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When China started its modern economic reform in 1979, engineered by the late Deng Xiaoping, its GDP (Gross Domestic Product) was officially valued at RMB 403.8 billion. In 2001, this figure reached over RMB 9.43 trillion (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2002, p51). Taking the moderate level of inflation\(^3\) over the same period into consideration, the above figure presents a tremendous increase in the size of the country’s economy. Such achievements can be largely attributed to two essential components of China’s economic reform policy: transformation from a centrally planned economy towards a market-oriented system, and the opening-up of its domestic market to foreign investment. Accepted into the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in December 2001, after 15 years of tough negotiations, China continues to adapt itself to WTO membership requirements by making its economy more market-oriented. As an increasingly competitive market brings pressure to bear on businesses operating in China, the extent of that adaptation is a key question. This study represents a systematic effort to examine this and related issues.

**Literature Review**

**Market Orientation Conceptualisation.** Market Orientation (MO) has been viewed as cornerstone of modern marketing. For decades, many have advocated that by adopting MO, businesses will improve their performance (Levitt, 1960, Kotler, 1984, Kotler and Andreasen, 1987, and Webster, 1988).

Kohli and Jaworski (1990) and Narver and Slater (1990) were the first to define MO as a multi-dimensional concept. Based on their extensive literature review, and on 62 field interviews, Kohli and Jaworski (1990) conclude that MO refers to (1) organisation wide generation of market intelligence with regard to customers’ current and future needs, and the factors affecting them, such as competition and regulation; (2) sharing and dissemination of such market intelligence across the various departments, and (3) organisation wide engagement in activities to meet selected customer needs. They constructed a research model, containing a set of antecedents (senior management factors, inter-departmental dynamics, and organisational structure), moderators (from either supply or demand side), and consequences (customer responses, business performance, and employee responses). They further proposed a set of hypotheses, speculating the relationship between the antecedents and MO, and in turn, the consequences of such relationship on performance.

Parallel to this work, and also based on an extensive literature review, Narver and Slater (1990) conclude that MO consists of three behavioural components: (1) customer orientation: sufficient understanding of a company’s target market in order to create superior customer value; (2) competitors orientation: understanding the short-term

---

\(^2\) Please do not cite, as this paper is under review.

\(^3\) The consumer price index in China has been increased from 100 in 1985 to 333.33 in 2001 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2002, p295).
strengths and weaknesses, and long-term capabilities and strategies of both the current
and potential competitors, and (3) inter-functional co-ordination: the co-ordinated
utilisation of company resources to create superior customer value. They further
developed a set of MO measures, and examined the effect of MO on market performance,
using a sample of 140 strategic business units (SBUs) within one corporation. Their
results show a positive association between the SBUs’ MO levels and their business
performance.

Since the popularisation of the MO conceptualisation, more than 40 studies have been
published, examining both the degree and, to a limited extent, the forms of MO and their
association with business performance. Most found a direct positive association between
MO and business performance (Ruekert, 1992, Deshpande et al, 1993, Jaworski and
Thirkell and Dau, 1998, Van Egeren and O’Connor, 1998, Dawes, 2000, Kumar and
discovered both a direct positive association and a moderating effect (Narver and Slater,
1997, Bhuian, 1998). Others revealed a positive but weak association (Au and Tse, 1995,
Greenley, 1995a, Pitt et al, 1996, Slater and Narver, 1996), or a mixed result, including a
positive association only between previously reported but not currently reported level of
MO and performance (Balabanis, et al, 1997), and a positive association with some
performance measures but not others (Appiah-Adu and Ranchhod, 1998). A further three
studies uncovered an association which was dependent on a certain environment
(Diamantopoulos and Hart, 1993, Greenley, 1995b, Appiah-Adu, 1998), while another
three found no significant association (Esslemont and Lewis, 1991, Tse, 1998, and
Caruana et al., 1999).

The use of a single aggregated MO measure dominates these studies. Despite the multi-
dimensional structure of the two original conceptualisations, Narver and Slater’ (1990)
and Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) both relied on a single aggregated MO measure to
examine its relationship to business performance. As Dawes (2000) points out, this is due
to the assumption that different MO components have equal-effect on performance (e.g.,
Narver and Slater, 1990, p23). While most subsequent studies followed this route,
findings of several recent studies questioned this assumption. Companies in UK for
example, are found to practise different “forms” of MO, including comprehensive and
competitor-focused (Greenly, 1995a), demonstrating that some companies emphasise
different MO components. Furthermore, the competition dimension of the MO scale was
found to have higher impact on business performance than the others (Dawes, 2000, and
Kumar and Subramanian, 2000), demonstrating the non-equal performance impact from
individual MO dimensions.

Most previous studies relied on cross-sectional research except for two longitudinal
studies by Pelham and Wilson (1996) and by Dawes (2000). The former examined data
collected at one point of time, possibly missing a time-lagged effect, thus having limited power to explain causality. While the latter compensated for this limitation, they need much longer time to complete, making it unappealing to researchers.


**Research Questions for the Current Study**

While the above studies demonstrated the applicability of MO concept internationally, the countries covered by these studies are market economies. No published study has systematically examined whether the MO concept, conceived and developed in the West, would apply to China. As China’s market reform intensifies, it is logical to expect that companies in China have become market-oriented. If so, it is important to know whether they have fully or partially adopted this concept, and what impact, if any, MO has on business performance in China. Towards this end, this study examines the following research questions. *First*, what forms of MO, if any, do companies operating in China practise? *Second*, what factors drive these various forms of MO? *Third*, are different MO forms associated with different ME factors? *Fourth*, are different MO forms associated with different organisational characteristics? And *fifth*, what is the association between the MO forms and business performance?

**MO Measurements**

So far several scales have been used to measure MO, including MKTOR (Narver and Slater, 1990), MARKOR (Kohli, et al, 1993), DFW (Deshpande, et al, 1993), Deng and Dart (1994), and Dawes (2000). While researchers disagree with one another over the operational definition and the dimensions of MO, most previous studies utilised measures based on either Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) or Narver and Slater’s (1990) conceptualisation. While related, the two popular scales are neither the same nor interchangeable (Uncles, 2000). Thus, the choice between them is key to all researchers. Mavondo and Farrel (2000) investigated the “generalisability” of these two popular scales via a sophisticated co-variance structure. They concluded that Narver and Slater’s (1990) conceptualisation is more robust and invariant among different populations, and that it is understood and responded to consistently and equivalently across populations. Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) framework did not perform as well, however, and was understood differently across populations. They therefore recommend that Narver and Slater’s approach is more suited for cross-country and cross-industry studies. Accordingly, Narver and Slater’s conceptualisation was adopted for this study. Specifically, the MO scale contains 14 items relating to three behaviour components,
namely: customer orientation (6 items), competitor orientation (4 items), and inter-functional co-ordination (4 items). Responses to each of these 14 item is recorded using a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating a respondent’s company does not practise a particular item, and 7 indicating it is practised a very great extent.

**Market Environment (ME) Factors**

So far, only a few studies found ME’s moderator effect (Slater and Narver, 1994, Atuahene-Gima, 1995, Greenley and Foxall, 1997, Bhuian, 1998, Diamantopoulos and Hart, 1993, Greenley, 1995b, and Appiah-Adu, 1998). ME is considered key to this study, however, as China is going through significant ME changes. Therefore, another 12 ME items were also utilised, measuring the extent to which change has happened to the various ME aspects a company may face within its principle market. They include changes in market needs and in marketing operation as a result (Miller, 1987), market growth and customer’s bargaining power (Porter, 1980), competitor concentration (Houston, 1986, Day and Wensley, 1988, Narver and Slater, 1990), company’s relative size in terms of sales and cost compared to its largest competitor (Buzzell and Gale, 1987, and Day, 1990), ease of market entry in terms of the possibility of new entrants earning satisfactory profits in the short term (Scherer, 1980), changes in competitor hostility and in market operation as a response (Day and Wensley, 1988), and technological changes in product and service development and in R&D operations (Bunnett and Cooper, 1981). These items, originally developed and utilised by a number of researchers, have been collectively applied by Greenley (1995a). Once again, the same 7-point Likert scale is used to measure each of these environmental variables.

**Company Performance**

Business performance can be captured using subjective or objective measures. The former refers to managers’ self-assessment of their company’s business performance, the latter are financial outcomes and market shares, etc. Some used both, and found a strong association between them (Dess and Robinson, 1984; Robinson and Pearce, 1988; Venkatraman and Ramanujam, 1986, and Dowes, 1999). Uncles (2000) observed that most previous studies on MO have used subjective ones. To rely on objective financial and market data to measure a company’s performance in China is challenging, as such information is rarely provided to the public. In addition, the accuracy of such measures are subject to the market definition and boundary that underlie them (Ngai and Ellis, 1998). Therefore in this study a company’s performance measurement is based on the assessment of its senior executives. This is consistent with the approach taken by Verhage and Waarts (1988), Narver and Slater (1990), Golden (1992), Slater and Narver (1994), Greenley (1995a), Ngai and Ellis (1998), Dawes (2000), Kumar and Subramanian (2000), Pulendran et al (2000), and Vorhies and Harker (2000). Respondents were asked to indicate how they compare their company’s average new product success, average annual sales growth, and average return on investment (ROI) to that of their largest competitor over the last three years. The scales consists of percentage in performance of the respondents’ own firm as compared to that of their competitors. In addition, respondents are also asked to report their company’s last year’s profitability.
Methodology

Since the MO concept was initially developed in the West, a small pilot study was first carried out in China. The MO items, the ME items, and the performance measures, as cited above, were translated from English into Mandarin, and were back translated. This was done by a committee of three bilingual business academics, one from Australia and two from China, followed by a small pilot study in China, to ensure that the wording was appropriate for the local business context. The unit of analysis for this study is at the firm level, consistent with the approach taken by Jaworski and Kohli (1993), Greenley (1995a and 1995b), Pelham and Wilson (1996), Ngai and Ellis (1998), Pitt et al (1996), Dawes (2000), Kumar and Subramanian (2000), Pulendran et al. (2000), and Vorhies and Harker (2000). Prospective respondents are senior executives. A convenient sampling approach was taken. A structured survey was administered to the student population of two local executive MBA (Master of Business Administration) programs in China, one at East China University (formerly China Textile University) in Shanghai with 81 students enrolled, and the other at Nankai University in Tianjin with 115 enrolled. These universities were chosen for their reputable MBA programs in China, and for their location. Shanghai and Tianjin are two of China’s largest open cities, and both with a vibrant economy. Of the total 196 surveys distributed, 141 useable ones were collected, achieving an effective response rate of 71.9%. Of these, the location split between Shanghai and Tianjin are 53 (37.6%) and 88 (62.4%), respectively. The ownership split between Chinese and foreign owned are 100 (71%) and 41 (29%), respectively. Furthermore, 34% of the respondents are general managers (GM) or directors, 55% are marketing managers, and the rest (11%) are executive assistant to GM.

The Results

Reliability test. The original data was randomly split into two samples before assessing reliability (Churchill, 1979). Cronbach's coefficient alpha ($\alpha$) was used to check the reliability of the MO scale (Churchill 1979; Nunnally 1978). This was performed on the first sample, and was then replicated on both the second and the combined sample. The results show that for sample one and two, $\alpha$ for the customer orientation sub-scale was .8569, and .8669; for the competitor orientation sub-scale was .8028, and .7592; and for the inter-functional co-ordination sub-scale was .7994, and .8620, respectively. Furthermore, $\alpha$ for the whole MO scale of the combined sample was .9174. All exceed the .70 benchmark recommended by Nunnally (1978), indicating that Naver and Slater’s (1990) scale is a reliable measure of MO in China.

Q1. What forms of MO are practised by the Chinese companies in the survey? A cluster analysis approach is taken to answer this question, consistent with the approach by Greenley (1995a) and Vorhies and Harker (2000). Prior to this analysis, an initial exploratory factor analysis was performed for two main reasons. While the MO scale developed in the West has three dimensions, no systematic research has confirmed that the same would apply in China. The structured survey utilised for this study did not present these dimensions prior either. The initial factory analysis was also necessary to produce factor scores as input for the subsequent cluster analysis (Saunders, 1980, and
Greenley, 1995a). This factory analysis produced a two-factor solution based on eigenvalue higher than 1 (refer to Table 1 (omitted) for the factor loadings) with 57.4% of the variances explained, and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.897. Hierarchical cluster analysis was chosen over non-hierarchical method due to limited sample size (Hair, et al, 1998). Average linkage procedure was selected to produce the agglomeration schedules, mainly for its advantages of not relying on extreme values to produce such schedules. Large increases of the clustering (agglomeration) coefficients were observed between clusters two and one (3.460-2.777=0.683), and clusters three and two (2.777-1.695=1.082). The percentage change in the clustering coefficient from three to two clusters is 63.8%, the largest of such changes in the cluster homogeneity from ten to two clusters. Together, the above suggests a three-cluster solution. The robustness of this solution was tested in two ways, following the approach by Greenley (1995a), first, by using a discriminant analysis. All 14 MO variables entered the discriminant model, based on a minimum tolerance level of 0.001. Wilks’ lambda is 0.369, chi-square 137.138 (p=0.000), while the model correctly classifies 92.9% of the cases. Second, the mean scores of each MO item for the three clusters were significantly different (p=0.000), using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Therefore, the three-cluster solution was accepted. Table 2 (omitted) contains the mean scores across all 14 MO items for each cluster.

Cluster 1: Underdeveloped MO. There are 59 companies in this cluster, all having under-developed MO, as the mean scores in 9 of the 14 MO items are the lowest among the three clusters. Only one item, namely, “Objectives are driven by customer satisfaction”, achieved a mean score of 5.25. The mean scores of other 7 items range from 4 to 4.5, while the remaining 6 items have a mean score below 4.0. Items rated the lowest within this cluster are (mean score in bracket): “Rapid response to competitive market actions”(3.25), “Inter-functional communication of information about customer experience”(3.76), “Strategies driven by beliefs about creating customer value” (3.80), “Managers understand how each staff can contribute to creating customer value”(3.83), “Customer satisfaction is frequently and systematically measured”(3.90), and “Sales people share information on competitors”(3.92).

Cluster 2: Competitor-focused orientation. Cluster two has 29 companies, all of which have a competitor-focused orientation. The four items of the competition sub-scale have the highest mean scores within the cluster. One of them, “Rapid response to competitive market actions”, has the highest mean score (6.00) among all three clusters. Also, the mean scores of the four customer orientation items are quite high (two above 5.3, and the other two over 4.4), indicating that the companies in this cluster emphasise customer orientation as well.

Cluster 3: Comprehensive MO. Companies in this cluster, 53 of them, have a well-developed and balanced MO, as 13 of the 14 MO items received the highest mean scores across all three clusters. Items most characteristic of MO, including all six customer-orientation items and all four inter-functional co-ordination items, have the highest mean scores across all clusters. In addition, except for the “Rapid response to competitive market actions”, all mean scores of the remaining items are above 5.0. The mean scores of the cluster in each item are as follows (mean score in bracket): “Objectives are driven by customer satisfaction”(6.00), “Inter-functional communication of information about customer experience”(6.00), “Strategies driven by beliefs about creating customer value” (6.00), “Managers understand how each staff can contribute to creating customer value”(6.00), “Customer satisfaction is frequently and systematically measured”(6.00), and “Sales people share information on competitors”(6.00).
market actions”, the other three competitor-orientation items also have the highest mean scores among all clusters.

The above results suggest that the companies covered in this study practise a range of MO forms. Specifically, 41.8% of them (i.e., cluster 1) have an underdeveloped MO. 20.6% (cluster 2) carry out a competitive-focused MO, while the rest 37.6% (cluster 3) practise a well-balanced and comprehensive MO.

Q2. What factors discriminate the various MO forms? A discriminant analysis was carried out, using all 14 MO items to answer this question (Greenley, 1995a). The analysis produced two canonical discriminant functions, whose correlations with the discriminant variables are contained in Table 3 (omitted), along with their test statistics. The two functions’ canonical correlations are 0.815 and 0.762, Wilks’ lambda are 0.141 and 0.420, and the chi-square statistics are 299.392 (p=0.000) and 118.053 (p=0.000), respectively. The model correctly classified 96.5% of the cases. Function 1 consists of four items, accounting for 58.8% of the variances. They are “Customer satisfaction is frequently and systematically measured”, “Close attention is given to after-sales service”, “inter-functional communication of customer information and experience”, and “Managers understand how each staff can contribute to creating customer value”.

Although function 2 is made up of only one item, i.e., “Rapid response to competitive market actions”, it accounts for the rest 41.2% of the variances. Together, these items are shown to be most important in distinguishing the various forms of MO uncovered by the cluster analysis.

Q3. Are different MO forms associated with different ME factors? A discriminant analysis was again used to address this question. Cronbach's coefficient α for the ME scale of the split samples was 0.8553 and 0.8115, respectively, and was 0.8368 for the combined sample, all exceeding the 0.70 benchmark (Nunnally 1978). The discriminant analysis, using all 12 ME items, produced one canonical discriminant function, whose correlations with each ME item and the test statistics are contained in Table 4 (omitted). The model is made up of two ME items, accounting for 100% of the variance, with canonical correlation of 0.383. Wilks’ Lambda for the model is 0.853, and the chi-square statistics is 20.337 (p=0.000). These two items, “the extent of change in technology associated with R&D operations” and “the extent of change in total market share held by the four largest competitors in the industry”, are most important in differentiating the three forms of MO. The model correctly classifies 62.5% of the cases.

Q4. Do companies practising different forms of MO have different organisational characteristics? A Chi-square test was conducted to examine the possible association between companies’ organisational characteristics and different MO forms, based on the cross-tabulation information presented in Table 5 (omitted). The organisational characteristics include product category, annual sales levels, location, and ownership structure. The results do not show any significant association between any of such organisational characteristics and a particular MO form.
Q5. Are different MO forms associated with different company performance? One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to answer this question, comparing the mean scores of each cluster along the four performance indicators. The results, contained in Table 6 (omitted), show a marginal difference (p < 0.10) in the “relative new product success” rate and significant difference (p<0.05) in the “relative annual sales growth” among the three clusters. The ANOVA results, although showing such differences in these two performance indicators, cannot mark where the differences lie. Thus, a Post Hoc analysis via Tukey’s extension of the Fisher least significant difference (LSD) method was carried out to pinpoint such difference between two clusters. Results show a significant difference in the “relative new product success rate” between clusters 1 and 2, and in the “relative annual sales growth” between clusters 1 and 2, and between 2 and 3. Furthermore, there is also a marginal difference in the “relative ROI” between clusters 1 and 2.

Discussion

Results of this study have extended the MO research by examining a transitional economy, China. Findings show that companies operating in China not only practise MO, but practise different forms of MO. This provides further empirical evidence demonstrating the multi-dimensional nature of MO, supporting both Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) and Narver and Slater’s (1990) conceptual models, and Greenley’s (1995a) discovery of the various forms of MO with UK companies. Conventional wisdom suggests that companies are more likely to go through different stages along its MO evolutionary process, from not market-oriented initially, to more customer and/or competitor-focused, and then to a well-balanced MO eventually. Such an evolution is likely to take an extended time period. The range of MO forms revealed by this study seems not only to echo this speculation, but also reflects the current situation in China. During the course of China’s market reform, some companies may have faced more intense competition than others, and have therefore become more market-oriented. Others, particularly those state-owned enterprises that have been sheltered under government protection in the past, may find it unnecessary to adopt the MO philosophy. Hence, different forms of MO exist.

Items most characteristic of MO, including “Customer satisfaction is frequently and systematically measured”, “Close attention is given to after-sales service”, “inter-functional communication of customer information and experience”, “Managers understand how each staff can contribute to creating customer value” and “Rapid response to competitive market actions”, are most important in distinguishing the three MO forms uncovered by this study. The range of these MO items indicates a level of comprehensiveness of the MO as practised by some of the companies covered in this study.

It is rewarding to note that cluster 1, the underdeveloped MO cluster, achieved the lowest in three of the four performance categories, namely “relative new product success”, “relative annual sales growth”, and “relative ROI”. Cluster 2, the competitor focused cluster, on the other hand, achieved the highest performance in the same three areas.
Ironically, it also has the lowest reported last year profitability (although not statistically significant) among the three clusters. It is also interesting to note that, while the comprehensive MO cluster did not achieve the highest performance in these three performance areas, it does have the highest last year profitability among the three clusters. Once again such difference is not statistically significant. These findings further confirm the multi-dimensional nature of the MO concept, expanding Greenly’s (1995a) finding to a transitional economy. It also demonstrates the non-equal effect of individual MO component on business performance, supporting the findings by Dawes (2000) and Kumar and Subramanian (2000).

It is also important to note that “change in technology associated with R&D operations” and “change in industry concentration in terms of percentage of sales held by its top four competitors”, are the key ME factors that differentiate the various forms of MO. This suggests that a company’s preference of a particular MO form is closed associated with the ME environment it faces.

**Managerial Implications**

Several managerial implications can be drawn from the above results. First, given the positive association between companies practising MO and higher business performance, this calls for all companies operating in China to adopt the MO business philosophy.

Second, among the companies practising MO, those with a competitive focus seem to have achieved a higher level of business performance in terms of “relative new product success”, “relative annual sales growth”, and “relative ROI”. This does not necessarily translate into higher profitability. One explanation for this could be that to be more competitive in China, a company needs to keep up the “change in technology associated with R&D operations” and the “change in industry concentration in terms of percentage of sales held by its top four competitors”, the two key ME items differentiating the MO forms. This is a very expensive option for any company to pursue however. Being competitive in China therefore seems to be a game for companies with sufficient financial resources. On the other hand, competitor-focused companies may also need to be more cost-effective in order to achieve higher financial returns. Nevertheless, the above results provide further empirical evidence both supporting the findings of most pervious studies in terms of the association between MO and business performance, and extending the current MO research focus to China, a major transitional economy.

**Limitation and Further Research Directions**

Findings of this study should be interpreted in light of the following limitations. First, the majority (93%) of the Chinese companies in this study are state-owned enterprises. As pointed out earlier, these enterprises have long been sheltered under government protection, and have therefore, not needed to be market-oriented. As a result, it is no coincidence that cluster 1, the underdeveloped MO cluster, has the largest numbers of companies among the three MO clusters discovered in this study. The domination of such enterprises within the Chinese company sub-group is a result of collecting data from
current executive MBA students in China. Although MBA studies have become increasingly popular in China, the tuition levels for such studies tend to be too high for most self-funded students. In addition, the Chinese central government has set up a specific timetable and financial resources to reform its entire state-owned enterprises sector, including MBA training for senior management as a means of accomplishing this. As a result, the majority students in a typical executive MBA program in China are government sponsored senior managers from a state-owned enterprise.

Second, a majority (88%) of the companies covered in this study conduct their business either entirely (54%) or partly (34%) in the business-to-business sector. It is believed that such companies may adopt a higher level of MO, given their closer relationship with their suppliers and customers alike. Thus, a possible business-to-business bias may exist.

Third, using subjective measures, such as respondents’ self reported MO and performance levels, etc., may encourage respondents to choose the top end of the scales. The range in mean scores of the MO items for the cluster solution from 3.25 to 6.60 on a 7-point scale suggests that such bias in the reported MO levels might not be particularly problematic for this study. Performance data via objective measures of individual businesses operating in China are seldom published and are extremely difficult to obtain. While all companies in this research reported their MO levels, no more than two-thirds of them, at best, reported their performance levels, and an even smaller group of companies reported their last year probability. This highlights such a difficulty. Therefore, researchers must often rely on subjective measures of business performance. This is one of the toughest challenges in conducting industrial organisation type of research in China.

Fourth, the reported sales level of over 83% of the companies in this study is over 10 million RMB, suggesting a possible large company bias (within China’s context) in the sample. Findings of this study should be cross-validated with small and/or medium companies before any attempt is made to draw general conclusions.

Fifth, there is also a possible location bias, as all the companies covered in the study are either in Shanghai or in Tianjin. These two cities are among the first group of open cities in China, enjoying the benefits of government policies favouring economic freedom and less government control. As a result, companies operating in these locations may have become more market-oriented over the past two decades.

Despite these concerns, a significant contribution of this study to the MO research is in demonstrating that the concept of MO, as originally conceived and developed in the West, also applies to transitional economies, such as China. Further systemic research effort should be carried out to examine the impact that MO may have on companies that have different characteristics in terms of size, ownership structure (including privately and collectively owned), (consumer) product and/or service categories, and location.
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