

Conquering the Market through Guerrilla Strategies: The Success Story of Small Paint Manufacturers in Zimbabwe.

Clever Vutete¹, Christopher Vutete²

¹*MBA, MSc Marketing, B Com Marketing Management, Lecturer, ZOU-Harare Region,*

²*BSc (Hons), MBA, Principal Director at AScaR Institute*

Abstract: *The pre-2009 period was dominated by some large paint manufacturers that fiercely defended their market shares and positions. Such players who used to enjoy an uncontested market space include Astra, Chroma, Chemical Enterprises and Dulux. Though it seemed impossible for small paint manufacturers to enter that market, the 2010-to-2015 period witnessed some significant entrance and influence of small firms in the paint manufacturing and marketing business. Given the thin resources by these small firms and their tendency of applying the attack military tactics to conquer the paint manufacturing market, this study aimed at analysing the common guerrilla strategies that were employed in attacking the large established firms. A quota sample of 63 respondents taken from seven(7) purposively selected small paint manufacturers' employees and managers was used for responding to the Likert scaled survey questionnaire. Stealing key accounts, lowering prices, taking low loyalty customers from large firms and launching sporadic promotional activities were found to be some special guerrilla tactics used by small paint manufacturers to conquer the market. Some guerrilla strategies were found to be positively related and others negatively related in their intended effects on warfare results. Use of independent guerrilla strategies by small firms was found to be behind their survival and success in entering the paint manufacturing industry. Small business guerrilla strategists are recommended to be ethical, customer oriented, employee oriented and also maintain their flexibility, agility and innovativeness character for them to succeed in entering a fortified market.*

Key Words: *Paint industry, attack strategies, offensive strategies, strategic groups, guerrilla warfare and established firms.*

I. Introduction

There are ongoing debates on whether marketers should use military strategies for attaining their competitive goals in any industry (Kolar and Toporistic, 2007; Jang and Morris, 2015). Even if there is going to be some agreement, the issue would be on the need to adjust to meet the complexity of the environment and improvements that had taken place in the military approaches since World War II. The two major classes of the military strategies are the defensive strategies and attack strategies(Rich, 2006; Kotler and Keller, 2013). The writers traditionally prescribed market leaders to use defensive strategies, and market challengers and followers to apply the attack strategies(Ries and Trout, 1986;Rich, 2006). Since the object of war is to survive and dominate, the writers believe that market leaders and large firms can use a combination of both defensive and attack strategies so that military terminology will not confuse the business strategists to their peril. DiMingo(1990) also expressed the view that right tactics combined with the right strategy can produce sizable gains in market share regardless of the size of the business.

Some major writers of military business strategies like Ries and Trout(1986), Levinston(1985), and Kotler(1997) used large firms, especially global firms to analyse both the attack and defensive strategies. Such companies used include, Coca-Cola, Pepsi, Caterpillar and Komatsu (Sims, 1986). With the government of Zimbabwe encouraging entrepreneurship and starting new businesses, neglecting small firms in the application of military strategies could be a serious error by both practitioners and academics (Thompson, 1983). Though the military strategies are part of the whole range of strategy models like growth strategies, generic strategies, marketing mix strategies, relationship marketing, partnership strategies and global entry and competition strategies, its role in analysing competitive objectives, competitive behaviour and response pattern is more realistic.

Since the early 2000s, the chemical paints subsector has been a preserve of few firms that enjoyed a huge market share. The Harare paints industry was dominated by Astra Paints, Chroma Paints, Chemical Enterprises and Dulux and other imported paints brands. The market opportunities for paints was shut and blockaded as customers were loyal to the big manufacturers and suppliers. There were also some decreasing opportunities for solvents and paints manufacturers and suppliers in the pre-2009 environment as less people were investing in the construction sector. This contributed to the heated rivalry among those large firms. The government of Zimbabwe encouraged opening up of new firms by local business people under the empowerment and indigenisation policies. The formalization of the multicurrency and associated dollarization

of the economy saw the market size expanding as revitalization of firms became visible. With government encouraging the opening up of new firms in each sector; the smaller players like Nash Paints, Solid Paints, Pigments Paints, Splash Paints and Crown Paints had to find ways of entering into the solvents and paints market. Birley and Norburn(1985) said that small businesses used to believe that they were inferior to larger companies in terms of ability to satisfy target markets. The Zimbabwean new and small firms in the paint manufacturing industry, however, showed some brevity in fighting large industry leaders.

The small paint manufacturers have their brands being used in many construction projects by rural household customers and urban household customers and corporate customers. They also achieved some significant shelf space in hardwares and department stores. This generally reflected the growth of market share and survival by small players. Since the small firms were generally invisible to each other, their efforts could have been concentrated on attacking large firms(market leaders) and avoiding direct confrontation among themselves. In some industries like grocery retailing, some small and new retailers who were operating in the period 2007 to 2009 were booted out by the Spars, OK, TM, Food World, Bon Marche and Pick'n Pay. The small paint manufacturers, on the other hand, grew in strength despite the threats by the large long serving players in the post 2009 business environment. Though business was generally growing, this scenario could be showing that new and small paint manufacturers were successful in taking a large chunk of market share from the long serving dominant players. The use of non-guerrilla strategies by small and new firms could not have achieved much since the market leaders' competitive intelligence could easily pick the small firms' actions and counter-offensives be built effectively. Given that majority of these small paint manufacturers had thin resources, low brand awareness in the market, less industry experience and other key success factors, the military strategy proponents will suggest that they used the guerrilla offensive strategies in their battles (Yannopoulos, 2011). Though the guerrilla strategy has some similarity with encirclement and end-run strategies, taking advantage of opportunities, loopholes and fissures in the market leader's territory and strategies make it a unique approach. Guerrilla marketing also involve use of alternative strategies and objectives with high mobility and flexibility(Kruger, 2003).

Though the entry barriers were generally low, the extent to which new firms snatched the market share was so dramatic to suspect some use of sophisticated strategies of guerrilla nature(Caudron, 2001) Though some writers believe that firms in the same strategic group are those who should wage fierce battles between each other, the small paint manufacturers were able to fight the upper group and gain some lucrative market footholds(Kotler and Keller, 2013). The fight for market share and market dominance is such bloody and similar to political wars for possessing territories, and firms in the paint industry had to content with coercive pressures that force their strategists to formulate and to adopt environmentally appropriate strategies. Jang and Morris(2015) said that marketing strategy educators and planners should encourage entrepreneurs to engage in guerrilla warfare. Now that the new and small firms had taken much market share from the large industry players, the industry is facing some structural change as the fight for customer attention is continuing. The thrust of this research is to analyse the guerrilla offensive strategies that were mainly used by the small paint manufacturers in achieving their competitive positions in the paint manufacturing industry in Zimbabwe. This will make both small and large firms be conscious of activities and operations that made small players shine under threatening environments.

II. Statement Of The Problem

Bigger firms used to enjoy an uncontested market space in manufacturing and supply of solvents and paints in the market before 2009. These established firms were having loyal customers, high market reputation, market experience and large market shares which they partly used as fortification walls against any competitive market attacks. Since the small and newly established firms gained the market share relative to market leaders, there could be need to suspect use of guerrilla marketing offensives for conquering the big players. The purpose of the study is to analyse the guerrilla offensive strategies that were applied by small companies manufacturing paints and solvents to get market share from the large players who used to dominate the sector.

III. Research Hypotheses

H₁: There is a strong linear relationship between the two strategies; 'Going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest' and 'Focusing on areas where larger firms are overextended and resources are spread thinly'.

H₂: There is a strong positive linear relationship between the two strategies; 'Lowering of prices to win a big order' and 'Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities'.

H₃: There is a strong positive linear relationship between the two strategies; 'Going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest' and 'Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities'.

H₄: Small firms in the paint manufacturing industry have been successful in mounting guerrilla strategies

IV. Guerrilla Strategies, Features, Strategic Options And Limitations

Mintzberg (1998) defines strategy as a plan, a pattern, a position, a perspective and a ploy that an organization pursues to remain relevant in the market. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2008:3) defined strategy as *“the direction and scope of an organization over the longer term which achieves advantage in a changing environment through configuration of resources and competencies with the aim of fulfilling stakeholder expectations”*. Barney and Hesterly (2015) commented that the business environment is becoming hyper-competitive and a variety of responses to competition have been suggested for businesses to pursue. One such set of the strategic option is to attack the competitor using guerrilla offensive strategies. The guerrilla offensives are developed by making reference to customers(the territory), competitors(the enemy) and the company itself(the warrior). The guerrilla offensives used in the military analysis include the C³I, where C³ is covered by command, control and communication and I being information. Though we believe that guerrilla strategists can survive with few resources, all military activities require some command on resources and market, measuring and monitoring internal and external environment, communicating with customers and other stakeholders and accumulating relevant information(Modern, 2007;Blaise, 2001).

Baltes and Leibing(2008) defined guerrilla marketing as use of unconventional and innovative marketing strategies and campaigns that use a smaller budget than traditional marketing strategies. It applies the ‘Hit and Run’ guerrilla warfare tactics used by Mao Tse Tung. Guerrilla marketing strategies avoid wasting marketing resources, attract customer attention through eye-catching activities and is generally effective if used wisely(Baltes and Leibing, 2008). It involves attacking the enemy, retreating and hiding, then doing it again-until competitors are tired or search for other markets. Guerrilla marketing is also referred as a multi-purpose, and double edged sword for small businesses to achieve business warfare goals. Garsombke(1987) said guerrilla marketing include specific and functional activities such as canvassing, trade shows, public relations, circulars and new distribution outlets. This definition gives an emphasis on promotional techniques and strategies for winning markets from market leaders. Levinson(1984) said guerrilla campaigns need to be shocking, unique, outrageous and clever.

The key features of guerrilla marketing include ability to concentrate resources, selling the ideology together with the product, identifying and overcoming the established patterns, searching for synergies, outsmarting any perception filters in the target group, avoiding direct attacks: using detours and alternatives, and being flexible, agile and avoid building strongholds(Elliot, 2003; Baltes and Leibing, 2008). Some principles of Guerrilla strategies include perfect knowledge of the ground, co-operation of people, and building relationships and sympathy with local people(Cummings, 2007). Guerrilla strategies use manoeuvre warfare strategies that are based on taking bold and risky decisions, using deceptive and ambiguous approaches, decentralized communication approaches and encouragement of taking actions by people in the combat. These make use of meandering, meditation, myopia and maneuvering as given by Wensley(2003). Pech and Slate(2003) referred the guerrilla strategy as employing surprise, speed and economy of effort to fight the enemy’s weak points and processes. Guerrilla marketing reduces the chance of businesses with deeper pockets and most patience to survive competition (Karakaya and Yannopoulos, 2015). This also removes the first mover advantages from the market leaders. Some fundamental principles of guerrilla marketing warfare include approaching segments that are small enough to defend, being quick on one’s feet, avoiding acting like a leader and being creative in a consistent way(Ries and Trout, 1986). Guerrillas should not be ashamed to make change strategies and engage in strategic withdrawal(Chandrasekar, 2010) MacInnes(2000) recommended new and small firms to use guerrilla warfare tactics based on speed as they will make competitors take a defensive or reactive stance.

Harrigan(1986) said that a small firm that refuses to abandon loyal customers when other firms do will win in its guerrilla based battles. This is possible since elderly players could have been caught up by pride in perceiving each small firm’s activity to be too small to affect their sales and market share. Cummings(2007) said many developments in military activities in the past years were shaped by the rise and popularity of guerrilla warfare usage. The guerrilla military groups in the world are known for disintegrating and mixing up with the civilian population. These guerrilla groups include religious groups, terrorist cells, drug cartels, revolutionaries and freedom fighters(Kolar and Toporis, 2007; Noriyuki, 2014). The different new and small paint manufacturers could have behaved like these religious groups, terrorists and freedom fighters.

Guerrilla marketing warfares specifically cover issues like targeted legal attacks on the competition, product comparison advertising, executive raids, short term alliances, selective price cuts, deliberate sabotage of the competitors’ test markets, marketing research, advertising campaigns, sales promotions and orchestrating negative publicity of competitors(Chandrasekar, 2010). Guerrilla marketing in retailing seems to be concentrating on handing out fliers, creating a sense of urgency on customers, creating a scene, making the front of the store unforgettable and refining the interior and exterior branding designs. The other way of viewing the guerrilla strategies is treating them as separate marketing programs like ambient marketing, ambush marketing,

stealth marketing, viral marketing, guerrilla alliances and street marketing. All these approaches are powered by ambushes, sabotages, surprises, high energy, and unconventional imaginations and raids.

The guerrillas aim at distracting the market leader and move quickly to seize an unserved, emerging or neglected market segment. They also consider differentiation and innovation in areas such as customer service, improved delivery time, extended warranties, sales terms, after sales support and even packaging. Guerrilla marketing make use of indirect approaches which include accessing the supply chain through add-on services, use of legal actions to dislodge a competitor, and filling product gaps(Norton, 2006). Guerrilla strategies also make use of alternative objectives to achieve concentration, to permit enough flexibility for exploiting opportunities, to keep competitors on their toes, and to make market leaders remain ignorant of the small firms' real intentions. Guerrilla strategy unsettles and unbalances the market leaders to cause them to make mistakes, to give them distraction, false moves and also misinterpretation of the small firm's direction and scope(Norton, 2006). Guerrillas attack on areas where leading competition is not able or willing to respond. The strategy also utilize new technology to unbalance competitors and make them scramble to catch up with the market trends.

Guerrillas use hit-and-run tactics (Thompson and Strickland, 2003) through sporadic and intensive bursts of promotional activity to attract attention of key industry buyers(Levinson, 1984; Kotler and Keller, 2013) . Another perspective of this strategy is to selectively capture market share from rival leaders in situations where the guerrilla fighter lack resources or market visibility that prevents a full scale offense. This tactic might be mainly used by challengers who are small and with limited resources.

Small firms in the paint sector might be able to accomplish this by going after buyer groups that are not important to large firms (Kotler and Keller, 2013; Jobber, 2010). Such neglected buyers could become a base for launching further attacks. One critical aim of guerrilla fighting in industrial markets is winning key accounts. A key account is a customer who buys in very large quantities and becomes very important for the total sales and business for a company (Modern, 2007). Small paint firms can launch initiatives to snatch and win key accounts from established firms. Such key accounts might be government agencies, non-governmental organisations and construction firms.

There are some limitations and some care is needed in using guerrilla marketing strategies by either large or small firms. Guerrilla marketing's weaknesses are questioned in terms of ethics in the area of resources and providers, disclosure, and stakeholder effects(Jang and Morris, 2015). Schee(2011) said that guerrilla marketers that ignore changing consumer preferences do so at their own peril. Guerrilla marketing makes modern businesses concentrate their resources and efforts on conflict between competitors and fail to meet the needs of customers. The best guerrilla strategies will fail if employees are not put at the centre of business operations. Franklin(1987) also condemned military and guerrilla marketing for misrepresenting business objectives, encouraging illegal and immoral practices, and depersonalizing customers into targets that should be hit. Despite such criticism many new firms have little options except using such strategies in a cleverly manner. This made it necessary to evaluate the extent and nature of guerrilla offensives used by new and small firms in the paint manufacturing industry in Zimbabwe.

V. Research Methodology

The research design used for analysing the guerrilla based marketing strategy was a positivistic cross-sectional survey. The study concentrated on analysing the guerrilla offensive strategies applied by small and new firms to attack large established firms in the paints, solvents and emulsions industry in Zimbabwe. The strength of using this method is its ability to provide an average feeling of how small firms were able to harass the long time market leaders using alternative mini-strategies(guerrilla strategy). Quota sampling was used to achieve a stipulated maximum number of respondents (Saunders et al, 2009) basing on their experiences from different firms competing in the paints and solvents chemicals sub-sector. The paints companies involved were Solid Paints(5), Gapco(13), Nash(11), Splash(9), Crown(5), Decotec(7), Pigments(8) and Imperial(5). This gave a total quota sample of 63 respondents which comprised of employees, line managers, middle managers and some top managers. Only respondents who have worked in the coatings, solvents and paints chemical subsector for at least two years were included in the sample. The KMO sampling adequacy value was 0.53 which was acceptable for factor analysis. The Likert-scaled questionnaire was used to rate the extent to which each guerrilla offensive strategy was used by the small paint manufacturers to enter the chemical paint sub sector.

The reliability and internal consistency value in terms of Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.67 and was generally acceptable since it was greater than 0.50. Field (2009) said validity is whether an instrument measures what it was designed to measure. Construct validity was achieved through extensive search of elements of the guerrilla offensive strategy model from literature and maintain them in the questionnaire. The drop and pick method was used by the researcher who paid visits to respondents' workplaces, factories and offices and dropped off questionnaires that were later on picked up after the appointed survey dates. Some questionnaires were also administered through e-mail platforms. The data was processed using the SPSS software and developed summary statistics that were used to interpret and make sense of the findings. The resulting measures

were the mean values, correlation matrix values, KMO values, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients, and the t-hypothesis testing values.

VI. Presentation And Discussion Of Results

The study on the guerrilla approaches used by small paint manufacturers to wrestle market share from market leaders are shown by Table I below. The sub items represent the possible Customer-Competitor – Company(3Cs) guerrilla strategy formulation. The discussion of results will start with basic mean value analysis, and then hypotheses testing.

4.1 Mean Value Analysis of Results.

Table I : Mean Value and Percentage Results on Guerrilla Strategy

	MEAN	Excellent %	Very Good %	Good %	Poor %	Very Poor %
1. Going after buyer groups that are not important to large firms	3.60	22.2	17.5	27.0	31.7	1.6
2. Going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest	3.38	6.3	44.4	31.7	15.9	1.6
3. Focussing on areas where larger firms are overextended and resources spread thinly	3.60	20.6	36.5	30.2	7.9	4.8
4. Stealing a key account of the larger firms	4.02	38.1	41.3	9.5	6.3	4.8
5. Lowering on price to win a big order.	3.40	23.8	20.6	33.3	15.9	6.3
6. Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities.	3.11	12.7	20.6	31.7	34.9	0
Overall Mean Value	3.52	-	-	-	-	-

The benchmark mean value for the agreement of using a specific guerrilla strategy was 3.00. All the six(6) variables scored mean values above the benchmark value. The variable *'going after buyer or customer groups that are not important to large firms'* had a mean value of 3.60. Large paint manufacturers were not targeting some geographically distant rural areas, some small construction companies and rural hard-wares. Small and new paint manufacturers started identifying those customers and distributed their various products in those previously neglected segments. The study showed that there could be some differences in depth and breadth of target markets or segments being served by these firms. Market segments might appear unimportant for large firms for different reasons including pride and complacency. This opportunity arises to guerrillas since it is impossible for existing firms to take care of all buyer groups in the market. The measure, *'going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest'* had a mean value of 3.38. The pre 2009 period saw some alterations of market structure and expectations. Such disconnections and reduced loyalty saw some customers distancing themselves from the large existing firms. Lack of loyalty could be linked to perceived product similarity among all paint manufacturers. This also shows the need for creation of strong corporate brands to be a good defensive strategy for market leaders.

'Focusing on areas where larger firms are overextended and resources spread thinly' got a mean value of 3.60. Small firms might have exploited the areas for competition where existing market leaders' resources and effort were too spread to have some critical mass. Their efforts were spread on supplying a variety of products, international activities and advertising. There was less depth on after sales services, customer training and quick delivery. The use of guerrilla strategies have been known to involve use of limited resources to fight competition (Jobber, 2010) especially through concentrating resources where the competitors are not paying enough attention. This could create the surprises and confusion required to unbalance the competitors.

'Stealing a key account of the larger firms' got a mean value of 4.02.

This guerrilla strategy was intensively used by the small players in the sector. A key account represent the greatest market share for a firm (Kotler and Armstrong, 2004). The key accounts taken by the small firms include hospitals, government departments, parastatals and some large construction firms. These small firms survived by snatching huge orders from large existing customers of paints, coatings and solvents. A key account will enable a small firm to get very large orders that leads to high profits. Such profits might be the source of next moves to take market space. Some strategists called such audacious moves to wrestle against bigger firm as a judo strategy.

'Lowering prices to win big orders/ Low-balling on price to win a big order.' was rated with a mean of 3.40

Since the aim of guerrilla strategies is to harass or demoralize competitors, these small firms might have succeeded by implementing price reductions through snowballing tactics. Small players communicated the

low prices as specials and as a deliberate penetration strategy for undercutting the large players. Though these small firms had little resources, they had little overheads which gave them flexibility, agility and speed in decision making. In practice, larger firms are expected to lower their prices as a way to defend their market space using economies of scale and learning curve effect. Though lowering of prices is discouraged as it reduces the whole industry profitability, this tactic seemed to have worked for smaller firms in the paint manufacturing industry as there was no retaliation.

‘Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities’ was rated with a mean of 3.11, which is just above the average. Though this variable scored less in terms of usage frequency, promotional activities are key tactics for mounting guerrilla marketing strategies for small firms without much resources and reputation (Kotler et al, 2004). This might show the varied impact of promotional activities in this chemical subsector. The small paint manufacturers used fliers, posters, coupons, rebates, customer deals, in store promotions and aggressive salespeople to sell their stock. Besides fighting competition, promotional activities have been known to increase brand visibility of a firm.

5.2 Correlation Matrix Analysis

The SPSS based correlation analysis of the guerrilla strategists’ responses produced the results in Table II. The analysis facilitate us to see whether managers were rating and using the strategic options in a similar manner. Negative values indicate that the guerrilla strategies were not used in the same situations, while positive correlation values indicate that the strategies were used in the same game plan and strategic context.

Table II: Correlation Matrix for Guerrilla Strategy Elements

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Going after buyer groups that are not important to large firms	1.000	-	-	-	-	-
2. Going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest	0.108	1.000	-	-	-	-
3. Focussing on areas where larger firms are overextended and resources are spread thinly	-0.023	0.439	1.000	-	-	-
4. Stealing a key account of the larger firms	0.002	0.195	0.724	1.000	-	-
5. Low-balling on price to win a big order.	-0.206	-0.357	0.075	0.429	1.000	-
6. Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities	-0.168	-0.680	-0.462	-0.102	0.446	1.000

a Determinant = .083

The guerrilla strategies with the highest correlation as perceived by small paint manufacturers were ‘stealing a key account of the larger firms’ and ‘ focussing on areas where larger firms are overextended and resources are spread thinly’. These had a correlation value of +0.724. Those who aimed at snatching big customers/accounts of existing players could have been influenced by observing the resource weaknesses of those market leaders. It shows these strategies were generally compatible for harassing market leaders. Another strong relationship was noted on the ‘starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities’ and ‘low-balling on price to win a big order’. These had an r-value of +0.446. Reducing prices was made in relation to promotional campaigns. This combination of guerrilla strategies made sense since heavy promotion was needed to announce a price reduction deal of small paint companies to price sensitive customers. The strong negative correlation was established between ‘starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities’ and ‘going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest’. The two had an r-value of -0.680. Concurrently using ‘promotional activities’ and ‘attacking weak areas’ were going to produce negative results since the large firms were going to notice the publicised strategies of the small firms and create some retaliation and also mount some flank defense. This was going to defeat the speedy, surprise, hit and run, and retreat battle styles of guerrilla attackers (Levinson, 1984). Another negative relationship was between ‘low-balling on price to win a big order’ and ‘going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brand is weakest’. The correlation coefficient was $r=-0.357$. The guerrillas were able to

attract the customers without much price reduction in cases where they were not loyal to existing firms. In this case, the need to pull customers using price reduction was less compelling. ‘Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities’ and ‘focussing on areas where larger firms are over-extended and resources spread thinly’ had an r- value of -0.462. It shows that promotion was less favoured where the guerrillas wanted to do some surprise insurgencies. All the above correlation analysis shows the need to neatly match the guerrilla manoeuvres to avoid self attacking and reducing the impact of retaliation by market leaders. It also confirms that guerrilla strategies are based on alternative objectives, flexibility and ability to concentrate resources in some selected segments.

5.3 Hypotheses Testing of Guerrilla Warfare Variables

This section provides a statistical confirmation and reporting of variable behaviour shown in basic mean analysis and correlation analysis. Three(3) test were made and presented below with their interpretation. Only the null hypotheses were stated and alternative hypotheses was assumed to be opposing the null hypotheses in each case.

H₁: *There is a strong linear relationship between the two strategies; ‘Going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest’ and ‘Focusing on areas where larger firms are overextended and resources are spread thinly’.* Since r-value is **0.439**, we accepted the null hypothesis(H₁) at 0.01 significance level and conclude that there is a significantly strong positive linear relationship between the two guerrilla strategic options. This indicate these strategies can be combined to produce an effective insurgency against market leaders.

H₂: *There is a strong positive linear relationship between the two strategies; ‘Lowering of prices to win a big order’ and ‘Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities’.* Since r= +0.446, we accept H₂ and conclude that there is a strong linear relationship between the two strategies at 0.01 significance level. According to Jobber (2010) promotional activities might incorporate lowering of prices to win bigger orders. This strategy was evident at Nash Paints where they have been advertising heavily on vehicles, billboards and newspapers.

H₃: *There is a strong positive linear relationship between the two strategies; ‘Going after buyers whose loyalty to rival brands is weakest’ and ‘Starting intensive and sporadic promotional activities’.* Since r=-0.680 at we reject H₃ and conclude that there is a negative strong correlation between the two strategies at 0.01 level of significance. This means that the two strategies can be used as alternative guerrilla attack tools rather than at the same time.

H₄: *Small firms in the paint manufacturing industry have been successful in mounting guerrilla strategies*

Table III: One-Sample Test for H₄

	Test Value = 3.00					
	T	d.f	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Guerrilla Strategies	4.164	5	.009	.51833	.1983	.8383

The T test results are shown in Table III above.

Since the p value of 0.009 is less that 0.05, we fail to reject **H₄** and conclude that, with a significance level of 5%, the guerrilla strategies have been implemented successfully by the small firms in the coatings, solvents and paints industry. The test results indicate that use of guerrilla tactics might be successful even for organisations that do not have enough resources since the small firms were able to take market share from established companies.

VII. Conclusions

The most favoured guerrilla strategy by small firms was ‘stealing key accounts of market leaders’ and the least preferred was ‘intensive and sporadic promotional activities’. This study also indicated that some guerrilla strategies are positively related, while others are negatively related. The research also conclude that some independent guerrilla strategies of small firms can be used to conquer some long serving industry leaders. Though the small firms could have used other business military strategies, it can be concluded that the guerrilla tactics were behind their survival and success in the paint manufacturing market.

VIII. Recommendations

The study recommends current and future users of guerrilla strategies to ensure their employees are empowered to make quick decisions while serving customers. Flexibility, high morale and hope is needed in the culture of guerrilla strategists. These guerrillas are recommended to grow into large firms that maintain their guerrilla character of flexibility, agility, innovativeness and responsiveness to customer needs. There is need for these firms to identify those strategies that complement each other and apply them simultaneously, for a greater impact. The small firms should develop ethical and legal guerrilla strategies that effectively address and solve customer problems. The small paint manufacturers are encouraged to use promotional based guerrilla tactics to

psychologically unbalance the market leaders as these small firms are now consolidating their market positions in the paint manufacturing industry.

References

- [1]. Baltes G and Leibing. I, (2008), "Guerrilla marketing for information services?", *New Library World*, Vol. 109 Iss 1/2 pp. 46 – 55
- [2]. Barney, J.B. and Hesterly, W. (2015) *Strategic Management and Competitive Advantage: Concepts and Cases*. 5th Edition, Prentice-Hall
- [3]. Birley S and Norburn D(1985) *Small vs Large Companies: The Entrepreneurial Conundrum*, *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol.6 Iss: 1, pp. 81-87
- [4]. Blaise C, (2001), "Information warfare: peering inside Pandora's postmodern box", *Library Review*, Vol. 50 Iss 6 pp. 279 – 295
- [5]. Caudron S.(2001) 'Guerrilla Tactics', *Industry Week*, Vol. 250 No. 10, pp 52-56.
- [6]. Chandrasekar K. S(2010) *Marketing Management, Text and Cases*; New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Education Private Limited.
- [7]. Cummings S(2007) *Shifting Foundations: Redrawing Strategic Management's Military Heritage*, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Vol. 3Iss: 1. Pp.41-62.
- [8]. DiMingo E. P.(1990) *Marketing Strategies For Small Share Players*, *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol 11 Iss:1, pp.26-30.
- [9]. Elliot. M.(2003), *Playing The Mogadishu Rules*, *Time Canada*, Vol. 161 No. 14, p.32.
- [10]. Field, A.(2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*, 3rd Edition, Washington DC: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [11]. Franklin B K(1987) *Military Metaphors: Semantic Pollution Of The Market Place; A Review of General Semantics*; Vol. 44, No. 2(Summer 1987) pp 141-148.
- [12]. Garsombke T. W.(1987) *Military Marketing Warfare: A comparative Review of The Use of Comabative Philosophies and Terminology*, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51, No. 1(Jan 1987).
- [13]. Harrigan K. R.(1986) *Guerrilla Strategies for underdog competitors*, *Planning Review*, Vol. 14 Issue 6, pp4-45.
- [14]. Jang Y and Morris M H(2015), *The Ethics of Guerrilla Behaviour in Early Stage Firms*, in Sherry Hoskinson, Donald F Kuratko(ed.) *The Challenges of Ethics and Entrepreneurship in the Global Environment(Advances in the Study of Entrepreneurship, Innovation and amp; Economic Growth, Volume 25)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.57-78
- [15]. Jobber, D.(2010) *Principles and Practice of Marketing*, 6th Edition, London;McGraw-Hill Education.
- [16]. Johnson, G., Scholes, K. and Whittington, R. (2008). *Exploring Corporate Strategy Text & Cases*. FT/Prentice Hall
- [17]. Karakaya, F. and Yannopoulos, P. (2011). *Impact of Market Entrant Characteristics on Incumbent Reaction to Market Entry*, *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol.19 No. 2 pp171-185
- [18]. Kolar T and Toporiši A, (2007), "Marketing as warfare, revisited", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 25 Iss 3 pp. 203 – 216
- [19]. Kotler, P. and Armstrong, G. (2004) *Principles of Marketing*. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, tenth edition
- [20]. Kotler P. (1997) *Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, Implementation and Control*, 9th Edition, Prentice Hall International, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey
- [21]. Kotler, P. and Keller, K.L. (2013) *Marketing Management*. 14th Edition, Pearson Horizon Editions, Boston.
- [22]. Kriger N(2003) *Guerrilla Veterans In Post War Zimbabwe: Symbolic Violent Politics(1980-1987)*, Cambridge University Press: UK.
- [23]. Levinson C J(1985) *Guerrilla Marketing*; Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.
- [24]. Levinson C.J. and Shel H(2010) *Guerrilla Marketing Goes Green : Winning Strategies to Improve Your Profits and Your Planet*, John Wiley & Sons
- [25]. Levinson, J.C. (1984), *Guerrilla Marketing: Secrets for Making Big Profits from your*
- [26]. Levinson, J.C. (1994), *The Guerrilla Marketing Handbook*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA.
- [27]. MacInnes A (2000) *Business Strategies in Transitional Economies*, *European Business Review*, Vol. 12 Iss: 4, pp.230-232.
- [28]. Mintzberg, H. (1998) *Strategic Safari: the complete guide through the wilds of strategic management*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- [29]. Modern, T. (2007) *Principles of Strategic Management*, 3rd Edition, Ashgate
- [30]. Noriyuki K(2014) *Adapting to Win : How Insurgents Fight and Defeat Foreign States in War* University of Pennsylvania Press
- [31]. Norton P(2006) *Manager's Guide to Competitive Marketing Strategies* London: Thorogood Publishing.
- [32]. Pech R J and Durden, G (2003), "Manoeuvre warfare: a new military paradigm for business decision making", *Management Decision*, Vol. 41 Iss 2 pp. 168 – 179
- [33]. Rich M K(2006) *Strategy Moves: 14 Complete Attack and Defense Strategies For Competitive Advantage'*, *Journal of business and Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 21 Iss:4.
- [34]. Ries A and Trout J(1986) *Marketing Warfare*: New York; McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- [35]. Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2007) *Research Methods for Business Students* (4th Edition).Harlow: FT Prentice Hall.
- [36]. Schee V.A.B(2011) *More Guerrilla Marketing Research*, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol 28 Iss: 4, pp. 312-313.
- [37]. Sims T. J(1986) *Japanese Market Entry Strategy At Work: Komatsu vs Caterpillar*, *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 3 Iss: 3, pp.21-32.
- [38]. Small Business, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA.
- [39]. Thompson W T(1983) *Marketplace Positioning in A Deregulated Environment*, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 1Iss:3, pp.3-26
- [40]. Wensley R(1989) *The Basic Principles of Marketing Warfare* by Robert Duro, Bjorn Sand strom; *Winning the Marketing War* by Gerald A. Michaelson; *Journal Of Marketing* Vol. 53, No.3(Jul 1989). Pp 128-130.
- [41]. Wensley, R. (2003), "Strategy as intention and anticipation", in Cummings, S. and Wilson, D. (Eds), *Images of Strategy*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 105-35.
- [42]. Yannopoulos, P. (2011) *Defensive and Offensive Strategies for Market Success*. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol.2 No.3