

• -

,

,

1.

-

,

(BsC), (DEA),

(ROI),

(mROI), (ROMI),

(EVA)

(CLTV/CLPV),

(BE), ( ) . .

,

,

2,

3,

4,

-

5.

,

-

-

<sup>1</sup> . Faridyahyaie, Reza, Faryabi, Mohammad, Bodaghi Khajeh Noubar, Hossein, Identifying Marketing Effectiveness Metrics. *Poslovnna Izvrnost/Business Excellence*, 2012, Vol. 6, iss. 2, pp. 47-58;

, 2013, . 86-94.

<sup>2</sup> Dunn, M., S. Birley D. and Norbum. The Marketing concept and the Smaller firm. *Marketing Intelligence and Planing*, 1986, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 3-11.

<sup>3</sup> Peter B. Fuller. Assessing Marketing in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises. *European Journal of Marketing*, 1994, Vol. 27, No 12, pp. 39-49.

<sup>4</sup> Sin, W. and D. Kirby. Approaches to Small firm Marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 1998, Vol. 32, No 1/2, pp. 40-60.

<sup>5</sup> Ian Chaston (1997) Small firm Performance: Assessing the Interaction Between Entrepreneurial style and Organizational structure. *European Journal of Marketing*, 1997, Vol. 31, No 11/12, pp. 814-831.

, -  
 , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 , ( ) , -  
 :  
 (1) , -  
 6. , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 (2) , -  
 , -  
 , ( , -  
 ). -  
 , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 “ ”7 -  
 “ , ”8 -  
 - “ ” -  
 9, -  
 ( .3(1))-  
 250  
 97 000 000 . .  
 ( . -  
 ).

<sup>8</sup> Ambler, T., F. Kokkinaki and S. Pantoni. Assessing Marketing Performance: Reasons for Market selection. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 2004, 20, pp. 457-498.  
<sup>9</sup> Mirzaei, A., D. Gay and Ch. Baumann. Developing a New Model for Brand Equity as a Measure of Marketing Effectiveness. *The Marketing Review*, 2011, Vol. 11, No 4, pp. 323-336.

10

“

11

12

13

14

15

16

<sup>10</sup> Clark, Bruce H. Managerial Perceptions of Marketing Performance: Efficiency, Adaptability, Effectiveness and Satisfaction. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 2000, 8, pp. 3-25.

<sup>11</sup> Clark, Fred E. Criterias of Marketing Efficiency. Thity-third Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association, Dec. 1920, pp. 214-220.

<sup>12</sup> . *Journal of Marketing*, Apr. 1941, Vol. V, No. 4,

<sup>13</sup> Dunn, M., D. Norbum and S. Birley. The Impact of Organisational Values, Goals and Climate of Marketing effectiveness. 1977, *Journal of Business Research*, 1994, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 131-141; Philip Kotler. From Sales Obsession to Marketing Effectiveness, *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec, pp. 67-75.

<sup>14</sup> , . , 2005, . 702.

<sup>15</sup> , .. , . , .., 2003, . 45.

<sup>16</sup> , .., 2006, . 212.

,  
 . ,  
 ,  
 ,  
 -  
 .  
 ,  
 :  
 = \_\_\_\_\_ , (1)

, , , , , .

- 17 . , , -

, , , , ,

(1) - : ,

(2) , .

(3) , ,

---

<sup>17</sup> Connor, P. . and Tynan. In *Sickness and In Health: Exploring and Redeveloping a Measure of Marketing Effectiveness*. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 1999, No 15. pp. 733-756.

— “ ” “ ” , -  
 ” , , -  
 , -  
 ) ” , , — “ ( -  
 , й , -  
 , , -  
 , , -  
 , 12 , -  
 , — , . .  
 ) ( . ,2012  
 1087<sup>18</sup>.  
 , 19, -  
 20.  
 425 , 128 , -  
 , , -  
 SPSS -

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.mzh.government.bg/MZH/bg/ShortLinks/BiologichnoZemedelie/BiolZemInfRegistri.aspx>, 10.02.2014.

<sup>19</sup> ( , ), , , , -

<sup>20</sup> , , -  
 , ,  
 , ,2008, .276.

, 21.  
 - 22  
 - 1/4 ( 22  
 -9 53). - “  
 ( .1), , ”.  
 0,5, - -  
 23 ,  
 , ,  
 , ,  
 , ( ), :  

$$= \frac{\sum xf}{\sum f}, \quad (2)$$

, x , 1 5, f  
 21  
 Cronbach's Alpha 0,901 ( 0,979,  
 0,631, 0,003).  
 22  
 , ,  
 23 -

. ., 2010, .105-107,  
 SPSS. . ., 2002, . 183-184.

(72,7%)  
 (51,7%) - ( . 1).

mROI, (47,4%)<sup>24</sup>.

1

		$\Sigma f$	$\Sigma xf$	
1		30	153	5,1
2		25	125	5
3	CLTV	22	97	4,41
4		30	131	4,37
5	EVA	27	116	4,11
6		29	117	4,03
7		25	97	3,88
8		28	103	3,68
9	mROI	19	65	3,42

<sup>24</sup>

( 1, 1 5)





， ， -

， ， -

， ， -

“ ” “ ” ， -

“ ” ， -

， ， -

25 ， ， -

， ， -

26 ， ， -

27 ( ) (12)

80.6%

80%

， ， -

， ， -

( .3).

3, ， ， -

28 ， ， -

44,34%

---

25 ， ， -

0,000 ， ， -

26 ， ， -

27 ... .142-173). ( - )

28 ， ， -

I		II		III	
	0,894		0,914		0,821
	0,854		0,793		0,809
	0,844		0,775		0,698
	0,842				
	0,836				
	0,701				
%	<b>44,34</b>	%	<b>26,44</b>	%	<b>9,84</b>

-33

,  
 ,  
 ”, 26,44%  
 “  
 ” – 9,84%.  
 – “  
 ”.  
 ,  
 ,  
 ,  
 .

3,22 4<sup>29</sup> , 5 3,59 4,17 -  
 -  
 - .  
 -  
 (4,17), -  
 (4,04),  
 (3,82). -  
 , , -  
 (3,91) (4), -  
 (3,91). -  
 , -  
 , -  
 . , -  
 , -  
 . , -  
 , -  
 30, , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 ( ) , -  
 ( ) -  
 ) , -  
 , -

---

29  $\frac{\sum xf}{\sum f}$ , x ,  
 1 5, f

30 .// 21- : -  
 , - , 2007, . 259-264.

## MARKETING EFFICIENCY OF INVESTMENT WITH SMALL BUSINESSES

Assist. Prof. Dr Svilen Ivanov

### Abstracts

Marketing efficiency acquires ever-increasing importance, both for the scientific community, and in the practice. At the corporate level there have - in theoretical plan - been developed and are applied a multitude of metrics for its assessment. The question whether these metrics are applicable and whether they are used in the activity of companies possessing scarce resources, has not yet been studied thoroughly.

The main aim of this article is to ascertain within a particular market whether or not small businesses apply in their practice the developed metrics for assessment of the marketing efficiency of their investments.

**Keywords:** *marketing efficiency, marketing efficiency of investments, marketing intangible assets, small businesses.*