
Librato El Arif
Director of PT. Berdikari (Persero),
Jakarta, Indonesia

Taher Alhabsyi, Zainul Arifin & Srikandi Kumadji
Faculty of Administrative Science,
Universitas Brawijaya,
Indonesia
luqman.academia@gmail.com

Abstract
Relationship Marketing (RM) is a key in contemporary marketing activities considering the importance of establishing long-term relationship with customers. Suppliers and customers are closely related especially within B2B (business to business) marketing context. The study developed model that described the influence of Relationship Marketing (RM) towards customer value, and customer satisfaction towards as well as the impact of RM towards customer loyalty, retention and Word of Mouth (WOM). To test the model, the researchers involved 128 companies that buy meat products in Jakarta; they consisted of 40 supermarkets, 30 caterers, 38 restaurants, and 20 hotels. GSCA (Generalized Structured Component Analysis) was the approach used for data analysis. The findings showed that Relationship Marketing (RM) had significant influence towards customer value, satisfaction, loyalty and retention; however, it did not have any significant influence towards WOM. Customer value had significant influence towards customer satisfaction, loyalty, retention and WOM. Customer satisfaction had significant influence towards customer loyalty and retention but it did not have any significant influence towards WOM. Customer loyalty had significant influence towards customer retention and WOM. They explained the importance of Relationship Marketing and customer value as the foundation to build marketing performance.
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1. INTRODUCTION

As the effect of business competition and massive change in marketing world in 21 century, transactional-based traditional marketing that use the 4P model of marketing proposed by Philip J. Kotter is no longer considered as suitable approach of marketing. The model needs revision and improvement for example incorporate relationship aspect as the key factor to develop marketing strategy. Britto (2011: 67) explained there were at least five factors why there was a shift from transactional marketing to more current relational-based marketing; they are (1) mass-market approach tend to be less effective; (2) growth of technology occurred not only in terms of communication and information but also production and logistics; (3) business competition resulted in increasing number of similar products/brands; (4) service became more essential; and (5) new partnership-based and web-based business models started to emerge and globalization encouraged these business models. Due to these conditions, conventional marketing activities can no longer win customer’s heart effectively.

The purpose of RM is to develop marketing strength through long-term relationship with customers. Consequently, company should change its marketing focus from getting more customers to maintain and expand range of customers (Stavros, 2005), where the logic is funding for new customers is more than that for maintaining existing customers (Kotler, 1999). However, implementation of the RM principles is not as easy as it seems. Marketing staffs should change their paradigm radically that it requires change of behavior, attitude and structure related to marketing activity (Grnroos, 1999). RM parameter of success is different from one of transactional marketing that emphasizes on larger market share; it is leaning towards indicators that describe customer itself such as customer satisfaction, loyalty, retention and Word of Mouth.

Related to the theoretical perspective of RM described previously, the researchers are interested to apply one model of B2B marketing which becomes less frequent field of study in Indonesia more particularly B2B marketing for meat products. Underlying issue in the national meat product marketing is lack of supply or supply-side problem; supply from domestic producers can meet growing demand of meat products and therefore, Indonesia should import their meat. Poor balance between supply and demand creates market distortion and consequently price of beef is increasing from time to time.

Based on their marketing characteristics, meat products can be divided into three namely (1) fresh meat, which generally is for individual consumers, (2) chill meat; it refers to fresh beef which later is frozen and bought by supermarket and catering companies through B2B marketing, and (3) frozen meat which is sold to hotels and restaurants through B2B marketing. Based on the explanation, it can be seen that meat product marketing is divided into consumer market (B2C) and industrial market (B2B). Interesting problem amidst high price of beef is fierce competition in B2B segment, where quality is pivotal consideration because hotel and restaurant industry requires prime-cut beef. However, local suppliers cannot meet demand of prime-cut beef for industrial need, as there is growing demand, so that the policy that limits import create possibility for market distortion in the form of increasing price due to lack of supply.

Analyzing customer segmentation within relational marketing context is of utmost importance. Based on the Customer Lifetime Value (CLV) theory, Kumar et al. (2009) argued that implementation of RM should start with identification and differentiation between potential and less-potential segments of customers. There should be different formulation for every segment of customer in each marketing activity, either in the form of cross-selling or up-selling conducted through promotional and direct mail. First, company should distinguish between customers with high, medium and low CLV. Customers with high CLV are those with high income and able to spend more than those with medium or low CLV. Second, company should distinguish Size of Unused Wallet (SUW), that refers to remaining amount of money customers have for buying goods/service. Customers with high SUW have a lot of remaining money to buy other goods/service. Purpose of CLV-SUW model is so that company achieve efficiency through implementation of RM by auditing how much cost it spends to maintain customers. Nevertheless, implementation of RM requires certain funding which is different from conventional marketing of which focus is anything but maintaining customers.

At the opposite of the background above, the study focused on B2B marketing for meat products phenomenon; more particularly it was directed to supermarket, catering industry, restaurants and hotels as dominant customers of B2B. The setting of the study was Jakarta, one of the regions in Indonesia with the largest meat consumption. Since the 2001, the area has been dominated by imported products (the National Bureau of Statistics of Jakarta). Based on Indonesian Chamber of Commerce data, Jakarta needs 118 tons of
beef per day (Liputan6.com, 7/8/2013), or 43,070 tons/year. However, other data reported that the 2013 supply achieved nearly three times of the estimation or 128,470 tons (the National Bureau of Statistics of Jakarta, 2014).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Previous Studies about RM

As new paradigm in marketing, RM has attracted a lot of researchers to study its various aspects. Studies on RM have been conducted using various objects, starting from manufacturing industry, banking to catering service. Most of RM studies in Indonesia emphasized on the influence of RM towards customer loyalty (Erika, 2009; Borneo, 2011; Zulkifli, 2012; Murti, 2013). There are very few studies that use more complex models such as customer value, satisfaction, retention and WOM (Fajarisman, 2011; Wahyu, 2014). Besides that, it should be noted that there has yet been study about meat product marketing, especially for B2b market. Previous studies, in general, have given confirmation about the theories of RM, that RM has influence towards certain variables in the study.

RM studies in foreign countries were more diversified and not limited to the correlation between RM and customer loyalty; instead, they involved variables like retention, WOM and customer satisfaction. Preliminary studies conducted before 2008 were explorative studies with qualitative approach; on the other hand, the studies after the era emphasized on quantitative approach through inter variable relationship model. Similar to Indonesia, most studies conducted in foreign countries confirmed the theory of RM. Studies conducted by Begalle (2008) and Rootman, Tait and Sharp (2011) were the exception.

Begalle (2008)’s study showed that not every dimension of RM had significant influence. Equity and commitment were the only ones having significant influence towards share of customer, as measured from the total percentage of the respondents’ meat products purchase. The study also found out among three types of relation bonding tactic, social bonding strategy was the only one effective for food business at schools. It supported RM theories partially because not all of the relationship formulated as hypotheses showed significant influence. Meanwhile Rootman, Tait and Sharp (2011)’s study mentioned that personalization, ethical behavior, and fees had significant influence towards RM; on the other hand, empowerment, communication, and technology had no significant influence. In addition, RM had significant influence towards customer retention. It showed only several dimensions of RM that had significant influence so it did not meet the theories of RM completely.

Based on the review of the related literatures and previous studies, it can be seen that there is research gap that has yet been discussed. The first, most of the previous studies emphasized on the correlation between RM and customer loyalty so that they did not explain the relationship with other factors that develop theoretical model for RM perspective for instance customer value, customer satisfaction, retention, and WOM. The second, analysis on implementation of RM in previous studies used the conventional model of implementation of RM, so that they did not discuss alternative logic through the CLV-SUW model as proposed by Kumar et al. (2009). The third, RM studies generally conducted within marketing to individual customer (B2C) context; similar studies within B2B context were rarely conducted so that the researchers were interested to apply marketing model for meat product that has dynamic and vastly growing market more specifically in Jakarta. The fourth, there was debatable inter-variable correlation or one not completely suitable with the theories of RM, for example Zulkifli (2012), Rootman, Tait and Sharp (2011) and Begalle (2008)’s studies that only supported the theories of RM partially. The fifth, there has yet been a study about influence of loyalty towards WOM. Dithan (2011) and Ntale, et al (2013)’s study found out the influence of WOM towards loyalty; however, WOM in that context referred to other people to respondents, where positive testimony from other people encouraged the respondents to be more loyal to certain goods/ service. Meanwhile, WOM in the study refers to positive words delivered to other individuals so that there are two different definitions in the two studies.
Theoretical model proposed in the study, described in Figure 1, consisted of components of RM (trust, commitment, communication and responsiveness), which is related to “customer value” as indicator of how capable a company is in creating higher value for products it offers. As an addition, it is related to “customer satisfaction”, as indicator for ability to meet customer demand and need. Customer value and customer satisfaction are later connected to other variables that represent successful long-term relationship namely customer loyalty, retention, and WOM. Empirical testing of the model is conducted in B2B marketing for meat products to identify specific implementation of RM paradigm for one type of product.

3. HYPOTHESES

There were 15 hypotheses in the study developed based on conceptual framework described previously. Previous studies showed there were at least 2 (two) correlations that had yet been discussed; they were customer value towards customer retention and customer loyalty towards WOM.

Relationship Marketing

It is expected that relational marketing increases better customer value because relational paradigm demands commitment and trust-based long-term relationship, as well as emphasizes on partnership in order to give better customer value. Relational marketing is considered more suitable for contemporary customers who demand personal treatment and producer’s understanding towards their specific need (Britto, 2011; Humphries, 2003). Company’s ability to develop relational marketing is expected to increase level of customer satisfaction. Previous studies elaborated that RM was effective medium for retailer for customer satisfaction (Carpenter and Fairhurst, 2005). Effectiveness of RM becomes more important when: (1) goods/service offered is complex, customized, and sent using continuous transaction (Berry, 2002); (2) most customers do not have detail information about goods or service being offered (Ghingold and Maier, 1996); and (3) dynamic environment and uncertainty influence future offer and demand (Crosby et al., 1990).

Related to customer loyalty, purpose of relational marketing is to shift marketing focus from activities of which purpose is to get customers to ones that aim at maintaining and developing customer loyalty pelanggan (Stavros, 2005). Hence, it is expected that RM has positive influence towards customer loyalty. Successful relational customer is represented by loyal customers buying products company offers (Griffin, 1995). Furthermore, RM is related to customer retention, since one of the main goals of relational marketing is to keep customers (Stavros, 2005), and the key of successful RM is increasing retention and customer satisfaction (Chirica, 2013; Gledhill, 2008).

Based on the elaboration, the hypotheses were formulated as follows:

- H1: Relationship Marketing has positive influence towards customer value.
- H2: Relationship Marketing has positive influence towards Customer satisfaction.
- H3: Relationship Marketing has positive influence towards Customer Loyalty.
- H4: Relationship Marketing has positive influence towards Customer Retention.
- H5: Relationship Marketing has positive influence towards WOM.

**Customer Value**

Customer value is any type of benefit customers can take from a product in one level of price/sacrifice they are willing to make. Based on Uлага and Eggert (2005), customer value represents attributes of goods/ service offer that marks trade between the benefit customers get and the sacrifice the customers should. Customer value consists of three major dimensions, namely: (1) self-oriented value, (2) reactive values and (3) extrinsic value (Holbrook 1996). Each company will compete to create customer value using various methods such as creating positive attitude and feeling, product differentiation, product quality, support for service, speedy delivery, time to market, customer satisfaction, service availability, product feature and utility, safety and cost of process. Robinette and Brand (2001: 85) divided customer value into two namely (1) rational value consisting of product and price; and (2) emotional value consisting of equity value, experience value and energy value. Implementation of relational marketing more particularly influences the second type of customer value and in turn will improve customer satisfaction. Besides that, it is convinced that relational marketing activities can influence WOM directly or using other factors as media (Dithan, 2011; Brown et al, 2005). High customer value will intrinsically motivate customers to spread news about certain product to other individuals; hence, improving customer value will result in increasing WOM as well.

Bontis and Booker (2007) studied the correlation between customer value and customer satisfaction and revealed that perceived value has significant influence towards customer satisfaction. Ishaq (2012) stated that customer-perceived value and service quality had significant influence towards customer loyalty whereas corporate image did not have significant influence. The influence of customer value towards customer retention has yet been discussed so far. Hidayah et al. (2013) discussed the influence of customer value towards WOM and the result was customer value had significant influence towards WOM (which was measured as customer advocacy behaviors variable).

Based on the theories, the hypotheses of the study were as follows:

- H6: Customer value has positive influence towards customer satisfaction.
- H7: Customer value has positive influence towards customer loyalty.
- H8: Customer value has positive influence towards customer retention.
- H9: Customer value has positive influence towards WOM.

**Customer Satisfaction**

Customer satisfaction is the key to win business competition and gain customers. RM concepts emerge to anticipate changing characteristics of customers, with the hope of more complex expectation and wish, where the first target to achieve is to meet customer's need and demand. Customer satisfaction can be
defined as "the level of a person's felt state resulting from comparing a product's perceived performance (or outcome) in relation to the person's expectations." (Kotler, 1994: 40). Ranaweera and Prabhu (2003) explained that based on the RM perspectives the final goal of customer satisfaction is high loyalty and satisfied customers are expected to buy again in the future as well as recommend products he or she buys to other customers. Customer retention can be achieved when companies can overcome factors that make customers leaving such as price, inconvenience, failure to carry out core service, staff's inability to deal with any issues related to service, ethics, accidents, competition, weakness in service delivery (Colye, 2002). Maintaining customer satisfaction is one of the methods to maintain customers where according to Kotler (2001), customer satisfaction is closely related to retention since there is small chance that satisfied customers will use goods/service from competitors.

Wong et al (2014)'s study revealed that customer satisfaction had influence towards customer loyalty. Bontis and Booker (2007) argued that customer satisfaction had significant influence towards customer loyalty. Jayantha and Geetha (2014) stated that customer satisfaction had the biggest contribution towards customer retention (r = 0.47) compared to other factors, payment equity (r = 0.20), and effective commitment (0.16), while calculative commitment did not have significant influence. Several previous studies postulated the correlation between customer satisfaction and WOM such as Jan et al. (2013), Taghizadeh et al. (2013), Hidayah et al. (2012) and Bontis and Booker (2007) among others. However, the findings of the studies were different. Jan et al. (2013) found out that the influence of customer satisfaction towards WOM was significant (0.825; CR= 8.354). Bontis and Booker (2007) had previously mentioned that customer satisfaction had significant influence towards customer loyalty(β =0.698, t= 78.53). The finding of Hidayah et al. (2012)'s study was different; it was customer satisfaction did not have significant influence towards WOM(0.149; CR =0.78). Finally, Taghizadeh et al. (2013) argued that not all elements of customer satisfaction had positive influence towards WOM; reliability and physical evidence had positive influence while employee competence had negative influence.

Based on the theories, the hypotheses of the study were formulated as follows:

H_{10}: Customer satisfaction has positive influence towards customer loyalty.
H_{11}: Customer satisfaction has positive influence towards customer retention.
H_{12}: Customer satisfaction has positive influence towards WOM.

Customer Loyalty

Customer loyalty is related to commitment to buy and use goods/service repeatedly in the future as elaborated by Oliver (1997: 392) that Customer loyalty is a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behavior. Loyal customer behavior is characterized by "non-random purchase" (Griffin, 2002:5) where buying pattern shows steady regularity at least for certain amount of time. In line with the purpose of relational marketing to develop customer loyalty, it is expected that customer loyalty will have positive influence towards customer retention and WOM. On one side, WOM is frequently perceived as part of customer loyalty (Zeithaml and Parasuraman, 1996); the real value of loyal customers does not rely within their personal purchase volume but impact/influence they cause to other individuals (Aker, 1991). Positive WOM is valuable medium to promote products and service company offers (Herr et al., 1991). Yet, theoretically, the correlation between customer loyalty and WOM is still questionable. On one side, loyal customer is an asset because they are a capable of spreading positive information to other people; people tend to react towards non commercial characteristics of WOM less skeptically than how they react to promotional programs sponsored by company (Herr et al., 1991). On the other side, there is another perspective that loyal customer does not result in WOM automatically. Various customer surveys show that customer longevity (amount of time indicating how long a customer uses one product) does not have strong correlation to spread of positive WOM since attitudinal loyalty (customer behavior in which they actively show appreciation towards certain products) shows significant correlation (Dithan, 2011: 19). In other words, loyal customer who has been using products for years will not tell other individuals how effective the products are immediately.

Jayantha and Geetha (2014) mentioned that Loyalty Program did not have significant influence towards customer retention. Ntale, et al. (2013) revealed that WOM had positive-significant correlation to customer loyalty($r = 0.594, p = 0.000$). However, WOM in the context is different from one in the study; the
experts perceived WOM as positive information from other parties to respondents while the researchers consider WOM as respondents’ information to other individuals. A descriptive study conducted by Esi (2012) revealed that Access Bank as the object of the study carried out implementation of RM and it increases customer retention so that customers were willing to spread positive word of mouth to their friends and relatives.

Based on the theories, the hypotheses of the study were formulated as follows:

H$_{13}$: Customer loyalty has positive influence towards Customer retention.
H$_{14}$: Customer loyalty has positive influence towards WOM.
H$_{15}$: Customer retention has positive influence towards WOM.
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**Figure 2. Hypothesis Model**

### 4. METHODOLOGY

**Population and sample**

The population was companies that buy meat products using B2B; the companies are divided into four categories, supermarkets, catering service, restaurants and hotels. From 343 companies in Jakarta that buy meat products, the researchers took 128 companies as the samples which consist of 40 supermarkets, 30 catering service, 38 restaurants and 20 hotels.

**Data Analysis**

Generalized Structured Component Analysis (GSCA) developed by Hwang and Takane (2004) was used for data analysis. GCSA became the tool for the data analysis since it was simpler and allowed both formative and reflective constructs to be conducted simultaneously in the model specification. Modelling procedures of GSCA structural equation began with designing structural model representing inter-variable correlation based on the theories, developing model of measurement (reflective or formative one), developing flowchart, converting the flowchart into equation system, estimating weight, loading, and coefficient line, evaluating goodness of fit using FIT, AFIT, NPAR, GFI, and SRMR.
5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Model Evaluation

The model was evaluated using the following criteria, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and consistency reliability. The purpose was to determine whether the model had met the minimum standardized requirement so that further analysis (hypothesis testing) could be conducted. Convergent validity is an evaluation that measured validity of each item, where cut-off value used was loading > 0.50. Discriminant validity is an evaluation that measured validity of each indicator; the cut-off value was AVE > 0.50. Besides that, root of AVE > inter-variable correlation could also be used as criterion. Reliability of consistence measured reliability of each of the variables and cut-off value used was Alpha > 0.60. Based on the evaluation, the data analysis using on-line GeSCA software showed that the model was valid and reliable so that further analysis was conducted.

Measure of Fit Evaluation

GeSCA data analysis showed FIT score was 0.690 and AFIT score was 0.684, so that proportion of variable variance explained by the model was 69.0%. NPAR score was 107 which meant the free parameters in the study involved loading coefficient (c), weighting coefficient (w), and coefficient line in the model. Measure of fit test for the entire model in GSCA was GFI and SRMR scores. GFI score was 0.989, indicating that the model had good fit, whereas SRMR is 0.089, indicating that the model had marginal fit.

Hypothesis Testing

The level of significance of the hypothesis testing was 5%, or CR (critical ratio) was > 1.98. Each of the hypotheses whose CR was < 1.98 meant it did not have significant influence or in other words, the hypothesis was rejected. On the other hand, each of the hypotheses of which CR was > 1.98 had significant influence significant, and therefore was accepted.

Table 1. Hypothesis Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Influential Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Relationship Marketing → Customer value</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>7.95*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Relationship Marketing → Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>3.2*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Relationship Marketing → Customer Loyalty</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>2.82*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Relationship Marketing → Customer Retention</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>3.62*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Relationship Marketing → WOM</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Customer value → Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>10.02*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Customer value → Customer Loyalty</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>3.28*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Customer value → Customer Retention</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>7.7*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Customer value → WOM</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>4.13*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction → Customer Loyalty</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>9.77*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction → Customer Retention</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction → WOM</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>Customer Loyalty → Customer Retention</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>3.46*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
<td>Customer Loyalty → WOM</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td>Customer Retention → WOM</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>2.58*</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * 5% level of significant
The full-model showed that inter-variable correlation in the study did not entirely meet the preliminary assumptions formulated based on literatures and previous studies, namely: (1) Relationship Marketing (RM) did not have correlation to WOM, and (2) Customer satisfaction did not have any correlation to WOM. These showed different characteristics of WOM in B2B marketing; relationship and customer satisfaction did not guarantee WOM as what happened in B2C marketing (Dithan (2011), Esi, (2012) and Ntale, et al. (2013) for RM towards WOM; as well as Jan et al, (2013), Taghizadeh et al., 2013), and Bontis and Booker, (2007) for customer satisfaction towards WOM). The largest influence towards WOM described in the full-model was customer loyalty (0.343) and customer value (0.305).

There was tendency that B2B segment did not carry out WOM (when both RM and customer satisfaction were at high level); however loyalty and customer value balanced things out. Customers with high loyalty tinggi who believed retailers would give high customer value yang tinggi were willing to spread WOM to other individuals to certain extent. It showed ambiguity, that is gap between perceiving suppliers as source of advantage (which should not be shared to other parties) and wish to share information about positive experience in business. Seen from the control variables, for example how long the companies have been in business with the suppliers, then the “ambiguity” could be explained more clearly. However, the issues were beyond the limitation of the study and they required further studies in the future.

Customer value, customer loyalty and customer retention seemed to have important roles in correlation between RM and WOM. It could be measured that indirect influence of RM towards WOM through customer value was (0.659*0.305 = 0.201), that through customer loyalty was (0.109*0.343 = 0.037), and that through customer retention was (0.159*0.298 = 0.047). Customer value had the biggest contribution in bridging the direct influence between RM and WOM. Therefore, when suppliers wished to improve WOM through RM, the most important factor one should pay attention to was customer value.

Furthermore, customer loyalty and retention played a role to connect customer satisfaction and WOM. It could be measured that the indirect influence of customer satisfaction towards WOM through customer loyalty Pelanggan was (0.699*0.343 = 0.240), and that through customer retention was
(0.170*0.298 = 0.051). It could be seen that customer loyalty had more contribution to bridge the indirect influence between customer satisfaction and WOM, compared to customer retention Pelanggan. Therefore, when suppliers wished to improve WOM through customer satisfaction, the most important factor one should pay attention to was customer loyalty.

**CLV-SUW Analysis**

CLV (Customer Life-time Value) and SUW (Size of Unused Wallet) analyses conducted in the study referred to Kumar et al. (2009); implementation of RM is supposed to be started with identification and distinguish between potential and non-potential segments of customers, determined using CLV and SUW criteria. SCL-SUW analysis is an alternative in the implementation of relational marketing, which is believed to give more advantage compared to conventional approach due to better control of fund (Kumar, et al., 2009). Conventional logics of the implementation of RM states that product innovation is the first element to develop relationship with customers because it results in customer acquisition, and is later combined with company's experience to achieve customer satisfaction. Furthermore, customer satisfaction will result in customer loyalty and retention, and in turns profits. The flowchart can be concluded in short as follows: Innovation→Customer Acquisitions→Customer Satisfaction→Customer Loyalty and Retention→Profit. Based on the Customer Lifetime Value (CLV) theory, Kumar et al. (2009) proposed alternative logics that the implementation of RM should begin with identification and putting customers into two segments, potential and non-potential customers. For example, promotional marketing activities, either cross-selling or up-selling conducted through promotion or direct mail, should emphasize on certain customer only (segment 6) so company can save some cost.

Table 2 described CLV-SUW segmentation of customers in B2B marketing for meat products. Different approaches were used for each segment of customers based on CVL and SUW positions the customers had.

Table 2. CLV-SUW Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Segmentation</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>SUW</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Findings of the Study (2015)*

Nurture relationship was the strategy used for segment 1 customers because they had high purchasing power (high CLV score), but they spent most of their income (low SUW) and as the effect, it is difficult for them to buy more goods/service. Thus, the company should only maintain relationship with the group of customer without trying to improve the relationship to higher degree. There were only 2 companies (0.57) that bought meat products using B2B so the suppliers did not have to make the strategy a priority.

The customers in segment 2 had high purchasing power (high CLV) and had quite amount of money to spend (high SUW), so the most appropriate strategy was defend relationship that prevented customers in the category to purchase goods and products from competitors. There were 228 companies (66.47%) in the category so the segment was where the customers were at. As the effect, suppliers should focus on the strategy and learn how to apply it in the implementation of relational marketing.
Sustain customer value was the strategy used for segment 3 customers; it referred to an effort to maintain customer value (balance between customer benefit and cost) so that it remained balance. It was conducted because the segment 3 customers had medium CLV but low SUW rendah so increasing customer value in the segment would not bring as much benefit for the suppliers. There were 19 (5.54) companies in the category so that the suppliers may apply the strategy but at the same time they did not have to put it as a priority.

Augment customer cost was used for segment 4 customers; it referred to an effort to increase cost for customers or cost the customers used to order products. The goal was to get higher profit because these customers had high SUV they could spend even though their CLV was medium. There were 88 (25.66%) companies that bought meat products in the segment, the segment with the second highest number of companies. As the consequence, suppliers should put them into priority and learn the implementation of the strategy in relational marketing carefully.

Reduce transaction cost was the strategy used for segment 5 customers; it referred to an effort to reduce transaction cost. The purpose was to cut maintenance fee as much as possible because these groups of learners had low CLV and low SUW and as the result, companies cannot get benefit from these customers and would cut some expenses in the implementation of relational marketing. There were only 3 (0.88%) companies in the category so that suppliers may put aside the strategy in the implementation of relational marketing.

Up-sell & cross-sell strategy was used for segment 6 customers; it referred to an effort to make customers purchasing other products the companies had since these customers had low CLV but they still had high SUW to spend. Customers in the segments are the ones where up-sell & cross-sell marketing activities were suitable. There were very few companies in the category, 3 (0.88%) companies, so that suppliers may put aside the strategy in the implementation of relational marketing.

Based on CLV-SUW analysis mentioned previously, it was suggested that suppliers focused on three types of strategies, defend relationship, augment customer value, and sustain customer value. The results of analysis emphasized on the importance of relationship marketing for B2B meat products suppliers because the majority of buyers were potential customers that guaranteed potential customer segments. The suppliers who considered relationship with customers was not more that transactional relationship may suffer from major loss.

6. CONCLUSION

The findings show that Relationship Marketing is antecedent of customer value, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, and customer retention; the hypothesis testing showed significant influence towards those variables. The better implementation of Relationship Marketing in B2B marketing for meat products means more improved customer value, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, and customer retention. It means Relationship Marketing has direct benefit towards the success of the suppliers to maintain long-term relationship with their customers.

Furthermore, it can be seen that Relationship Marketing is not the antecedent towards Word of Mouth (WOM). The hypothesis testing showed there was not any significant direct influence between Relationship Marketing and WOM. Relationship Marketing can influence WOM indirectly through customer value, customer loyalty, and customer retention in which the biggest influence is through customer value. It means Relationship Marketing approach does not give immediate benefit towards the success of the suppliers in developing positive WOM among customers. The difference between B2B and B2C WOM happens due to supplier’s position as one of the competitive advantages for the buyers which are not shared to other parties.

Customer value is antecedent of customer satisfaction, loyalty, retention, and WOM; the hypothesis testing showed the significant influence towards the variables. In other words, the higher customer value in B2B marketing for meat product means the higher customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, customer retention, and WOM. Therefore, customer value gives direct benefit towards success of the suppliers to maintain long-term relationship with their customers.

Customer satisfaction is antecedent of customer loyalty and retention, but it is the antecedent towards WOM. The hypothesis testing showed customer satisfaction had significant influence customer loyalty and retention but it did not have any significant influence towards WOM. It reveals that customer satisfaction has immediate advantage towards loyalty and retention; however, customer satisfaction does not
give any impact towards WOM. Customer satisfaction can directly influence WOM through loyalty and retention, in which the largest indirect influence is through loyalty.

Both customer loyalty and retention are the antecedent of WOM and the two has direct and significant influence towards WOM. It means developing customer loyalty and retention may give direct advantage towards the success of suppliers to encourage positive WOM.
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