

# Entrepreneurial Marketing: 4Ps Approach in MSME Industrial Clusters of Karnataka

**Dr. Pushpa Hongal**

Assistant Professor, Kousali Institute of Management Studies, Karnatak University, Dharwad

## Abstract

Historically speaking, Many scholars though argue marketing and entrepreneurship as has been looked upon as a something what distinct and unreasonable relationship components, unrelated to each other, However, several the studies argue in favour of done till today have contributed to collate interlinking these two disciplines. In the last two decades, efforts have been made to theoretically as well as empirically Studies have also identified and evaluated the relationships between these two fields, which has led to the emergence of new area of theoretically as well as practically. In the last two decades, a new area of marketing is identified and, focused, and called known as “Entrepreneurial Marketing”.

Entrepreneurial Marketing has grown both as a discipline as well as a subject in various management schools. Entrepreneurial Marketing helps the firms to adopt bold postures in changing the business environment. Entrepreneurial Marketing is originates from two major discipline’s, namely, Entrepreneurship and Marketing. Entrepreneurial Firms, Commonly as owner -managed firms, have the characteristics of Opportunity Focus, Pro-activeness, Customer Intensity, Risk Taking, Innovation, Resource Leveraging and Value Creation which are seen similar to Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Marketing identified by various scholars/academicians over a period of time.

The aim of this paper is to bring out the origin and development of Entrepreneurial Marketing, How the definitions of Entrepreneurial marketing and its dimensions have changed over a period, and measuring dimensions of Entrepreneurial Marketing in MSME Entrepreneurial Firms along with 4Ps in selected Industrial Clusters of Karnataka.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurship, Marketing, Entrepreneurial Firms, Entrepreneurial Marketing, 4Ps, MSME Clusters.

## Introduction

Marketing and Entrepreneurship traditionally has been identified as two separate academic fields. Recently, various researchers and scholars have proposed models that combine the two fields of marketing and entrepreneurship. At present, entrepreneurship is recognised as a field of economic growth in developing countries like India. Due to the growing importance of entrepreneurship and marketing across the globe, the significance of entrepreneurial firms, entrepreneurial behaviour and entrepreneurial marketing has also increased.

### Significance of Entrepreneurial Firm

Entrepreneurial firms are resource constrained firms that need to have network competent in establishing and using relationships with their partners to obtain significant resources for product development. They are characterized by their abilities to find and exploit opportunities to create products and services that would meet the future needs of people (Shane, 2000; Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990; Venkataraman, 1997). However, these firms are subjected to volatile business environments that produce rapid and unexpected changes, which can be considered both as a boon in terms of opportunity creation or a bane in terms of threat to the firm. To convert the vicissitudes of changes favourably towards them, the firms should be proactive, innovative and willing to take risks (Covin and Slevin, 1991; Covin and Miller, 2014). As a definition, entrepreneurial firms are the ones that “engage in product-market innovation, undertake somewhat risky ventures, and are the first to come up with “proactive” innovations.

In entrepreneurial firms, ownership and decision-making is typically centred on entrepreneurs (Glancey, 1998). Covin and Slevin (1991) suggest that entrepreneurial firms consist of risk-takers who are innovative and proactive in their environments and behave entrepreneurially at three levels. The first level that comprises top management are risk-takers pertaining to investment and its return. The second level entrepreneurs include production specialist who are innovative and have a tendency to be market leaders in terms of technology. The third level entrepreneurs include pioneers, who have aggressive characteristics against their competitors in the market.

The limited resources available to the entrepreneurial firms restrict their resilience and ability to adapt. Being new to the role, firm members are often inefficient and error-prone. They lack track record of buyers and suppliers and other constituents, which curb their success.

Entrepreneurial Marketing also have the similar dimensions based on Entrepreneur behaviour such as Opportunity, Focus, Pro-activeness, Risk-taking, Resource Leveraging, Innovation and Value creation. The emergence of entrepreneurial marketing as a field of study will be discussed in the ensuing section. The term “Entrepreneurial Marketing” is emerges from two fields, namely, Entrepreneurship and Marketing. According to the American Marketing Association, marketing is “the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion and distribution of ideas, goods and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational goals”

In relation to this, Pride and Ferrell (2000, p. 14) define marketing management as “the process of planning, organizing, implementing and controlling marketing activities to facilitate effective and efficient exchanges.” Any definition of marketing should have the following five components as suggested by Zikmund and D’amico (2001):

1. Two or more parties.
2. Something that is given by a party.
3. Something that is received by a party.
4. Level of communication between the parties.
5. Mechanism to perform the exchange.

Entrepreneurship can be conceptualized as a process that occurs in organizations of all sizes and types (Bygrave, 1989; Cornwall and Perlman, 1990; Morris and Kuratko, 2001; Pinchot, 2000). Stevenson, Roberts, and Grousbeck (1989) define entrepreneurship as “the process of creating value by bringing together a unique package of resources to exploit an opportunity.” The process itself includes a set of

activities necessary to identify an opportunity, define a business concept, assess the needed resources, acquire those resources, and manage and harvest the venture. Two key ingredients are necessary for accomplishing these activities: an entrepreneurial event and an entrepreneurial agent. The event involves the development and implementation of a new concept (i.e., a new product, service, or process), while the agent is a person or group that takes responsibility for bringing the event to fruition.

A new field has emerged from the past two decades known as Entrepreneurial Marketing which has characteristics of creating, communicating and delivering value to the customers and stakeholders. Entrepreneurial Marketing enables the processes of finding an opportunity, providing environmental pro-activeness in conducting business, and managing customer intensity with calculated risk taking.

Prof. G. Hills promoted the concept of Marketing with-in and Entrepreneurship in marketing. In an entrepreneurship research conference, he first wrote first about the empirical study of the marketing and entrepreneurship interface, starting this way thus laying the foundation for marketing and entrepreneurship movement within marketing.

**Table 1 depicts the evolution of Entrepreneurial Marketing.**

Year	Milestone	Impact
1982	First marketing and entrepreneurship research conference (G. Hills)	Started the marketing and entrepreneurship movement within marketing
1985	First empirical study of the marketing and entrepreneurship interface in frontiers of entrepreneurship research (G. Hills)	Started empirical research at the marketing and entrepreneurship interface and documented the importance
1987	“The relationship between entrepreneurship and marketing in established firms,” published in the Journal of Business Venturing (Morris and Paul). Empirical study of the interrelationship between marketing and entrepreneurship.	Moves EM into higher academic standing with JBV acceptance
1989 – 1991	AMA Task Force (1989) and, later, Special Interest Group is established for the marketing and entrepreneurship interface—First Tracks are created in the AMA summer (1990) and winter (1991) conferences for EM. Also, Academy of Marketing Science Congress in Singapore (1989) (G. Hills). Best Paper in Summer conference (P. Braden and R. Merz).	This added entrepreneurship legitimacy for marketing academics
1995	Carson, Cromie, McGowan, and Hill published a textbook, Marketing and Entrepreneurship in SMEs: An Innovative Approach.	Helps establish the content and Structure of EM courses.
	First academy of marketing symposium (U.K.)	These two milestones helped

Year	Milestone	Impact
1995	(D. Carson, Andrew McAuley). Slater and Narver's Market orientation and the learning organization, published in Journal of Marketing.	move some scholars in mainstream marketing to look at the similarities between marketing and entrepreneurship
1999	Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship created (J. Day, P. Reynolds also D. Carson, G. Hills)	JRME provided an academic journal dedicated to EM. JRME increased the acceptance of EM scholarship
2000	Special issue of the Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice on the marketing and entrepreneurship interface (M. Miles)	Provided additional credible publication outlet for scholars of EM.
2001	Lodish, Morgan, and Kallianpur published a book based on their pioneering MBA course in EM	This text enhanced the credibility of EM as a result of Wharton Business School's Reputation
2002	Bjerke and Hultman published Entrepreneurial Marketing: The Growth of Small Firms in the New Economic Era. Morris, Schindehutte, and LaForge publish Entrepreneurial marketing: A construct for integrating an emerging entrepreneurship and marketing perspective.	This text provided additional guidance on content and context of EM. Increased the visibility and creditability of work in EM and helped define and bound the EM construct.
2004	Buskirk and Lavik published Entrepreneurial Marketing.	EM textbooks move toward the mainstream in the U.S. market.

Regarding the definition of Entrepreneurial Marketing, many authors and scholars have defined Entrepreneurial Marketing in various dimensions. Table 2 illustrates the definitions of Entrepreneurial Marketing by different scholars and researchers over a period of time.

Author and Year	Definition	Dimensions Focused
Morris et al (2002)	EM is the proactive identification and exploitation of opportunities for acquiring and retaining profitable customer through innovative approaches to risk management, resource leveraging and value creation (2002;5)	Identification Exploitations Resource Leveraging Risk Management Value Creation
Miles & Darroch (2004)	Entrepreneurial Marketing is composed of a proactive organizational focus on customer satisfaction through innovative and efficient value creation throughout the value chain (2004).	Customer Satisfaction Value creation

<b>Author and Year</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Dimensions Focused</b>
Beverland & Lockshin (2004) and Becherer et al. (2006)	Define entrepreneurial marketing as effective action or adaptation of marketing theory to the specific needs of SMEs. Those effective actions should simultaneously solve matters such as restrictions regarding innovation, opportunities, risk and resources.	Innovation Opportunities Risk and resources
Bäckbrö & Nyström (2006)	EM is the overlapping aspects between entrepreneurship and marketing; therefore it is the behaviour shown by any individual and/or organization that attempts to establish and promote market ideas, while developing new ones in order to create value	Individual behaviour Organizational behaviour Create Value
Becherer et al (2008)	Entrepreneurial marketing is describe the marketing processes of firms pursuing opportunities in uncertain market circumstances	Market opportunities leveraging resources
Hills, et al (2010)	“EM is spirit, an orientation as well as a process of pursuing opportunities and launching, and growing venture that create perceived customer value through relationship, especially by employing innovativeness, creativity, selling, market immersion, networking, or flexibility”	Create relationship
Kraus, et al (2010)	“EM is an organisational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organisation and its stakeholders, and that is characterised by innovativeness, risk-taking, pro-activeness, and may be performed without resources currently controlled”.	Creating value Communicating value Delivering value
Jones and Rowley (2011)	“Entrepreneurial marketing is (...) strategic direction and involves organizational members’ practice of integrating customer preferences, competitor intelligence and product knowledge into the process of creating and delivering superior value to customers”.	Creating superior value Delivering superior value
Hills & Hultman (2011)	“Entrepreneurial marketing is considered more proactive, more innovative, more opportunity and growth oriented, and more willing to take risks than conventional marketing”.	Proactive Innovative Opportunity Growth

Author and Year	Definition	Dimensions Focused
		oriented Willing to take risk
Hacioglu et al, (2012)	“We define entrepreneurial marketing as a process with an entrepreneurial spirit (marketing by founder-entrepreneur)”	Process
Daniela IONIȚĂ, (2012)	“EM is a set of processes of creating, communicating and delivering value, guided by effectual logic and used a highly uncertain business environment.	Creating Communicating Delivering value

From the above definitions, it can be stated that Entrepreneurial Marketing is an activity of finding and exploiting an opportunity with environmental pro-activeness and it innovatively leverages resources with risk-taking abilities to maintain the customer intensity regarding delivery and create value for the stakeholder.

The difference between traditional marketing and Entrepreneurial Marketing is discussed here.

**Table 3 provides the difference between traditional marketing and Entrepreneurial Marketing.**

Elements	Traditional Marketing	Entrepreneurial Marketing
Basic Premise	Facilitation of transactions and market control.	Sustainable competitive advantage through value creation innovation.
Orientation	Marketing as an objective, dispassionate science.	Central role of passion, zeal, persistence and creativity in marketing.
Context	Established and relatively stable markets.	Envisioned, emerging fragmented high level of turbulence.
Marketers Role	Coordinator of marketing mix, brand building.	Internal and external category, change agent.
Market Approach	Reactive	Proactive
Customer Needs	Expressed by customers	Identified by lead users.
Risk	Risk minimization	Calculated risk taking, risk sharing
Resource Management	Efficient use of existing resources	Leveraging, doing more with less
New	With R&D, marketing support	Innovative marketing, customer is

Elements	Traditional Marketing	Entrepreneurial Marketing
Product/Service Development		co-producer.
Customers Role	External source of intelligence and feedback	Active participation in firms marketing decision

Source: Morris, Schindehutte, LaForge (2002)

**Industrial Clusters:**

Cluster theory and its application and cluster-based economic development policy; have been in the forefront of regional economic development theory and practice during the past decade. Cluster theory suggests that firms that are part of a geographically defined cluster benefit from being a part of that cluster and that these benefits result in growth in economic output for the region. These benefits accrue as a result of co-location or geographic proximity that, in turn, creates lower input costs for firms through agglomeration economies and facilitates knowledge spillovers that produce innovation and increased productivity. Consequently, firms in clusters that generate these benefits will be more competitive<sup>3</sup>, and regions with effective clusters will experience greater growth.

Porter (1998), who is the most frequently cited advocate and analyst of cluster policy, defines clusters as “Geographic concentrations of interconnected companies and institutions in a particular field, linked by commonalities and complementarities.”

In our review of the literature, we found a wide variety of conceptualizations of clusters, some of which focused entirely on inter-firm relationships and some of which included much broader links:

- Krugman, (1991): New economic geography: Clusters as co-location decisions of firms due to increasing returns to scale, lower costs of moving goods across space, etc.
- Rosenfeld (2005): clusters “are simply geographic concentrations of interrelated companies and institutions of sufficient scale to generate externalities.”
- Cortright (2006): “An industry cluster is a group of firms and related economic actors and institutions, that are located near one another and that draw productive advantage from their mutual proximity and connections”.
- Glaeser and Gottlieb (2009): “People cluster in cities to be close to something. At their heart, agglomeration economies are simply reductions in transport costs for goods, people, and ideas” (p.1005).
- Marshall (1890): Clusters as external economies created by labor market pooling and the benefits of moving people across firms, supplier specialization, knowledge spillovers.
- Porter (1998): “Geographic concentrations of interconnected companies and institutions in a particular field, linked by commonalities and complementarities”. Clusters include: linked industries and other entities (suppliers), distribution channels and customers (demand), related institutions (research organization, universities, training entities, etc) (see also Porter (2000), p.254 for definition)
- Saxenian (1994): Clusters as social and institutional phenomena: technological change, organizations, social networks, and other non-market relationship in which markets are embedded: organization within and between businesses, relationship among firms.
- Hill and Brennan (2000, p. 67-8): We define a competitive industrial cluster as a geographic concentration of competitive firms or establishments in the same industry that either have close buy-

sell relationships with other industries in the region, or share a specialized labour pool that provides firms with a competitive advantage over the same industry in other places.”

**Definition of MSME in India:**

Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) sector have proved to be an exciting and energetic sector since last five decades in the Indian economy. MSMEs in addition to contributing to the job creation at a lower capital cost, they also contribute to the industrialization of the country and undeveloped localities, which reduces the inequalities and ensures that the national income and wealth could be distributed equally. MSMEs complements big organizations and participate in the important production areas, MSMEs has a huge contribution to the socioeconomic development of the country. In India, MSMEs are defined according to MSMED Act, 2006, by the investment made by them in factories and equipment’s and on the machinery which provides services. (MSME at a GLANCE 2016).

**Revised Definition of MSME: According to MSMEs Act 2020:**

Revised Classification applicable w.e.f 1st July 2020			
Composite Criteria: Investment in Plant & Machinery/equipment and Annual Turnover			
Classification	Micro	Small	Medium
Manufacturing Enterprises and Enterprises rendering Services	Investment in Plant and Machinery or Equipment: <b>Not more than Rs.1 crore</b> and Annual Turnover ; <b>not more than Rs. 5 crore</b>	Investment in Plant and Machinery or Equipment: <b>Not more than Rs.10 crore</b> and Annual Turnover ; <b>not more than Rs. 50 crore</b>	Investment in Plant andMachinery or Equipment: <b>Not more than Rs.50 crore</b> and Annual Turnover ; <b>not more than Rs. 250 crore</b>

**Table 1: Definition of MSMEs as per MSME Act of 2020**

**Research Methodology:**

The Study is Exploratory in nature. In this study, based on the dimensions of Entrepreneurial Marketing, marketing mix strategies were evaluated and measured to see if there are any relationship between antecedents of entrepreneur and marketing strategies, and evaluating the cluster characteristics and marketing strategies. Impact of effectual behaviour on Marketing Strategies was also evaluated.

**Population and Sample Size:**

The population considered for the study consists of Entrepreneurial (Single Owner Managed Firms) Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises associated with Hubballi-Dharwad Auto-Component Cluster, Hubballi-Dharwad and Belgaum Foundry Cluster, Belagavi. The Size of the total population is 137 Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises associated with two clusters. Data has been collected form 64



Entrepreneurs using Stratified Random Sampling Technique for better Validation Statistical Analysis. Due to confidentiality and ethical consideration, the list of entrepreneurs and contact details were not disclosed in the thesis.

**Stratified Random Sampling Technique:**

The list of MSMEs collected from both Cluster offices. After Collecting the list, Started contacting the entrepreneurs over telephone this helped to find out the entrepreneurial firms which are available at the cluster. The Total Population of both clusters is 137 and out of 137 Total Firms, Total no of Entrepreneurial Firm are 102. Based on this Data, We Selected 3 Stratums such as Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises.

**Sampling Unit for Analysis:**

The Sampling Unit is Entrepreneur of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises associated with Hubli-Dharwad Auto Component Cluster and Belgaum Foundry Cluster.

**Table 1.5. Sampling Unit of Analysis**

Cluster Types	Micro Enterprises		Small Enterprises		Medium Enterprises		Total	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
HDAC	22	14	20	16	4	2	46	32
BFC	21	8	26	18	9	7	56	32
<b>Total</b>	43	22	46	34	13	9	102	64

**Data Collection Method:**

Primary Data was collected using Structured Interview Schedule, The list of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises is obtained from both Cluster offices and contacted the Entrepreneur personally. Out of 102 Entrepreneurs, 64 entrepreneurs responded and the response rate was 64%.

Secondary Sources of Data has been obtained from Mysore University Library Open Access Resources, Articles, Journals, Research Papers, Reports and other various available sources.

**Statistical Tools used for Analysis:**

A multi-method data analysis was used on the collected data. Appropriate statistical techniques were used to analyze the data. The focus of the analysis was on the Entrepreneurial Marketing Mix Strategies based on Entrepreneurial Marketing Dimensions, the statistical test used for the analysis was One-way Analysis of Variance.

**One-way ANOVA table for EM Mix Strategies based on EMD**

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Product Strategy</b>	Between Groups	2.911	2	1.455	11.474	.000
	Within Groups	7.738	62	.127		
	Total	10.649	64			

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pricing Strategy	Between Groups	.286	2	.143	1.577	.215
	Within Groups	5.524	62	.091		
	Total	5.810	64			
Place Strategy	.001	.001	2	.001	.001	.999
	37.141	37.141	62	.609		
	37.142	37.142	64			
Promotion Strategy	Between Groups	6.556	2	3.278	8.618	.001
	Within Groups	23.202	62	.380		
	Total	29.757	64			

Marketing Strategies	Type of Firms	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Product Strategy	Micro	21	3.82	.40077	.08746
	Small	34	4.20	.34066	.05842
	Medium	9	4.42	.29486	.09829
	Total	64	4.10	.41113	.05139
Pricing Strategy	Micro	21	4.01	.25279	.05516
	Small	34	4.13	.32222	.05526
	Medium	9	4.20	.32016	.10672
	Total	64	4.10	.30368	.03796
Place Strategy	Micro	21	4.39	1.26408	.27585
	Small	34	4.39	.35960	.06167
	Medium	9	4.38	.33830	.11277
	Total	64	4.39	.76783	.09598
Promotion Strategy	Micro	21	3.13	.71913	.15693
	Small	34	2.51	.58875	.10097
	Medium	9	2.30	.42131	.14044
	Total	64	2.68	.68727	.08591

### Discussion and Conclusion

#### Product Strategy:

From the above ANOVA Table, Under Product Strategy the overall ratings by Micro, Small and Medium were respectively **3.8, 4.1 and 4.37**, based on 7 Dimensions of EM on 5-Point Scale. We found that there is Increase in the ratings From Micro Firm to Medium Firm is attributed.

Product Strategy Varies from Firm to Firm and Product to Product. Micro Enterprises need to focus on Product Design, Quality Certifications, Product Modifications Whereas Small and Medium Enterprises are already established there brand with their Product Development, Quality, Designs and Certifications in Two Selected Clusters.

**Place Strategy:**

From the above ANOVA Table, Under Place Strategy the Overall Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises were respectively **4.39, 4.39 and 4.37**, based on 7 Dimensions of EM on 5-Point Scale. Thus, Place Strategy is adopted by the enterprises is almost same in all three categories since most of the entrepreneurs geographical origin is same where entrepreneurs or their ancestors started these enterprises.

**Price Strategy:**

From the above ANOVA Table, Under Price Strategy the overall ratings by Micro, Small and Medium were respectively **4.0, 4.1 and 4.2**, based on 7 Dimensions of EM on 5-Point Scale.

Thus, The Ratings of Pricing Strategy Increasing from Micro to Medium Enterprises this is because Micro Enterprises in the selected clusters work on Small Engineering Components, Fabrication, Single Type of Valves, or Castings and Other Engineering Job Works Whereas Small and Medium Enterprises involved in High Quality Products Such as Conveyors, All types of Valves and All type of Castings under one roof. The Investment of Micro Enterprises is low compared to Small and Medium Enterprises. Micro Enterprises depend upon daily orders whereas Small and Medium Companies are getting sufficient orders from their customers since some Small and Medium Enterprises design Different Pricing Strategy with Special Discounts and Credit Facility to their Loyal Customers.

**Promotion Strategy:**

From the above ANOVA Table, Under Promotion Strategy the overall ratings by Micro, Small and Medium were respectively **3.1, 2.5 and 2.3**, based on 7 Dimensions of EM on 5-Point Scale.

Thus, The Ratings of Promotional Strategy decreasing from Micro to Medium Enterprises in the selected Clusters. This is because Micro Enterprises rating is high because the Entrepreneurs of Micro Enterprises need to promote their product because of the Competition from the similar type of Industries are more in the selected Clusters, For Micro Enterprises Word of Mouth of Customer is a Major Promotional Tool and also they promote their products exhibitions tradeshows etc. In case of Small and Medium Enterprises they also promote their Products through their Own Websites in Industrial Magazines; some of the entrepreneurs promote their products to social networking such as Facebook, Whatsapp etc. Small and Medium Enterprises are built their brand in the clusters, they will get continues orders from their loyal customers so they feel there is no need of much promotion for their products, whereas Micro Enterprises need to promote their product because it is a question of survival to them.

**4.2. Hypothesis for Marketing Mix Strategies based on Entrepreneurial Dimension in MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H<sub>01</sub>: Product Strategy does not differ significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H<sub>11</sub>: Product Strategy differs significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-way ANOVA Table for Product Strategy**

Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.911	2	1.455	11.474	.000
Within Groups	7.738	62	.127		
Total	10.649	64			

From the Above table it can be interpreted that, there is a There is a Significant Difference between Product Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms based on Dimensions of EM in MSMEs, since P-Value  $.000 < 0.05$ .

**H02: Pricing Strategy does not differ significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H12: Pricing Strategy differs significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-Way ANOVA Table for Pricing Strategy**

Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.286	2	.143	1.577	.215
Within Groups	5.524	62	.091		
Total	5.810	64			

From the Above table it can be interpreted that, there is a There is no significant Difference between Pricing Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms since P-Value  $.215 > 0.05$ . This is because; MSME Entrepreneurial Firms produce similar kind of products in the cluster based environment such as Valves, Castings etc.

**H03: Place Strategy does not differ significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H13: Place Strategy differs significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-way ANOVA Table for Place Strategy**

Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.001	2	.001	.001	.999
Within Groups	37.141	62	.609		
Total	37.142	64			

From the Above table it can be interpreted that, there is a There is no significant Difference between Place Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms since P-Value  $.999 > 0.05$ .

**H04: Promotion Strategy does not differ significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H14: Promotion Strategy differs significantly between MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-Way ANOVA Table for Promotion Strategy**

Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.556	2	3.278	8.618	.001
Within Groups	23.202	62	.380		
Total	29.757	64			

From the Above table it can be interpreted that, there is a There is a Significant Difference between Promotion Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms based on Dimensions of EM in MSMEs, since P-Value  $.001 < 0.05$ .

**H<sub>05</sub>: There is no association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Product Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H<sub>15</sub>: There is an association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Product Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-way ANOVA Table for EM Dimensions under Product Strategy**

One-way ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Product Opportunity Focus</b>	Between Groups	5.070	2	2.535	6.617	.003
	Within Groups	23.370	62	.383		
	Total	28.440	64			
<b>Product Pro-activeness</b>	Between Groups	5.665	2	2.832	4.763	.012
	Within Groups	36.273	62	.595		
	Total	41.938	64			
<b>Product Customer Intensity</b>	Between Groups	.164	2	.082	.812	.449
	Within Groups	6.175	62	.101		
	Total	6.340	64			
<b>Product Risk Taking</b>	Between Groups	3.739	2	1.870	6.491	.003
	Within Groups	17.570	62	.288		
	Total	21.309	64			
<b>Product Innovation</b>	Between Groups	10.831	2	5.415	5.928	.004
	Within Groups	55.728	62	.914		
	Total	66.559	64			
<b>Product Resource Leveraging</b>	Between Groups	3.623	2	1.812	6.360	.003
	Within Groups	17.377	62	.285		
	Total	21.000	64			
<b>Product Value Creation</b>	Between Groups	.457	2	.229	1.211	.305
	Within Groups	11.523	62	.189		
	Total	11.980	64			

Thus, there is a significant association between Product Strategy and Entrepreneurial Marketing Dimensions Such as Opportunity Focus (0.003<0.05) Pro-activeness (0.012<0.05) Risk Taking (0.003<0.05) Innovation (0.004<0.05) and Resource Leveraging (0.03<0.05) in Entrepreneurial

MSMEs. In case of Customer Intensity(0.449) and Value Creation(0.305) there is in-significant relationship because p-value is greater than 0.05.

**H<sub>06</sub>: There is no association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Pricing Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H<sub>16</sub>: There is an association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Pricing Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-way ANOVA Table for EM Dimensions under Pricing Strategy**

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Price Opportunity Focus</b>	Between Groups	5.466	14	.420	5.769	.000
	Within Groups	3.644	50	.073		
	Total	9.109	64			
<b>Price Pro-activeness</b>	Between Groups	10.969	14	.844	3.337	.001
	Within Groups	12.641	50	.253		
	Total	23.609	64			
<b>Price Customer Intensity</b>	Between Groups	7.228	14	.556	2.319	.017
	Within Groups	11.986	50	.240		
	Total	19.215	64			
<b>Price Risk Taking</b>	Between Groups	17.151	14	1.319	4.044	.000
	Within Groups	16.314	50	.326		
	Total	33.465	64			
<b>Price Innovation</b>	Between Groups	50.020	14	3.848	4.015	.000
	Within Groups	47.918	50	.958		
	Total	97.938	64			
<b>Price Resource Leveraging</b>	Between Groups	4.068	14	.313	2.840	.004
	Within Groups	5.509	50	.110		
	Total	9.578	64			
<b>Price Value Creation</b>	Between Groups	5.404	14	.416	1.961	.045
	Within Groups	10.596	50	.212		
	Total	16.000	64			

From the above table it can be interpreted that: the p-value of all 7 Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Marketing is <0.05. Thus, we can say that there is a significant association between Pricing Strategy and EM Dimensions.

**H<sub>07</sub>: There is no association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Place Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H<sub>17</sub>: There is an association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Place Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-way ANOVA Table for EM Dimensions under Place Strategy**

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Place Opportunity Focus	Between Groups	13.975	14	.998	1.863	.055
	Within Groups	26.259	50	.536		
	Total	40.234	64			
Place Pro-activeness	Between Groups	7.537	14	.538	2.964	.002
	Within Groups	8.901	50	.182		
	Total	16.437	64			
Place Customer Intensity	Between Groups	4.265	14	.305	3.539	.001
	Within Groups	4.219	50	.086		
	Total	8.484	64			
Place Risk Taking	Between Groups	4.895	14	.350	2.130	.026
	Within Groups	8.042	50	.164		
	Total	12.938	64			
Place Innovation	Between Groups	9.509	14	.679	2.020	.036
	Within Groups	16.476	50	.336		
	Total	25.984	64			
Place Resource Leveraging	Between Groups	47.038	14	3.360	10.138	.000
	Within Groups	16.239	50	.331		
	Total	63.277	64			
Place Value Creation	Between Groups	4.671	14	.334	1.978	.040
	Within Groups	8.267	50	.169		
	Total	12.937	64			

From the above table it can be interpreted that: the p-value of all 7 Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Marketing is <0.05. Thus, we can say that there is a significant association between Place Strategy and EM Dimensions.

**H<sub>08</sub>: There is no association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Promotion Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**H<sub>18</sub>: There is an association between Entrepreneurial Marketing dimensions and Promotion Strategy adopted by MSME Entrepreneurial Firms.**

**One-way ANOVA Table for EM Dimensions under Promotion Strategy**

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Promotion Opportunity Focus</b>	Between Groups	63.589	24	2.765	3.092	.001
	Within Groups	35.771	40	.894		
	Total	99.359	64			
<b>Promotion Pro-activeness</b>	Between Groups	70.914	24	3.083	41.146	.000
	Within Groups	2.997	40	.075		
	Total	73.911	64			
<b>Promotion Customer Intensity</b>	Between Groups	12.271	24	.534	2.613	.004
	Within Groups	8.167	40	.204		
	Total	20.438	64			
<b>Promotion Risk Taking</b>	Between Groups	55.375	24	2.408	3.695	.000
	Within Groups	26.062	40	.652		
	Total	81.438	64			
<b>Promotion Innovation</b>	Between Groups	32.267	24	1.403	8.334	.000
	Within Groups	6.733	40	.168		
	Total	39.000	64			
<b>Promotion Resource Leveraging</b>	Between Groups	18.417	24	.801	6.005	.000
	Within Groups	5.333	40	.133		
	Total	23.750	64			
<b>Promotion Value Creation</b>	Between Groups	13.109	24	.570	3.800	.000
	Within Groups	6.000	40	.150		
	Total	19.109	64			

From the above table it can be interpreted that: the p-value of all 7 Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Marketing are <0.05. Thus, we can say that there is a significant association between Promotion Strategy and EM Dimensions

**Conclusion:**

An industrial cluster plays a critical role in promoting the performance of firms in developing countries by allowing for shared production networks and stimulating Micro, Small and Medium Entrepreneurs.

The present research focused on Manufacturing Units of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises of Auto-component cluster and Belgaum foundry clusters.

The Marketing Mix Strategies Product, Price, Place and Promotion were analysed with Entrepreneurial Marketing Dimensions such as Opportunity Focus, Pro-activeness, Customer Intensity, Risk taking, Innovation, Resource, Leveraging and Value Creation.

Considering Marketing Mix Strategies, Product and Promotion Strategies are the two major strategies which impact significantly on Entrepreneurial MSMEs Select Industrial Clusters in Karnataka.



**1. References:**

2. Hills, G. E. & Hultman, C. M. (2006). Entrepreneurial Marketing, In Lagrosen, S. and Svensson, G., editors, *Marketing - Broadening the Horizons*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
3. Hills, G., Hultman, C., Kraus, S. & Schulte, R. (2010). History, theory and evidence of Entrepreneurial Marketing – An overview. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management (IJEIM)*, 11(1), 3-18.
4. Hills, G. E., Hultman, C. M., & Miles, M. P. (2008). The evolution and development of entrepreneurial marketing. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1), 99-112.
5. Hills, G., & Hultman, C. (2011a). Academic roots: The past and present of entrepreneurial marketing. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 24(1), 1-10.
6. Hill, J. & Wright, L. T. (2000). Defining the scope of entrepreneurial marketing: A qualitative approach. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 8(1), 23-46.
7. Hills, G. and LaForge, R. (1992). Research at the marketing interface to advance entrepreneurship theory. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(3), 33-59.
8. Morris, M. H., Schindehutte, M., & LaForge, R. W. (2001). The emergence of entrepreneurial marketing: nature and meaning. *Paper presented at 15th Annual UIC Research Symposium on Marketing and Entrepreneurship*.
9. Morris, M. H., Schindehutte, M., & LaForge, R. W. (2002). Entrepreneurial marketing: A construct for integrating emerging entrepreneurship and marketing perspectives. *The Journal of Marketing -Theory and Practice*, 10(4), 1-19.
10. Becherer, R. C., Haynes, P. J., & Helms, M. M. (2008). An exploratory investigation of entrepreneurial marketing in SMEs: The influence of the owner/operator. *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, 20(2), 44.
11. Becherer, R. C., Helms, M. M., & McDonald, J. P. (2012). The effect of entrepreneurial marketing on outcome goals in SMEs. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 3.
12. Kraus, S., Harms, R., & Fink, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial marketing: Moving beyond marketing in new ventures. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 11(1), 19-34.
13. Ahlstrom, D., & Bruton, G. D. (2002). An institutional perspective on the role of culture in shaping strategic actions by technology-focused entrepreneurial firms in China. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(4): 53–69.
14. Yu, B., Hao, S., Ahlstrom, D. Si, S. & Liang, D. (2014). Entrepreneurial firms' network competence, technological capability, and new product development performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 31(3), 687–704.
15. Eisenhardt, K. M., Schoonhoven, C. B. (1996). Resource-based view of strategic alliance formation: Strategic and social effects in entrepreneurial firms. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 136–150.
16. Aramand, M., & Valliere, D. (2012). Dynamic capabilities in entrepreneurial firms: A case study approach. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 10(2), 142–157.
17. Veglio, V. & Zucchella, A. (2015). Entrepreneurial firms in traditional industries. Does innovation matter for international growth? *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 13(2), 138–152.

18. Eisenhardt, K. M. (2013). Top management teams and the performance of entrepreneurial firms. *Small Business Economics*, 40(4), 805–816.
19. Croce, A., Martí, J., & Murtinu, S. (2013). The impact of venture capital on the productivity growth of European entrepreneurial firms: ‘Screening’ or ‘value added’ effect? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(4), 489–510.
20. Colombo, M. G., Croce, A., & Murtinu, S. (2014). Ownership structure, horizontal
21. Bhushan, B. and Pandey, S. (2015). Exploring the dynamics of network characteristics for Indian high technology entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 5(1), 1-20.
22. Katila, R., Chen, E. L., & Piezunka, H. (2012). All the right moves: How entrepreneurial firms compete effectively. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(2), 116–132.
23. Allen, J. and Potiowsky, T. (2008). Portland’s Green Building Cluster: Economic Trends and Impacts. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 22 (4), 303-315.
24. Austrian, Z. (2000). Cluster Case Studies: The Marriage of Quantitative and Qualitative Information for Action. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14 (1), 97-110.
25. Bacheller, J. (2000). Commentary on State-Level Economic Development in New York. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14 (1), 5-10.
26. Baptista, R. and Swann, P. (1998). Do firms in clusters innovate more? *Research Policy*, 27, 525-540.
27. Barkley, D., and Henry, M. (1999). Industry agglomerations and employment change in non-metropolitan areas. The applied regional science conference (ARSC). Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
28. Barkley, D., Henry, M. and Nair, S. (2006). Regional Innovation Systems: Implications for Nonmetropolitan Areas and Workers in the South. *Growth and Change*, 37(2), 278- 366.
29. Bartik, T. (2008). *The Revitalization of Older Industrial Cities: A Review Essay of Retooling for Growth*. Upjohn Institute Working Paper No. 08-143. Kalamazoo, MI. The Upjohn Institute.
30. Bergman, E. and Feser, E. (1999). Industrial and Regional clusters: Concepts and Comparative applications. *The Web Book of Regional Science*. Retrieved from <http://www.rri.wvu.edu/WebBook/Bergman-Feser/contents.htm>
31. Black, D. and Henderson, V. (1999). A theory of urban growth. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 107 (2), 252-284.
32. Cortright, J. (2006). Making sense of clusters: regional competitiveness and economic development. Discussion paper Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program.
33. Cortright, J. and Mayer, H. (2001). High-Tech Specialization: A comparison of high technology centers. Center on urban and metropolitan policy. The Brookings Institution. Survey series, January 2001.
34. Cumbers, A. and MacKinnon, D. (2004). Introduction: Clusters in Urban and Regional Development. *Urban Studies*, 41 (5/6), 959-969.
35. Dahl, M. S., and Pedersen, C.O.R. (2004). Knowledge Flows through Informal Contacts in Industrial Clusters: Myth or Reality?. *Research Policy*, 33 (10), 1673-86.
36. Davis, J. and Henderson, J. (2004). The agglomeration of headquarters. Discussion papers. Center for Economic Studies, Bureau of the Census. Washington, DC.

37. Deloitte Consulting . (2004). Manufacturing Pennsylvania's Future: Regional Strategies That Build from Current Strengths and Address Competitive Challenges.
38. Duranton, G. (2009). *California Dreamin': The Feeble Case for Cluster Policies*. Unpublished paper, Department of Economics, University of Toronto, July 1, 2009.
39. Duranton, G. and Puga, D. (2004) Micro-foundations of urban agglomeration economies. In Henderson, J., and Thisse, J. *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics. Vol. 4. Cities and geography*. The Netherlands: Elsevier B.V
40. Duranton, G. and Puga, D. (2005). From Sectoral to Functional Urban Specialization. *Journal of Urban Economic*, 57 (2), 343-370.
41. Enright, M. (2003). Regional Clusters: What we know and what we should know.
42. In Brocker, J. Dohse, D. and Soltwedel, R. (Eds.), *Innovation Clusters and Interregional competition*. Springer. NY: 2003.
43. Felbinger, C. and Robey, J. (2001). Globalization's impact on state and local policy: the rise of regional cluster-based economic development strategies. *Policy Studies Review*, 18 (3), 63-79.
44. Feldman, M. (2000). Location and Innovation: The New Economic Geography of Innovation, Spillovers, and Agglomeration.
45. In Clark, G., Feldman, M. and Gertler, M. (Eds). *The Oxford handbook of economic geography* (pp. 373-394). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
46. Feldman, M. and Audretsch, D. (1999). Innovation in cities: Science based diversity, specialization and localized competition. *European Economic Review*, 43, 409-429.
47. Feser, E. (2008). On Building Clusters Versus Leveraging Synergies in the Design of Innovation Policy for Developing Economies. In Uwe Blien and Gunther Maier(Eds.) *The Economics of Regional Clusters: Networks, Technology, and Policy* (pp.185-207).
48. Cheltenham, UK. Edward Elgar. Feser, E., Renski, H., and Goldstein, H. (2008). Clusters and Economic Development Outcomes: An Analysis of the Link Between Clustering and Industry Growth *Economic Development Quarterly*, 22 (4), 324-344.
49. Glaeser, E. (2000). The new economics of urban and regional growth. In Clark, G., Feldman, M. and Gertler, M. (Eds). *The Oxford handbook of economic geography* (pp.83-98). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
50. Glaeser, E. and Gottlieb, J. (2009). The Wealth of Cities: Agglomeration economies and spatial equilibrium in the United States. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(4), 983-1028.
51. Glaeser, E., Kallal, H., Scheinkman, J. and Shleifer, A. (1992). Growth in cities. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 100 (6), *Centennial Issue*, 1126-1152.
52. Gordon, I.R. and McCann, P. (2000). Industrial clusters: complexes, agglomeration and/or social networks?. *Urban Studies*, 37(3), 513-532.
53. Granovetter, M. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360-1380.
54. Hanson, G. (2000). Firms, Workers, and the Geographic Concentration of Economic Activity.
55. In Clark, G., Feldman, M. and Gertler, M. (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography* (pp. 477-494). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

56. Hanson, G. (2005). Market potential, increasing returns and geographic concentration. *Journal of International Economics*, 67, 1-24.
57. Henderson, V., Kuncoro, A. and Turner, M. (1995). Industrial development in cities. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 103(5), 1067-1090.
58. Henry, M., Barkley, D. and Zhang, Y. (1997). Industry clusters in the TVA region: Do they affect development of rural areas. TVA rural studies. Contractor Paper 98-9.
59. Hill, E. and Brennan, J.F. (2000). A methodology for identifying the drivers of industrial clusters: the foundation of regional competitive advantage. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14, 65- 96.
60. Hill, E., Samuel, J, Stewart, F. In cooperation with the MPI Group, Inc. (2008). Driving Ohio's prosperity: Central Ohio is the leverage point of a two-job strategy for growing the value of automotive and advanced manufacturing. How to help manufacturers do today's job of meeting customer's demands and tomorrow's job of continuing to innovate and improve. Prepared for Compete Columbus.
61. Hippel, E.v. (1988). *The Sources of Innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
62. Iammarino, S. and McCann, P. (2006). The Structure and Evolution of Industrial Clusters: Transactions, Technology and Knowledge Spillovers. *Research Policy*, 35, 1018-1036.
63. Krugman, P. (1991). Increasing returns and economic geography. *Journal of Political Economy*, 99(3), 483-99.
64. Krugman, P. (2000). Where in the world is the 'New Economic Geography'? In Clark, G., Feldman, M. and Gertler, M. (Eds). *The Oxford handbook of economic geography* (pp.49-60). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
65. Malmberg, A. and Maskell, P. (2006). Localized Learning Revisited. *Growth and Change*, 37 (1), 1-18.
66. Markusen, A. (1985). *Profit Cycles, Oligopoly, and Regional Development*. Cambridge, MA. The MIT Press.
67. Markusen, A. (1996). Sticky places in slippery space: a typology of industrial districts. *Economic Geography*, 72 (3), 293-313.
68. Martin, R. and Sunley, P. (2003). Deconstructing clusters: Chaotic concept or policy panacea? *Journal of Economic Geography*, 3, 5-35.
69. Mills, K., Reynolds, E. and Reamer, A. (2008). *Clusters and Competitiveness: A New Federal Role for Stimulating Regional Economies*. Washington, DC. Metropolitan Policy Program. Brookings Institution.
70. Motoyama, Y. (2008). What Was New About Cluster Theory? What Could It Answer and What Could It Not Answer? *Economic Development Quarterly*, 22(4), 353-363.
71. Muro, M. and Katz, B. (2010). The new "cluster moment": How regional innovation clusters can foster the next economy. Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution.
72. Newlands, D. (2003). Competition and Cooperation in Industrial Clusters: the Implications for Public Policy. *European Planning Studies*, 11(5), 521-532.
73. OECD (2008). The sources of economic growth in OECD regions: a parametric analysis. Working party on territorial indicators.

74. O'Huallachain, B. (1992). Economic structure and growth of metropolitan areas. In Mills, E. and McDonald, J. (Eds). *Sources of Metropolitan Growth*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research.
75. Peters, D. (2004). Revisiting industry cluster theory and method for use in public policy: An example identifying supplier-based cluster in Missouri. Mid-Continent Regional Science Association, 35th Annual meeting.
76. Phelps, N.A. (2004), Clusters, Dispersion, and the Spaces in Between. *Urban Studies*, 41(5/6), 971-989.
77. Porter, M. (1998). *Competitive Advantage. Creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York: Free Press.
78. Porter, M. (2000). Locations, clusters and company strategy. In Clark, G., Feldman, M. and Gertler, M. (Eds). *The Oxford handbook of economic geography* (pp.253-274). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
79. Porter, M. (2003). The Economic Performance of Regions. *Regional Studies*, 37(6), 545-578.
80. Porter, M. (2009). *Clusters and Economic Policy: Aligning Public Policy with the New Economics of Competition*. White Paper, Institute for Strategy and Competitiveness, Harvard Business School.
81. Porter, M. (2010). Cluster Mapping Project. Retrieved from <https://secure.hbs.edu/isc/login/login.do?http://data.isc.hbs.edu/isc/>
82. Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work. Civic tradition in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
83. Reid, N., Smith, W., and Carroll, M. (2008). Cluster Regions: A Social Network Perspective. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 22 (4), 345-352.
84. Rosenfeld, S. (1997). Bringing Business Clusters into the Mainstream of Economic Development. *European Planning Studies*, 5 (1), 3-23.
85. Rosenfeld, S. (2000). Community college/Cluster connections: Specialization and Competitiveness in the United States and Europe. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14 (1), 51-62.
86. Rosenfeld, S. (2005). *Industry Clusters: Business Choice, Policy Outcome, or Branding Strategy?* Carrboro, NC. Regional Technology Strategies.
87. Rosenfeld, S. (2010). Discussion at *Implementing Clusters Workshop*, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, May, 26, 2010.
88. Rosenthal, S. and Strange, W. (2004). Evidence of the nature and sources of agglomeration economies. In Henderson, J.V. and Thisse, J.F. (Eds.). *Handbook of regional and urban economics*, Vol. 4.
89. Safford, S. (2009). *Why the Garden Club Couldn't Save Youngstown: the Transformation of the Rust Belt*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
90. Saxenian, A. (1994). *Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route Cambridge and London*: Harvard University Press.
91. Strauss-Kahn, V. and Vives, X. (2006). Why and where do headquarters move? Working paper No. 650. IESE Business school, University of Navarra.
92. Waits, M. (2000). The added value of the industry-cluster approach to economic analysis, strategy development, and service delivery. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14 (1), 35-50.

93. Enright, M. J. (2003). Regional clusters: what we know and what we should know. In *Innovation clusters and interregional competition* (pp. 99-129). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
94. Enright, M. J. (2000). The globalization of competition and the localization of competitive advantage: policies towards regional clustering. In *The globalization of multinational enterprise activity and economic development* (pp. 303-331). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
95. Porter, M. E. (1998). Clusters and Competition. *New Agenda for Companies*. In *Governments and Institutions*, in: *Ibid., On Competition*.
96. Romero-Martínez, A. M., & Montoro-Sánchez, Á. (2008). How clusters can encourage entrepreneurship and venture creation. Reasons and advantages. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 4(3), 315-329.
97. Wang, F., & Huang, Z. (2011, May). Notice of Retraction *Entrepreneurs synergy, inclusive development and formation of industrial clusters: A case study from Shanxiahu, China*. In *E-Business and E-Government (ICEE), 2011 International Conference on* (pp. 1-4). IEEE.
98. Gartner, W. B. (1990). What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship?. *Journal of Business venturing*, 5(1), 15-28.
99. Miller, D. & P.H. Friesen (1983), "Innovation in Conservative and Entrepreneurial Firms: Two Model of Strategic Momentum," *Strategic Management Journal*, 3(1):1-25.
100. Das, K. (2005). *Industrial clustering in India: local dynamics and the global debate*. Indian Industrial Clusters. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1-19.
101. Gupta, S. (2014). *Automobile clusters in India: a comparative analysis of structure and linkages (1982-2007)*.
102. N. Nagesha, M. H. Bala Subrahmanya (2006), *Energy Efficiency for sustainable development of Small industry clusters: what factors influence it?*. *The International Journal of Economic Policy Studies* Volume 1 October 2006, pp. 133-153.
103. N. Nagesha, P. Balachandra (2006), *Barriers to energy efficiency in small industry clusters: Multi-criteria-based prioritization using the analytic hierarchy process*. *Journal of Energy*, Volume 31. 1969–1983
104. M.R. Narayana, (2007), "Economic size and performance of dispersed and clustered small scale enterprises in India", *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 34 Iss 9 pp. 599 – 611
105. M.R. Narayana (2014), *Growth Effects of Industrial Clusters: Evidence and Implications for India*. *South Asia Economic Journal* 15(1) 71–92.