41.
- , ———, and ———. "Interactive Integrated Marketing Communication: Combining the Power of IMC, the New Media and Database Marketing." *International Journal of Advertising* 22, 1 (2003): 93-115.
- , ———, ———, and JOHN DAVIS. "Interactive Psychographics: Cross-Selling in the Banking Industry." *Journal of Advertising Research* 42, 2 (2002): 7-22.
- PENROSE, EDITH. *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- PEPPERS, DON, and MARTHA ROGERS. "More Personalization Equals More Click Throughs." *Inside 1-1, 1to1.com*, Peppers and Rogers Group 1:1 Marketing, July 22, 2002.
- , and ———. *Making an Impact: Maximizing ROI in the Customer Interaction Center*. Peppers and Rogers Group, 2001.
- , ———, and BOB DORF. "Is Your Company Ready for One-to-One Marketing." *Harvard Business Review* 77, 1 (1999): 151-60.
- PHELPS, JOSEPH, T. E. HARRIS, and E. JOHNSON. "Exploring Decision-Making Approaches and Responsibility for Developing Marketing Communications Strategy." *Journal of Business Research* 37, 2 (1996): 217-23.
- RIDNOUR, RICK E., FELICIA G. LASSK, and C. DAVID SHEPHERD. "An Exploratory Assessment of Sales Culture Variables: Strategic Implications within the Banking Industry." *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 21, 3 (2001): 247-54.
- ROBERTS, MARY LOU. *Integrated Internet Marketing*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 2002.
- ROBINSON, RICHARD B., JR., and JOHN A. PEARCE II. "Planned Patterns of Strategic Behavior and Their Relationship to Business-Unit Performance." *Strategic Management Journal* 9, 1 (1988): 43-60.
- SCHLAPHOFF, EVELYN. "Turning a Telemarketing Program into a Competitive Database Marketing Weapon." *The Journal of Database Marketing* 4, 2 (1996): 187-91.
- SCHULTZ, DON E. "Integrated Marketing Communications and How It Relates to Traditional Media Advertising." In *The Advertising Business: Operations, Creativity, Media Planning, Integrated Communications*, J. P. Jones, ed. London: Sage Publications, 1999.
- . "Summit Explores Where IMC, CRM Meet." *Marketing News* 36, 5 (2002): 11-12.
- , and SCOTT BAILEY. "Customer/Brand Loyalty in an Interactive Marketplace." *Journal of Advertising Research* 40, 3 (2000): 41-53.
- SHOEMAKER, MARY E. "A Framework for Examining IT-enabled Market Relationships." *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 21, 2 (2001): 177-85.
- SLATER, STANLEY F., and JOHN C. NARVER. "Market Orientation and the Learning Organization." *Journal of Marketing* 59, 3 (1995): 63-74.
- SRIVASTAVA, RAJENDRA K., TASADDUQ A. SHERVANI, and LIAM FAHEY. "Marketing, Business Processes, and Shareholder Value: An Organizationally Embedded View of Marketing Activities and the Discipline of Marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 63 (1999): 168-79.
- VENCE, DEBORAH. "Marketers Will Always Rely on the Transactional Angle." *Marketing News* 36, 13 (2002): 1, 9.
- WANG, RICHARD Y., and DIANE M. STRONG. "What Data Quality Means to Data Consumers." *Journal of Management Information Systems* 12, 4 (1996): 5-34.
- WEBSTER, FREDERICK E., JR. "The Changing Role of Marketing in the Corporation." *Journal of Marketing* 56, 4 (1992): 1-17.
- WORKMAN, JOHN P., JR., CRISTIAN HOMBURG, and KJELL GRUNER. "Marketing Organization: An Integrative Framework of Dimensions and Determinants." *Journal of Marketing* 62, 3 (1998): 21-41.
- YU, LARRY. "Successful Customer Relationship Management." *MIT Sloan Management Review* 42, 4 (2001).
- ZEITHAML, VALARIE A., A. PARASURAMAN, and A. MALHOTRA. "A Conceptual Framework for Understanding e-Service Quality: Implications for Future Research and Managerial Practice." Report Nr. 00-115. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 2000.