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ABSTRACT
This study purpose research is to examine business orientation development namely market, learning and entrepreneurial orientation by emphasizing role of marketing capability in an effort to improve marketing performance. This study developed a field marketing strategy to blend marketing and strategy. This study examines medium-sized businesses. Samples were 158 companies spread in 7 district/city in Southeast Sulawesi. Research result show Stronger market orientation encourages higher-performing companies. Market orientation has not been able to improve the company's marketing capabilities. Learning Orientation has not been able to improve company performance. Learning orientation can improve a company's marketing capabilities. Entrepreneurial orientation can improve marketing capabilities. Entrepreneurial orientation does not increase company's marketing performance. Marketing Capability is able to improve the company performance.
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INTRODUCTION

Medium enterprise issues in Southeast Sulawesi is relate to HR issues, access to finance and marketing. From education aspect view, only 34.2% of medium enterprise employers continued education and only 6% enter to higher education. They can access to bank resources only 2.0% with relying on bank credit as and other use capital from family and own capital. Formal legal aspects also became an obstacle, SMEs incorporated only 2.2%. While it is seen from the marketing aspect is still limited to local market

Problems faced by medium enterprise in Southeast Sulawesi affect on low performance achievement. An examination of sales turnover show about 84.9% of SMEs in Southeast Sulawesi is only able to achieve maximum sales of 100 million rupiah, or less than 10 million dollars per month. Only about 14.3% of SMEs are able to achieve sales of between 100 million - 1 billion dollars. Marketing reach is confined to county/city that reached 97%. As a result, SMEs in Southeast Sulawesi is difficult to develop.

Various attempts have been made in an attempt to improve performance of medium enterprise ranging from training activities, capital assistance, and legislation government for medium enterprise, but until now has not been demonstrated optimal performance. Problems that need attention are: "find what variables that determine performance of medium enterprise ". In depth study show poor performance of medium enterprise is determined by several aspects such as resource (Brush, Greene and Hart (2001); Brush & Chaganti (1998); Lichtenstein and Brush (2001), Penrose (1959); Chandler & Hanks (1994); managerial, (Cooney and Malinen, 2004); Gimeno et al., 1997) and business orientation (Tan and Smyrnios, 2005; Storey, 1994; Tan and Smyrnios (2005a).

Based on description of aspects related to company success, attempt to achieve better performance for medium-sized businesses actually relies on two approaches namely structural approach (Porter, 1980, 1985) as a market-based approach (Makhija, 2003) and Resource Base View of firm (Barney, Wright and Ketchen Jr., 2001). The RBV developments are related to business orientation. Therefore, the problem arises "Is the business orientation that includes market, learning and entrepreneurial orientation will be able to drive marketing performance company?"

Market-oriented culture is needed to build and maintain core capabilities to create sustainable superior customer value. Hooley et al., (1999); Slater & Narver, (1993) found that marketing capabilities are considered
more important than operational capabilities. When the company is up-to-date with information about customers and competitors, the company is able to effectively handle the marketing activities within their organization.

Dawes (2000) emphasize that each component is highly correlated with market orientation (MO) profitability. Each element has a unique feature. Therefore, MO assessed by three indicators (Tan & Smyrnios, 2004a). Empirical studies conducted by Appiah-Adu (1997) found that MO has a positive effect on firm performance. It is consistent with findings of study Kumar, Subramanian, and Yauger, (1998). Based on these explanations, this study hypothesis is follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** The stronger company’s market orientation, the higher company's marketing performance.

Gounaris *et al.* (2004) said companies that adopt MO systematically conduct a formal market research, collect and disseminate market intelligence throughout the enterprise and emphasizes the strategic marketing planning. In addition, these organizations tend to segment and adjusting product, price and promotion strategies to suit the target segment. MO also affects the company control direction by making companies more focused on customer, market and product-related information, as well as respond to information collected.

Vorhies & Harker (2000, 1999) found that large-scale manufacturing and services in Australia and America found MO has a significant positive effect on marketing capabilities. Slater and Narver (1994a) state that a market-oriented culture needs to be built and maintain core capabilities that continue to create superior customer value. In effort to strengthen a statement of Slater and Narver (1994a) in context of medium enterprise at developing countries, this study hypothesis is follows:

**Hypothesis 2:** The stronger market orientation of company, the higher company's marketing capabilities.

Sinkula *et al.* (1997) stated that LO is a set of organizational values that affecting company’s tendency to create and use knowledge. Learning orientation is associated with three values: commitment to learning, open-mindedness and shared vision (Sinkula *et al.*, 1997).

Researchers highlighted that learning orientation (LO) is associated with firm performance (Stewart & Mavondo, 2004). Farrell (1999) identified that LO is positively related to organizational commitment, togetherness and organizational innovation. Similarly, Sadler-Smith, Spicer and Chaston (2001) demonstrated empirically that higher growth manufacturing company owned is by a more active LO by better usage of knowledge assets as compared to its competitors with lower growth. However, the actual LO can be problematic because the inside-out orientation (Day, 1994).

Consistent with this, a number of researchers (Baker & Sinkula, 1999b, 2002; Farrell & Oczkowski, 2002) agree that market and LO is the antecedent for company performance. Hult *et al.* (2004), suggests positive relationship between LO and firm performance. Based on description above, hypothesis effect of LO on firm performance can be formulated as follows:

**Hypothesis 3:** The stronger learning orientation, the higher company's performance.

Celucha *et al.* (2002) demonstrated empirically that managers who think their companies have a higher LO found better information systems and the ability to market, the better. As a learning organization seeks to understand their market, they develop rules to process information that will affect the internal and external organization (Sinkula *et al.*, 1997, Calantone *et al.*, 2002). External measures refer to products, promotions, distribution and pricing strategies and tactics which are all part of marketing capabilities. LO positively increase market information and dissemination of information which in turn affects on company changes level to marketing strategy. Accordingly, the proposed hypothesis is follows:

**Hypothesis 4:** The stronger learning orientation, the higher company's marketing capabilities.

Entrepreneurship is indicated by innovativeness, proactiveness, aggressiveness in competing and risk-taking will be able to improve market research, distribution, pricing of products and services, product development, communication/promotion and marketing management. They are indicators of marketing capabilities. This means that companies who have an entrepreneurial orientation will enhance the marketing capabilities. Capability-base theory states that in order to achieve competitive advantage then entrepreneur is an important element. Entrepreneurship will drive capability to achieve competitive advantage.

Guenzi & Troilo (2006) found that ability to create superior value for consumers flow from company’s marketing capabilities. Lee and Hsieh (2010) states that in period with a very high competition, company needs to have a competitive advantage in global marketplace. This means that capability can improve competitive advantage directly. On basis of these findings, hypothesis is formulated as follows

**Hypothesis 5:** The stronger entrepreneurial orientation, the higher marketing performance.

Based on description of hypothesis 5, empirical studies the effect of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) has been carried out. Wiklund, (1999) showed a positive relationship between EO and firm performance. Covin & Slevin (1989) concluded that EO affect positively on firm performance in an environment with adversarial competition and depend on structure of organization. Tzokas *et al.* (2001) noted that marketing techniques are uniquely related to overall company performance. Consistent with this view, Smart and Conant (1994) asserts that there seems to be a strong relationship between EO and firm distinctive marketing capabilities. Based on description of proposed hypothesis is

**Hypothesis 6:** The stronger entrepreneurial orientation, the higher company's marketing capabilities.
Favorable development of marketing capabilities are very important for the marketing activities in business to collect information about the needs of market segmentation and selection of target market (market planning activities); development of new services to meet the needs of targeted segment (through product development activities); the price of services/products and communication services benefits offered to target market (Day, 1994). This activity can be achieved through advertising/promotion or personal selling (Vorhies & Yarbrough, 1998; Tzokas et al. (2001); Weerawardena, 2003b). Small companies/entrepreneurial (Chaston, 1998a) emphasizes that marketing has a major affect on marketing performance. For this reason, hypothesis of this study is stated follows:

Hypothesis 7: The higher marketing capabilities, the higher company's marketing performance.

Methods:
Population and Research Sample:
These study populations are all medium enterprise in Southeast Sulawesi. Samples area was chosen by judgment sampling. Districts/cities samples in land chosen one city and 3 districts while samples in islands selected 1 city and 1 county. District/city samples in land area are (1) Kendari, (2) Kolaka, (3) Konawe South (4) Bombana. Districts/cities samples in archipelago are Bau-Bau city and Buton district. Total the study areas were 2 cities and 4 counties.

Research Variables:
This study uses 20 manifest variables (indicators) with 5 factors (variables) that analyzed to determine how many factors (variables) that will be formed. Variables of this study are: three independent variables namely market orientation (MO), Learning Orientation (LO), Entrepreneurship Orientation (EO), one dependent variable namely the Marketing performance. Mediation variable is Marketing Capability (MC)

Market Orientation Variable (Exogenous-Independent):
Market orientation is a behavior to deliver superior value to customers in response to actions of competitors and communicated internally (Venkatesan, Soutar, 2000); Farrell, Oczkowski; 2002). Market orientation is measured by three indicators, namely: customer orientation; Orientation competitors; coordination between functions/communications internally

Learning Orientation variable is emphasis degree of company value for benefit of a long-term study (Sinkula et al. (1997). It is measured by indicator: commitment to learning; shared organizational vision, open-mindedness.

Entrepreneurial orientation variable:
Miller (1983), Lamkin and Dec (2001) define entrepreneurial orientation as an entrepreneurial company with regard to product innovation, risk and first to introduce innovations in a proactive and aggressive competition. It will require intensive activities to outperform competitors are characterized by combining posture or an aggressive response to improve the position in competition. Indicators for these variables are: innovativeness; proactiveness; competitive aggressiveness and risk-taking.

Marketing capability variable:
Marketing capability is company ability to perform various marketing functions. Marketing capabilities is measured by the 6 indicators (Tzokas et al., 2001): marketing research; Relationship/distribution, pricing, product development, promotion/marketing communications; Marketing management.

Marketing performance variable:
Marketing performance is company outcome to meet consumer expectations (Vorhies et al., 1999; Vorhies & Harker, 2000; Vorhies, 1998) this variable was measured by four indicators, namely: customer satisfaction; customer value delivery; marketing program effectiveness and new product success. Likert Scale is used to measure a social phenomenon. Social phenomena is determined specifically by researchers and called study variables.

Validity and Reliability Test of Research Instruments:
Instrument test was done prior research instruments used as a medium to collect data collection. All indicators are valid (correlation> 0.3) and reliable (Cronbach’s alpha> 0.6)

Data Analysis Methods:
This study uses path analysis to test relationship of various variables and causal relationship between variables (Hair, JF Jr., Black, WC, Babin, BJ, Anderson, RO, Tatham, RL 2006). Specific reason to use path analysis is causality relationship between variables is tiered. Variables in study are latent variables that
unobservable. Pathway analysis requires observable variables. Therefore, latent variables are scored by factor scores with Confirmatory Factor Analysis method, using SPSS software.

**Results:**

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results:**

Confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine the variables that define a construct that cannot be measured directly. Indicators analysis that used above gives meaning to label given latent variables or other constructs confirmed. Confirmatory factor analysis results for each variable in this study are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Result.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Factor weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market orientation</td>
<td>Consumer Orientation</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitor Orientation</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination between functions</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning orientation</td>
<td>Commitment to learning</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared organizational vision</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship orientation</td>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactiveness</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive aggressiveness</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing capability</td>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Communications</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing performance</td>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value delivery</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing program effectiveness</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New product success</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Appendix, 2012.

Table 1 shows that dominant indicator to measure market orientation is coordination between functions. On other hand, dominant indicator to measure learning orientation is Shared organizational vision. Dominant indicators of competition aggressive variable are entrepreneurial orientation. Dominant indicator of marketing performance marketing program effectiveness.

**Results of Path Analysis:**

Path analysis results can be seen in Figure 1 and Table 2 below.

**Fig. 1:**
Table 2: Direct Effect Testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market orientation</td>
<td>Marketing performance</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market orientation</td>
<td>Marketing capability</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning orientation</td>
<td>Marketing performance</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning orientation</td>
<td>Marketing capability</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship orientation</td>
<td>Marketing performance</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship orientation</td>
<td>Marketing capability</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing capability</td>
<td>Marketing performance</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Appendix, 2012.

Table 2 and Figure 1 show significant and not significant direct effect of independent variables to dependent variables. Table 2 shows that from seven variables tested there are four significant effects and three were not significant.

Analysis result indicates that direct path coefficient value the effect of market orientation on marketing performance is 0.344 with a probability of 0.003. It shows that there is enough empirical evidence to accept hypothesis (H1) that the stronger market orientation of company, the higher company’s marketing performance. Positive path coefficients can be interpreted that relationship between market orientations to market performance are unidirectional. This means that the stronger market orientation, the higher company's marketing performance.

Analysis result the effect of market orientation on marketing capability is obtained value of 0.062 with a probability of 0.585. This suggests that there is not enough empirical evidence to accept hypothesis (H2) that the stronger market orientation, the higher company's marketing capabilities.

Analysis result the effect of learning orientation on marketing performance obtained value of 0.167 with a probability of 0.153. These results indicate that there is not enough empirical evidence to accept hypothesis (H3) that the more powerful learning orientation, the higher marketing performance.

Analysis result the effect of learning orientation on marketing capability obtained a value of 0.426 with a probability of 0.000. These results indicate that there is enough empirical evidence to accept hypothesis (H4) that the stronger learning orientation, the higher marketing capabilities. Positive path coefficients indicates that the stronger learning orientation, the higher the company's marketing capabilities.

Analysis result the effect of entrepreneurial orientation to marketing capabilities of company obtained a value of 0.301 with a significance of 0.000. These results indicate that there is enough empirical evidence to accept hypothesis (H5) that the higher marketing performance. Positive path coefficients can be interpreted that relationship between entrepreneurial orientations with marketing capabilities are unidirectional. This means that the stronger entrepreneurial orientation, the higher marketing capability.

Analysis result the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on marketing performance obtained a value of 0.105 with a significance of 0.198. These results indicate that there is not enough empirical evidence to accept hypothesis (H6) that the stronger entrepreneurial orientation, the higher of company's marketing capabilities.

Analysis result the effect of marketing capabilities on company’s marketing performance obtained a value of 0.203 with a significance of 0.012. These results indicate that there is enough empirical evidence to accept hypothesis (H7) that the higher marketing capabilities, the higher company's marketing performance. Positive path coefficients can be interpreted that relationship between a company's marketing capabilities with company’s marketing performance are unidirectional. This means that higher marketing capabilities, the higher company’s marketing performance.

Discussion:
Following sections will describe the comparison between the factor loading and average indicator. Factors loading or weighting factor describes value of each indicator that contributes to form variable. Average value of indicator reflects respondent's perception of each study variable. Respondents' perceptions in terms of value of factor loading and average values are presented in Table 5.3.

All three indicators of market orientation is a valid because weighting factors above 0.5 at alpha (α) of 5%. Based on value of weight factor, coordination between function indicator is strongest to reflect market orientation. The findings of this study support the views expressed by Narver and Slater (1990). This study also supports the findings of Appiah-Adu, Kwaku (1997); Appiah-Adu, Ranchhold (1998); Kumar et al. (1998; 2004), John Dawes (2000); Farrell Oczkowski M.A & E (2002); Medina C & R Rufin (2009) to measure market orientation with three indicators mentioned above.

Learning orientation variable is measured by 3 indicators namely learning commitment, shared organizational vision and Open-mindedness. This study findings support the notion measurements made by Sinkula et al. (1997), Calantone (2002), Panayides (2005); Deakins & Freel, (1998) and Hendry (1996)

Entrepreneurship orientation variable is measured by 4 indicators namely innovativeness, proactiveness, competitive aggressiveness and risk-taking. These findings support the notion that entrepreneurial orientation
has three main characteristics, namely innovation, risk taking and proactive (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Miller, 1983; Miller & Friesen, 1982).

### Table 5.3: Respondents perception of Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market orientation</td>
<td>Consumer Orientation</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitor Orientation</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination between functions</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning orientation</td>
<td>Commitment to learning</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared organizational vision</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship orientation</td>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactiveness</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive aggressiveness</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing capability</td>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Communications</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing performance</td>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value delivery</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing program effectiveness</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New product success</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Appendix, 2012.

The results of analysis found that all indicators that reflect marketing capability is valid. Dominant indicator to reflect marketing capability is market research with factor loading of 0.964. These findings confirm the statement of Vorhies et al. (1999) and Conant et al. (1990). They reveal the principles of marketing research; Relationship/distribution, pricing, product development, promotion/marketing communications; marketing management.

Marketing performance indicators are customer satisfaction; customer value delivery; marketing program effectiveness and new product success. Analysis found that all of these indicators reflect marketing performance. Marketing program effectiveness is dominant indicator. This finding is consistent with research conducted by Vorhies et al., (1999) Vorhies & Harker (2000) and Vorhies (1998).

Analysis result the effect of market orientation on marketing performance showed a positive and significant effect. This means that ability to share information about consumers, the success and failure to integrate marketing to meet needs of target market in order to create customer value will increase the effectiveness of marketing programs better than competitors. Although coordination between functions is an important indicator that can improve marketing performance, but still not maximum. This is because company functions has not been formally established, so the perception of coordination between functions more on activities rather than on a formal shape. The findings of this study confirm the statement Slater and Narver (1993). The findings of this study support the research Appiah-Adu (1997) Kumare et al., (1998) and Pelham (2000)

Comparison of this study with other research findings show that affect of market orientation on performance tends to be consistently good at companies both large and small companies. This study findings support the view that market orientation as an organizational culture is associated with all activities to deliver and disseminate market responsiveness on market the orientation (Narver and Slater, 1990).

Analysis results the effect of market orientation on marketing capability demonstrate a positive effect but not significant. The findings of this study do not support the research of Vorhies & Harker, (2000) Vorhies et al. (1999, but this study also inconsistent with other researchers (Hooley et al., 1999: Slater & Narver, 1993) which found that marketing capabilities are considered more important than operational capability. Analysis showed that learning orientation has no effect on marketing performance. This fact may be due to awareness of company’s business, and consumer target is not external activity, but more on employee cognition enrichment. To find new markets and consumers is an effort that is run by a part of R & D. The fact shows that there is no single medium-sized companies in Southeast have R & D as part of design effort to get new customers. This study findings certainly different from the research Farrell (1999) Sadler et al. (2001)Selain this study also did not support the research Salavou (2002) Baker & Sinkula, (1999b, 2002); Farrell & Oczkowski, (2002) Hult et al. (2004), Vijande, Perez & Gonjales (2005), Panayides (2005) Weerawardena, O’Cass and Julian (2006)

Analysis results the effect of learning orientation on marketing capability demonstrate a positive and significant effect. The findings of this study support findings of Celucha et al. (2002) that managers who think their companies have a higher LOKASI will have better information systems and the ability to market. In addition, company also has more robust a product/service development, order fulfillment and the ability of external partnerships. As a learning organization that seeks to understand their market, they develop rules to
process information that will affect the organization internally and externally. External actions refer to product, promotion, distribution and pricing strategies and tactics which are all part of marketing capabilities.

Analysis results the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on marketing capability demonstrate a positive and significant effect. This study findings support research of Lee and Hsieh (2010) who found a positive relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and marketing capabilities. This study also supports the statement of Tzokas et al. (2001) who noted that entrepreneurial orientation contributes synergistically with advent of techniques unique marketing and overall company performance. Consistent with this view, Smart and Conant (1994) asserts that there seems to be a strong relationship between EO and firm distinctive marketing capabilities. Based on findings of this study provides opportunities for medium-sized companies in Southeast Sulawesi to enhance marketing capabilities because of entrepreneurial orientation that inherent to manage company.

Analysis results the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on Marketing Performance shows a positive but not significant effect. This study findings support the research of Arbaughcox & Camp (2009) who found that EO does not affect performance. This is because EO is less focus on relationship between organizational culture and business orientation and more on relationship between corporate structure, management style and performance (Tzokas et al., 2001). Entrepreneurship is the process to create value by combining resources.

Conclusion:
Conclusion of this research can be presented as follows.
1. Stronger market orientation encourages higher-performing companies.
2. Market orientation has not been able to improve the company's marketing capabilities.
3. Learning Orientation has not been able to improve company performance.
4. Learning orientation can improve a company's marketing capabilities.
5. Entrepreneurial orientation can improve marketing capabilities.
6. Entrepreneurial orientation does not increase company's marketing performance.
7. Marketing Capability is able to improve the company performance.

Based on findings of research finding the recommendations of study are: business enterprise should provide value added products/services, communicate with more customers, and increase sales service. They need to increase employee understanding of importance of learning, giving bonuses to employees who excel. The company should be a response to actions of competitors. Company should increasing the search for new market segments, need to do more training and marketing incentives to employees. Marketing capabilities of company is determined by learning orientation and entrepreneurial orientation. This means that to move medium enterprise Southeast Sulawesi to reach a wider market Local Governments should formulate policies that provide opportunities to improve knowledge of medium enterprise.
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