European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research
Vol.4, No.11, pp.81-100, December 2016
Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

Marketing Analytics in Financial Services and Its Impact on Customer Acquisition Strategies

Lukasz Bikowski
Independent Researcher, Australia
lb@bikowski.com
doi: https://doi.org/10.37745/ejaafr.2013/vol4n1181100

Abstract: *This paper examines how marketing analytics reshaped customer acquisition strategy in financial services up to 2016. The study develops a conceptual synthesis of research on customer equity, customer lifetime value, relationship marketing, customer relationship management, multichannel management, data mining, and marketing productivity, with a specific focus on banking, insurance, credit, and investment services. Financial services present a distinctive setting because products are information intensive, switching costs vary across categories, regulatory oversight is high, and customer value unfolds over long relationship horizons. The paper argues that analytics improves acquisition not simply by reducing campaign waste, but by connecting prospect selection, channel choice, offer design, onboarding, and early relationship development to expected long term value. A framework is proposed that links data inputs, analytical capabilities, acquisition decisions, and performance outcomes. The paper shows that firms that align acquisition spending with customer value and risk quality are more likely to achieve profitable growth than firms that optimize only response volume or short term sales. Research and managerial implications are discussed.*

Keywords: marketing analytics, financial services, customer acquisition, CRM, customer equity, banking

INTRODUCTION

Financial services firms have long depended on information advantages. Banks, insurers, credit providers, wealth managers, and payment firms collect large volumes of transactional, demographic, service, risk, and channel data. Yet the existence of data does not automatically produce better marketing decisions. For many years acquisition in financial services was driven by broad segmentation, managerial intuition, branch location logic, product silos, and campaign rules inherited from direct marketing. These practices helped firms scale, but they often produced weak targeting, rising acquisition costs, poor prospect quality, and a mismatch between sales volume and long term profitability. By 2016, the strategic question was no longer whether data should inform marketing, but how analytics should be embedded in acquisition strategy in a way that balances growth, profitability, risk, and relationship development. (Davenport and Harris, 2007; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

This paper addresses that question by examining marketing analytics in financial services and its impact on customer acquisition strategies. The argument advanced here is that acquisition in financial services differs from acquisition in many fast moving consumer markets because the value of a customer is usually realized over time rather than at the point of sale. A new current account, mortgage, insurance policy, managed fund account, or credit card relationship can generate revenue streams, cross-buying opportunities, referrals, and learning effects that extend well beyond the initial conversion event. Acquisition therefore needs to be evaluated through a dynamic lens that incorporates retention probability, risk exposure, cost to serve, share of wallet, and engagement potential. This

makes the sector especially receptive to analytical approaches grounded in customer equity and customer lifetime value. (Rust et al., 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005).

The paper is timely for a 2016 publication context for three reasons. First, financial services firms faced intense margin pressure after the global financial crisis, which increased scrutiny of marketing expenditure and intensified demand for measurable returns. Second, customers became more multichannel and digitally active, moving between branches, websites, mobile interfaces, call centres, aggregators, and social media during search and purchase. Third, advances in data warehousing, campaign management systems, predictive modelling, and CRM infrastructure made it feasible for firms to move from descriptive reporting to more proactive prospect scoring and allocation. What changed was not only technology, but the managerial expectation that customer acquisition should be evidence based, value focused, and accountable. (O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007; Day, 2011; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

Despite this progress, the literature remained fragmented. Some streams examined customer equity and valuation. Others focused on relationship marketing, CRM implementation, service quality, multichannel management, or data mining. A further body of work studied banking practice directly, often showing a gap between the analytical tools available to firms and the rules of thumb still used in managerial decision making. The current paper brings these streams together and asks a focused question: how does marketing analytics influence the design and effectiveness of customer acquisition strategies in financial services? (Bolton et al., 2004; Neslin et al., 2006; Ngai et al., 2009).

The contribution of the paper is fourfold. First, it integrates marketing, service, and analytics literature into a framework tailored to financial services. Second, it explains why analytics should shift acquisition objectives away from raw volume and toward expected relationship value. Third, it identifies the key analytical levers that shape acquisition performance, including prospect selection, channel orchestration, offer design, onboarding, and cross-functional integration. Fourth, it draws implications for both research and practice by outlining the conditions under which analytics improves acquisition outcomes and the risks that arise when firms over-rely on incomplete data or poorly aligned metrics. (Blattberg and Deighton, 1996; Payne and Frow, 2005; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The remainder of the paper follows the journal structure. Section 2 reviews the theoretical foundations that connect analytics, customer value, and relationship development. Section 3 explains the conceptual methodology used in the paper. Section 4 presents the main findings as an integrated framework. Section 5 discusses the strategic meaning of those findings. Section 6 draws implications for research and practice. Section 7 concludes, and Section 8 identifies priorities for future research.

LITERATURE/THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

Marketing analytics can be defined as the use of data, models, measurement systems, and decision rules to improve marketing effectiveness and accountability. In the broad marketing literature, the rise of analytics is closely tied to concern with marketing productivity and the demand that marketing demonstrate its contribution to firm value. Rust, Ambler, Carpenter, Kumar, and Srivastava argued that marketing needed stronger metrics and tighter connections between market actions and financial outcomes. This concern is especially relevant to financial services because products are intangible, competition is often intense, offerings can be easily imitated, and customer profitability varies sharply across segments. Marketing expenditures therefore need to be justified not only by acquisition counts

but by downstream value creation. (Rust et al., 2004; Davenport and Harris, 2007; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

A useful starting point is the customer equity perspective. Blattberg and Deighton framed acquisition and retention spending as an optimization problem and introduced the idea that firms should manage marketing by the customer equity test. This perspective was further advanced by Berger and Nasr, Gupta and Lehmann, Gupta, Lehmann and Stuart, and Hogan, Lemon and Rust. The central insight is simple but powerful: customers are economic assets whose value can be estimated, compared, and managed. For acquisition strategy, that means prospecting decisions should be based on expected future cash flows rather than immediate response rates alone. A channel, campaign, or offer that generates many low value or high risk customers may look efficient in the short term while destroying value over time. (Blattberg and Deighton, 1996; Blattberg et al., 2001).

Customer lifetime value deepens this logic. CLV models estimate the present value of future profits attributed to an acquired customer. In financial services, CLV is particularly appealing because many offerings involve recurring fees, interest spreads, balance growth, policy renewals, and product bundling. At the same time, the sector complicates CLV because profitability depends on risk quality, delinquency, claims behaviour, regulatory cost, service usage, and customer tenure. Reinartz and Kumar, Verhoef, and Kumar and Reinartz show that value is not determined by loyalty alone. Some long-standing customers are unprofitable, while some newer customers create substantial value through depth of relationship, low servicing costs, or strong cross-buying potential. Acquisition strategy therefore has to target profitable potential, not just likely responders. (Berger and Nasr, 1998; Gupta and Lehmann, 2003; Gupta et al., 2004).

A second theoretical stream comes from relationship marketing and CRM. Relationship marketing emphasizes trust, commitment, interaction quality, and long term exchange rather than isolated transactions. This perspective is highly relevant to financial services because many customer decisions involve perceived risk, information asymmetry, and repeated contact. Customers are often buying promises, expertise, and institutional reliability rather than tangible goods. Payne and Frow, Boulding et al., and Reinartz, Krafft and Hoyer show that CRM should not be understood merely as software. It is a strategic process that integrates information, interaction, and organizational design around customer value creation. In acquisition terms, CRM widens the task from winning a prospect to beginning a relationship that can be developed, retained, and expanded. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Reinartz et al., 2004; Boulding et al., 2005).

The service-dominant logic proposed by Vargo and Lusch adds another layer. This perspective treats value as co-created through service provision and use, not embedded in goods alone. In financial services, the implication is that acquisition does not end when a customer signs up. Value is co-produced through onboarding, usage, advice, service encounters, digital interfaces, and problem resolution. Analytical systems that focus only on initial conversion miss important post-acquisition drivers of realized value. A prospect predicted to be attractive on demographic grounds may fail to become valuable if onboarding is poor, channel friction is high, or the customer never adopts relevant services. (Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Kumar et al., 2006).

Service and customer asset management research further explains why acquisition and retention cannot be separated. Bolton, Lemon and Verhoef developed the customer asset management perspective to link acquisition activities, relational processes, and financial outcomes. Rust, Lemon and Zeithaml similarly argued for a return on marketing logic that evaluates marketing in terms of customer assets. In financial services, acquisition campaigns often pull forward future service obligations, risk

exposures, and cross-sell opportunities. This means acquisition choices influence not only marketing cost but the composition of the customer base and the economics of future service delivery. (Bolton et al., 2004; Hogan et al., 2002; Rust, Lemon and Zeithaml, 2004).

Another relevant stream concerns multichannel management. Neslin et al. showed that customers move across channels and that firms must manage data integration, channel migration, conflict, and customer metrics across the channel system. In financial services, multichannel behaviour is not peripheral. Prospects may compare rates through third party aggregators, seek reassurance through a branch or adviser, complete application forms online, call for clarification, and later manage the relationship through mobile tools. Acquisition analytics therefore needs to account for assisted and unassisted journeys, channel substitution, sequence effects, and the economics of channel mix. A low cost digital lead may convert only after expensive human intervention. Equally, a branch interaction may be influenced by prior digital behaviour that conventional systems fail to capture. (Neslin et al., 2006; Verhoef, 2003).

Data mining and predictive modelling literature made these developments operational. Ngai, Xiu and Chau reviewed the application of data mining techniques in CRM and showed how classification, clustering, association, and forecasting methods support customer identification, attraction, retention, and development. In financial services, such methods have been applied to response modelling, credit card uptake, churn prediction, attrition risk, fraud screening, and cross-sell targeting. Predictive analytics does not replace strategy, but it changes the quality of managerial judgment by converting raw data into probabilities, segments, and action priorities. (Shaw et al., 2001; Ngai et al., 2009; Davenport and Harris, 2007).

The financial services context adds several distinctive considerations. First, regulation shapes what can be offered, to whom, through which channels, and with what disclosure. Second, risk and marketing are tightly coupled. A highly responsive prospect may still be undesirable if risk-adjusted profitability is low. Third, trust and reputation matter more than in many categories because customers disclose personal financial data and often commit to long term contracts. Fourth, products differ in acquisition logic. A current account may serve as a gateway product, a mortgage as a long horizon profit engine, and an insurance policy as a renewal-based relationship with a different risk structure. Analytics must therefore adapt to product economics rather than impose a generic response model across all categories. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Day, 2011).

Research on banking practice confirms both the potential and the limitations of analytics. Farquhar and Panther found that UK banks sought to balance acquisition and retention, but the process remained complex and not always analytically mature. Persson et al. later observed that commercial banking decisions often relied on rules of thumb even where stronger analytical approaches were available. This gap matters. When managerial rules dominate without value-based analytics, firms tend to over-invest in easily measurable leads, under-estimate channel interactions, and treat acquisition as a standalone campaign problem rather than a portfolio design problem. (Farquhar and Panther, 2008; Persson et al., 2014).

The literature also suggests that acquisition effectiveness depends on the metrics used. Traditional metrics such as cost per lead, conversion rate, or account openings are useful, but incomplete. O'Sullivan and Abela showed that marketing performance measurement capability contributes to firm performance, implying that advantage lies not only in collecting metrics but in using them well. For financial services, stronger metrics include risk-adjusted CLV, early activation, share of wallet growth, cross-buy propensity, attrition probability, complaint incidence, and channel migration cost. These

metrics help firms evaluate whether an acquired customer is likely to become an attractive relationship. (Ambler, 2003; O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007; Hanssens et al., 2009).

Taken together, the literature indicates that marketing analytics influences acquisition in three linked ways. It improves selection by identifying more promising prospects. It improves allocation by matching prospects, offers, and channels more intelligently. It improves learning by enabling firms to connect acquisition activities to longer term value outcomes. Yet the same literature warns against narrow determinism. Models can be biased by incomplete data, they may overfit past behaviour, and they can privilege short term efficiency over trust, fairness, or customer experience. These tensions provide the basis for the conceptual framework developed in this paper. (Blattberg et al., 2001; Rust et al., 2004; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

A further stream relevant to this paper is the literature on marketing performance measurement and firm value. O'Sullivan and Abela demonstrated that measurement capability itself is linked to improved firm performance, which suggests that the competitive advantage of analytics lies not merely in model ownership but in the organizational ability to turn analysis into disciplined action. Hanssens, Rust and Srivastava pushed this argument toward capital market relevance by showing that marketing decisions increasingly need to be connected to broader financial outcomes. This matters in financial services because acquisition expenditure can be significant, while the resulting asset base influences revenue stability, funding profiles, renewal streams, and cross-category penetration. Analytics helps make these links visible. (O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007; Hanssens et al., 2009).

The literature also indicates that analytics matured in stages. Early direct marketing and database marketing practices focused on list selection and response improvement. Later CRM approaches expanded the frame to ongoing relationship management. By the mid-2000s, data mining and multichannel management extended analytical reach into customer journeys, interaction design, and behaviour prediction. By 2016, the emerging marketing analytics literature, represented strongly by Wedel and Kannan, treated firms as operating in data-rich environments where customer actions leave continuous traces that can be analysed at scale. For financial services marketers, this progression meant that acquisition could now be informed by browsing behaviour, transaction histories, branch usage, service contact patterns, and product bundle trajectories rather than by static segment descriptors alone. (Shaw et al., 2001; Davenport and Harris, 2007; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

Another theoretical issue concerns the relationship between customer acquisition and customer profitability analysis. Customer profitability analysis estimates the revenues and costs associated with individual customers or segments. In services, this is especially useful because high-contact customers may consume substantial resources even when revenue appears attractive. For financial institutions, cost-to-serve differences can be large due to branch usage, adviser time, complaint handling, fraud review, or manual exception processing. Analytics improves acquisition strategy when it incorporates these downstream service economics. Without that connection, firms risk attracting customers who look attractive at the point of conversion but become expensive to maintain. (Berger and Nasr, 1998; Reinartz and Kumar, 2003; Gupta et al., 2004).

The review also suggests that analytics influences strategic segmentation. Traditional segmentation in financial services often relied on age, income, occupation, or broad life-stage categories. These variables remain useful, but analytics enables more behaviourally grounded segmentation based on transaction patterns, channel preference, financial complexity, or relationship potential. Such segmentation can improve customer acquisition because it supports more relevant propositions. A first-home buyer, a digitally confident saver, a small business owner, and a pre-retiree investor may all

belong to similar income bands while requiring very different messages, advice intensity, and channel pathways. (Wedel and Kannan, 2016; Kumar and Reinartz, 2012).

A final theoretical consideration is learning under uncertainty. Customer acquisition decisions are probabilistic by nature. Firms rarely know ex ante which prospects will become valuable customers. Analytics reduces this uncertainty by estimating probabilities, but it never eliminates uncertainty entirely. This makes feedback systems crucial. The literature implies that stronger firms use post-acquisition outcomes to retrain models, revise segmentation rules, and improve future targeting. In this sense, marketing analytics is not only a decision tool. It is a learning architecture that helps the firm improve acquisition strategy over time. (Davenport and Harris, 2007; Day, 2011; Persson et al., 2014).

METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a conceptual and integrative literature review methodology. The aim is not to test a single hypothesis with original field data, but to synthesize existing knowledge into a coherent explanatory framework for the role of marketing analytics in customer acquisition within financial services. A conceptual approach is appropriate because the relevant insights are dispersed across several research traditions, including customer equity, CRM, relationship marketing, services marketing, marketing metrics, multichannel management, and analytics. By 2016 these literatures had matured enough to support integration, yet they had not been assembled around a focused financial services acquisition question. (Bolton et al., 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The review concentrated on publications up to and including 2016 in order to match the historical position of the intended manuscript. Priority was given to peer reviewed journal articles and major scholarly books that have influenced thinking about customer valuation, acquisition, customer management, analytics, and financial services marketing. Sources were selected for conceptual relevance, citation significance, and direct applicability to the paper's research problem. Works that were purely technical in the statistical sense but disconnected from managerial acquisition decisions were treated as secondary unless they clearly informed CRM or prospect modelling. (Rust et al., 2004; Ngai et al., 2009; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The review process involved four stages. First, foundational works were identified around customer equity, customer lifetime value, and marketing productivity. These publications established the economic rationale for value-based acquisition. Second, literature on CRM, relationship marketing, and service management was examined to clarify how acquisition links to longer term relationship development. Third, studies on multichannel customer management and data mining were used to explain how analytical capabilities translate into practical targeting and channel decisions. Fourth, sector-specific studies from banking and related financial services were examined to ground the framework in the institutional realities of the industry. (Blattberg and Deighton, 1996; Gupta and Lehmann, 2003; O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007).

The analysis followed an abductive logic. Rather than imposing a fixed model from the outset, the paper moved iteratively between the literature and the focal problem. During this process, recurring themes were coded at a conceptual level. These included data integration, customer value orientation, prospect scoring, channel orchestration, offer design, onboarding quality, risk adjustment, metric choice, and organizational alignment. The themes were then grouped into broader dimensions and linked into a process logic that explains how marketing analytics affects acquisition outcomes. (Bolton et al., 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005).

This methodology has several strengths. It allows the paper to integrate literatures that are often treated separately. It supports theory development by identifying relationships among concepts rather than simply cataloguing prior findings. It is also suitable for a managerial domain where different kinds of evidence, including conceptual work, empirical studies, and sector analyses, all contribute to understanding. The methodology is particularly useful in financial services because acquisition decisions involve both marketing and non-marketing considerations such as credit risk, compliance, service operations, and customer experience. (Bolton et al., 2004; Kumar et al., 2006).

At the same time, the approach has limitations. The paper does not generate new primary data, so its claims remain analytical and interpretive rather than causal in a strict empirical sense. The framework developed here is shaped by the body of literature available up to 2016 and therefore reflects the assumptions, technologies, and market structures of that period. In addition, financial services is a broad category, and differences among retail banking, insurance, credit cards, and wealth management cannot be fully explored within a single paper. These limitations are acknowledged, but they do not reduce the usefulness of the framework for clarifying the strategic role of analytics in acquisition. (Day, 2011; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The output of the methodology is an integrated framework that identifies the main inputs, mechanisms, and outcomes involved in analytics-enabled acquisition strategy. The framework is presented in the findings section and then interpreted in relation to theory and practice. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Rust, Lemon and Zeithaml, 2004).

RESULTS/FINDINGS

The literature synthesis suggests that marketing analytics affects customer acquisition in financial services through a structured chain of influence rather than a single direct effect. The chain begins with data resources and analytical capability, moves through acquisition decision domains, and ends with relationship and firm-level outcomes. Five core findings emerge from the review. (Rust et al., 2004; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The first finding is that analytics changes the unit of acquisition decision making. In traditional campaign management, the relevant unit is often the lead, the application, or the sale. In an analytics-driven model, the unit shifts toward the expected value of the acquired relationship. This shift matters because many financial services customers differ sharply in future profitability even when their immediate acquisition behaviour looks similar. A prospect who opens a basic account may later take a mortgage, accumulate balances, adopt digital self-service, and remain with the firm for years. Another prospect may respond to a rate promotion, generate high service costs, and leave quickly. Analytics reframes acquisition around expected future contribution rather than immediate conversion. (Gupta et al., 2004; Blattberg et al., 2001).

The second finding is that successful acquisition analytics depends on data integration across customer, product, risk, and channel domains. The literature repeatedly shows that isolated campaign data has limited value. Better acquisition decisions are made when firms combine demographic information, behavioural history, response data, credit or risk indicators, service interactions, digital traces, and product economics. This integration enables prospect scoring models that estimate not only likelihood of response but expected risk-adjusted value. In financial services, this is a major strategic advantage because acquisition quality depends on both revenue potential and risk acceptability. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Reinartz et al., 2004; Persson et al., 2014).

The third finding is that analytics improves acquisition through four operational levers: targeting, channel allocation, offer design, and onboarding prioritization. Targeting refers to identifying which prospects should be contacted and with what probability of value creation. Channel allocation concerns the selection and sequencing of channels, including branches, call centres, websites, mobile tools, advisers, email, direct mail, or comparison platforms. Offer design concerns the matching of product, rate, message, and incentive to the predicted needs and economics of the prospect. Onboarding prioritization concerns post-conversion actions that increase the probability that the newly acquired customer will activate, adopt, deepen, and remain. The literature shows that firms often underappreciate this fourth lever even though poor onboarding can destroy the value predicted at acquisition. (Ngai et al., 2009; Neslin et al., 2006; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The fourth finding is that analytics alters the metrics of acquisition performance. Instead of relying only on cost per acquisition or gross response volume, firms increasingly evaluate campaigns using richer indicators such as expected CLV, early tenure profitability, cross-sell propensity, channel migration, service usage, complaint behaviour, and attrition risk. This broadening of metrics supports better resource allocation. It also changes managerial behaviour by discouraging the pursuit of customers who are easy to win but difficult to serve profitably. (Ambler, 2003; O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007; Hanssens et al., 2009).

The fifth finding is that analytical benefits are conditional on organizational alignment. Models alone do not improve acquisition if marketing, risk, sales, operations, and service functions work with different objectives or incompatible data systems. CRM research shows that cross-functional coordination, governance, and measurement capability are essential. In financial services this point is acute because customer acquisition often sits at the boundary of marketing and underwriting, marketing and branch operations, or marketing and compliance. Where these interfaces are weak, analytics may produce technically sound recommendations that never influence practice. (Boulding et al., 2005; Day, 2011; Payne and Frow, 2005).

Based on these findings, the paper proposes an integrated framework of analytics-enabled customer acquisition in financial services. The framework is summarized in

Table 1. Integrated framework of analytics-enabled customer acquisition in financial services

Stage	Core content	Strategic role in acquisition
Data foundation	Customer, prospect, transaction, risk, service, channel, and external data	Expands visibility beyond campaign response to expected relationship quality
Analytical capability	Segmentation, scoring, classification, CLV estimation, response modelling, and performance measurement	Converts data into actionable acquisition priorities
Decision domain 1	Prospect targeting	Identifies whom to contact and whom to exclude
Decision domain 2	Channel allocation and sequencing	Matches prospects to the most efficient and trusted contact path
Decision domain 3	Offer and message design	Aligns product proposition with value potential and customer needs
Decision domain 4	Onboarding and early relationship development	Protects and amplifies the value created at conversion

Outcome domain 1	Acquisition efficiency	Lower waste, better conversion, improved media and channel productivity
Outcome domain 2	Relationship quality	Higher activation, trust, retention potential, and share of wallet growth
Outcome domain 3	Financial performance	Better risk-adjusted profitability, customer equity, and marketing accountability

A second layer of findings concerns the logic linking analytics to acquisition outcomes. The literature indicates that this logic is not linear in the narrow sense. Analytics does not work simply because more data produces more precision. Rather, three mechanisms appear to mediate impact. (Bolton et al., 2004; Rust et al., 2004).

The first mechanism is selection quality. Better analytics helps firms distinguish between high response and high value. This distinction is critical in financial services because campaigns that optimize response alone often attract rate-sensitive or opportunistic customers whose long term value is low. Value-based models support superior customer selection and reduce adverse acquisition. (Blattberg and Deighton, 1996; Gupta and Lehmann, 2003).

The second mechanism is resource matching. Different prospects require different levels of marketing investment and different channel combinations. Analytics supports more nuanced allocation of resources by identifying which prospects justify adviser time, branch intervention, premium onboarding, or tailored pricing. This reduces over-servicing of low value leads while protecting high potential relationships. (Neslin et al., 2006; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The third mechanism is organizational learning. When campaign outcomes are linked to longer term customer behaviour, the firm can refine its acquisition models and strategic assumptions. This is a cumulative effect. A bank or insurer that continuously learns which acquisition sources produce profitable customers develops an advantage that is difficult for competitors to copy. (Davenport and Harris, 2007; Day, 2011).

The review also highlights sector-specific findings. In retail banking, acquisition often revolves around gateway products such as current accounts, savings accounts, or credit cards. Here analytics matters because the initial product may be only weakly profitable by itself, yet highly valuable as an entry point into broader relationships. In insurance, analytics shapes acquisition by linking prospect selection to risk quality, renewal potential, and cross-policy opportunities. In wealth and investment services, the economics of acquisition depend heavily on trust, adviser credibility, and balance growth, making analytics valuable but insufficient on its own. These differences suggest that the same analytical architecture must be adapted to different product and service logics. (Farquhar and Panther, 2008; Persson et al., 2014).

Another important finding concerns the role of customer experience in acquisition effectiveness. The service and CRM literatures imply that analytics produces stronger results when combined with interaction quality. In financial services, acquisition is often a high involvement decision shaped by perceived fairness, transparency, speed, and confidence in the institution. A predictive model may successfully identify a valuable prospect, but the acquisition strategy will still fail if the application process is confusing, approval is slow, or the first service encounter is poor. Thus, analytics should be

viewed as an enabler of better acquisition design, not as a substitute for experience quality. (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990; Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005).

The literature also identifies several risks. One is metric myopia, where firms confuse measurable short term indicators with strategic performance. Another is model lock-in, where historical data reproduces past targeting assumptions and prevents firms from identifying emerging or underserved segments. A third is over-personalization that feels intrusive in a sector where privacy and trust are sensitive. Finally, there is a governance risk: when accountability systems are weak, analytics may be used selectively to justify decisions rather than genuinely improve them. (Day, 2011; Hanssens et al., 2009; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

These findings can be condensed into a set of propositions suitable for future empirical testing.
P1. Marketing analytics improves customer acquisition performance in financial services when prospect evaluation is based on expected relationship value rather than immediate response alone.
P2. The effect of marketing analytics on acquisition performance is strengthened by integration of marketing, customer, risk, and service data.
P3. The impact of analytics on acquisition is mediated by improvements in targeting precision, channel allocation, offer design, and onboarding quality.
P4. The relationship between analytics and acquisition performance is moderated by organizational alignment across marketing, risk, operations, and customer service functions.
P5. Firms that evaluate acquisition using long horizon metrics such as CLV, activation, and retention potential achieve stronger risk-adjusted performance than firms relying primarily on short term campaign metrics.

Overall, the findings show that marketing analytics has a substantial impact on customer acquisition strategy in financial services, but the impact is strategic and systemic rather than purely technical. Analytics works best when it redefines the purpose of acquisition around profitable relationship creation. (Rust, Lemon and Zeithaml, 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The findings also reveal that the impact of analytics varies across the main phases of the acquisition funnel. In the awareness and prospecting stage, analytics supports market selection, look-alike modelling, and media allocation. In the consideration stage, it helps predict propensity, compare offer attractiveness, and identify the likely need for human assistance. In the conversion stage, analytics can optimize application design, approval routing, follow-up timing, and abandonment recovery. In the early relationship stage, it can identify customers at risk of inactivity and trigger specific onboarding interventions. This phase-based view is important because acquisition performance depends on cumulative conversion across the full path, not only on one contact point. (Neslin et al., 2006; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

The literature further indicates that analytics changes the role of intuition. In many financial institutions, branch leaders, product managers, and campaign planners have historically relied on experience-based rules. These rules are not inherently weak. In fact, they often encode practical knowledge about local markets, customer language, and selling conditions. The problem arises when such rules are detached from systematic feedback on customer quality and long term value. Analytics is most effective when it disciplines intuition with evidence. The best acquisition strategies therefore combine managerial insight with predictive systems rather than treating them as substitutes. (Davenport and Harris, 2007; Persson et al., 2014).

Another finding concerns the heterogeneity of product acquisition cycles. Short-horizon products such as transaction accounts or standard cards allow faster performance feedback, making analytical refinement easier. Long-horizon products such as mortgages, pensions, and some insurance lines involve delayed value realization, which makes acquisition evaluation more complex. In these categories, firms need proxy indicators such as application quality, early engagement, document completion speed, adviser follow-up, balance funding, or first-year retention. Analytics allows those proxy indicators to be linked to eventual value, improving decision quality before full profitability is realized. (Gupta et al., 2004; Kumar and Reinartz, 2012).

The findings also suggest that acquisition strategy should distinguish between individual-level and portfolio-level optimization. At the individual level, analytics aims to identify the best action for a specific prospect. At the portfolio level, the aim is to allocate acquisition resources across products, segments, and channels so that the overall customer base develops in a profitable direction. This distinction matters because the individually optimal decision is not always the same as the portfolio optimal decision. A campaign that attracts a narrow segment with strong short term value may still be undesirable if it weakens portfolio diversity or increases concentration in high-service channels. Financial institutions therefore need analytical dashboards that support both levels of decision making. (Blattberg et al., 2001; Rust et al., 2004).

Table 2 summarizes the main mechanisms and risks identified in the review.

Table 2. Main mechanisms through which analytics influences acquisition strategy

Mechanism	Positive effect	Common risk if mismanaged
Value-based prospect selection	Improves fit between acquisition spend and future profitability	Over-reliance on historical data may exclude emerging segments
Channel orchestration	Reduces waste and improves conversion quality across branch, digital, and assisted channels	Channel metrics may be siloed and distort true economics
Offer optimization	Improves relevance of message, pricing, and product bundle	Excessive incentive use may attract low-loyalty customers
Onboarding analytics	Increases activation and early relationship depth	Firms may underinvest because onboarding sits outside campaign budgets
Performance learning	Builds cumulative advantage through feedback and model refinement	Weak governance may encourage selective use of evidence

In addition, the literature points to an interaction between analytics and trust intensity. Categories that involve higher financial complexity or greater perceived personal risk tend to require more than efficient targeting. In those contexts, the role of analytics is partly to identify when reassurance, explanation, or adviser interaction is needed. For example, wealth management and retirement products may depend less on mass targeting precision and more on identifying high-potential prospects who should receive richer educational or consultative contact. This illustrates that analytics can support differentiated acquisition design even when human judgment remains central. (Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005).

Finally, the findings show that analytics should be understood as both a measurement system and a strategic language. Once firms begin to evaluate acquisition through customer value and lifecycle metrics, internal decision conversations change. Senior managers can compare products not only by

sales volume but by quality of acquired relationships. Marketing can communicate with finance through projected value rather than promotional activity alone. Risk teams can collaborate with marketers around risk-adjusted profitability rather than default avoidance in isolation. This shared language may be one of the most durable impacts of analytics on customer acquisition strategy. (Ambler, 2003; O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007).

DISCUSSION

The findings provide a richer interpretation of acquisition in financial services than the common view that analytics is mainly a targeting tool. In practice, many organizations first adopt analytics through campaign response models because these are relatively easy to justify. The literature reviewed in this paper suggests that such a narrow use understates the strategic role of analytics. The deeper contribution is that analytics helps a firm decide what kind of customer base it wants to build and how acquisition decisions influence future customer equity. (Davenport and Harris, 2007; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

This point helps reconcile several strands of prior research. Customer equity theory shows why customers should be treated as assets. CRM research explains how relationships are developed and managed over time. Services marketing clarifies that value is co-created across interactions. Multichannel research shows that customers move through complex paths rather than single channels. Analytics brings these strands together by offering a means to estimate, compare, and learn across acquisition alternatives. In financial services, this integration is especially powerful because profitability unfolds over time and depends on both behaviour and risk. (Blattberg et al., 2001; Payne and Frow, 2005; Ngai et al., 2009).

The discussion also suggests that customer acquisition should be repositioned from a front-end marketing activity to a portfolio management activity. Acquisition decisions change the composition of the future customer base. A firm that consistently acquires low-balance, high-contact, low-loyalty customers will create different service economics from a firm that acquires digitally active, advice-seeking, multi-product households. Once seen this way, acquisition is not merely about filling the funnel. It is about shaping the future portfolio of customer assets. (Gupta et al., 2004; Rust, Lemon and Zeithaml, 2004).

The literature also clarifies why some firms struggle even when they invest heavily in data and technology. One reason is that analytical outputs may conflict with entrenched organizational routines. Branch managers may prefer locally familiar selling rules. product managers may optimize product volume rather than relationship value. Risk teams may focus on default avoidance without considering customer development potential. Service teams may inherit customers whose expectations were shaped by aggressive acquisition messaging. These frictions weaken the effectiveness of analytics because they disconnect model logic from execution. A technically robust model cannot compensate for inconsistent organizational incentives. (Boulding et al., 2005; Day, 2011).

A second issue concerns the balance between exploitation and exploration. Predictive analytics typically performs best when future behaviour resembles the past. Yet financial services markets change. Economic cycles shift, regulation evolves, customer trust rises and falls, new digital intermediaries emerge, and new service models alter channel behaviour. If acquisition models rely too heavily on historical response patterns, firms may optimize yesterday's customer base. This is a strategic danger in categories where fintech entrants, aggregators, or digital-first banks alter

expectations quickly. For this reason, analytics should support experimentation as well as prediction. (Davenport and Harris, 2007; Day, 2011; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

A third discussion point concerns ethics, transparency, and trust. By 2016, most debate focused on data capability and marketing productivity rather than the broader social implications of analytics. Still, the financial services context makes these issues unavoidable. Customers provide sensitive information and expect decisions to be fair, explainable, and secure. Highly targeted acquisition can improve relevance, but it can also create perceptions of manipulation or exclusion if opaque models drive differential treatment. In sectors such as lending or insurance, concerns about fairness are even more acute because marketing, risk assessment, and pricing can overlap. The managerial lesson is that analytical sophistication should be matched with governance and clear communication. (Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005).

The findings further suggest that acquisition metrics should be interpreted as part of a hierarchy rather than in isolation. At the lowest level are activity metrics such as impressions, clicks, enquiries, and applications. The next level includes conversion and cost metrics. A more strategic level includes activation, retention, cross-buying, and customer satisfaction. At the highest level sit CLV, customer equity, and firm value implications. Problems arise when firms stop at the lower levels because those indicators are easier to observe. In financial services this can be especially misleading. For example, a campaign with a low cost per acquisition may be harmful if the acquired customers have poor retention, low balances, or high servicing costs. The literature on marketing productivity strongly supports this hierarchy view. (Ambler, 2003; O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007; Hanssens et al., 2009).

The sector-specific discussion also points to the importance of gateway products. Many financial institutions deliberately acquire customers through products that are easy to compare and easy to switch into, such as transaction accounts, savings products, basic insurance policies, or standard credit cards. The immediate economics of these products may be modest. Their value lies in opening the door to broader relationships. Analytics is useful here because it can estimate which gateway acquisitions are likely to lead to deeper engagement. This matters because not all gateway customers are equal. Some are likely to remain low involvement and rate sensitive, while others become valuable over time through product adoption and relationship expansion. (Farquhar and Panther, 2008; Verhoef, 2003).

Another implication concerns the boundary between acquisition and retention. Traditional organizational structures often separate these functions. Yet the literature reviewed in this paper suggests that the distinction is less meaningful in analytical terms. The variables that predict acquisition quality often overlap with variables that predict retention and share development. Early activation, digital adoption, service usage, and first-month satisfaction may tell the firm more about acquisition success than the original campaign response itself. This supports a lifecycle view in which acquisition strategy is evaluated through post-acquisition behaviour. (Reinartz et al., 2004; Kumar et al., 2006).

The discussion therefore leads to a broader proposition: in financial services, the impact of marketing analytics on acquisition is strongest when the firm manages acquisition as the first stage of a value-creating relationship system. This shifts the managerial conversation from campaign efficiency to customer portfolio architecture. It also suggests that future competitive advantage will come not merely from better models, but from better integration of analytics with service design, governance, and customer strategy. (Bolton et al., 2004; Payne and Frow, 2005).

The discussion also points to a tension between standardization and customization. Analytics encourages firms to standardize data definitions, model structures, and measurement systems so performance can be compared across units and campaigns. Yet financial services acquisition often benefits from tailored execution because products differ in complexity, purchase involvement, and trust requirements. A standardized value framework is therefore useful, but the tactical expression of acquisition strategy should remain flexible. This balance helps explain why some CRM programs fail: they impose system consistency without preserving customer and product sensitivity. (Day, 2011; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

It is also important to recognize that customer acquisition strategy in financial services often has dual objectives. One objective is immediate profitable growth. The other is strategic positioning. Firms sometimes acquire customers through products that serve as relationship anchors or brand entry points even when near-term margins are modest. Analytics adds value here by showing when such trade-offs are justified and when they are not. A low-margin acquisition campaign may still be sound if it reliably generates high-quality relationships that later deepen. Without analytics, these strategic bets are harder to evaluate and easier to misjudge. (Gupta and Lehmann, 2003; Hanssens et al., 2009).

The findings further suggest that acquisition decisions should be examined at different time horizons. At a short horizon, analytics can improve contact efficiency and response rates. At a medium horizon, it can improve activation, retention, and cross-sell. At a longer horizon, it shapes customer equity and institutional learning. A firm that evaluates analytics only at the short horizon will often underinvest in capabilities whose main benefits emerge later. This may explain why some institutions adopt only the visible front-end elements of analytics, such as campaign scoring, but neglect deeper investments in customer databases, feedback loops, and onboarding systems. (Gupta et al., 2004; Kumar et al., 2006).

There is also a competitive dimension. When products are relatively similar and prices are easily compared, customer acquisition advantage often comes from who can identify and develop valuable relationships more effectively. Analytics contributes to this advantage because it enables better use of proprietary customer and interaction data. Unlike mass advertising messages, these data-driven insights are difficult for competitors to observe directly. Over time, firms that connect acquisition decisions to richer lifecycle outcomes may therefore build stronger defensibility than firms that compete primarily on promotional intensity. (Rust et al., 2004; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

An additional discussion point concerns measurement credibility inside the organization. One reason marketing has historically struggled for influence is that performance claims were sometimes viewed as soft or indirect. The customer equity and marketing productivity literatures attempt to address this by connecting marketing decisions to financial outcomes. In financial services, analytics makes that connection more concrete. When marketers can show that a certain campaign source yields customers with stronger balances, lower attrition, or better risk-adjusted contribution, acquisition strategy gains legitimacy with finance and executive leadership. This is not just a communication benefit. It can materially affect budget allocation and the strategic status of the marketing function. (Ambler, 2003; O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007).

At the same time, the discussion cautions against technological determinism. Sophisticated models can create the illusion that acquisition can be fully optimized. In reality, customer behaviour remains partly contingent, socially embedded, and shaped by macro conditions that no model fully captures. Interest rate changes, economic shocks, regulatory reforms, and reputational events can alter customer response patterns quickly. The role of analytics is therefore to improve preparedness and decision

discipline, not to guarantee certainty. A mature acquisition strategy uses models as decision support while remaining responsive to context. (Day, 2011; Davenport and Harris, 2007).

Implication to Research and Practice

The implications for research are substantial. First, the paper shows that acquisition should be studied as a longitudinal value creation problem rather than a discrete campaign outcome. Researchers in financial services marketing can contribute by linking acquisition variables to retention, cross-buying, service cost, and risk-adjusted profitability over time. This would strengthen the empirical base for customer equity theory in service-intensive and regulated settings. (Gupta et al., 2004; Kumar et al., 2006).

Second, the synthesis suggests that future studies should integrate marketing and risk perspectives more explicitly. Much of the customer value literature assumes profitability can be estimated from revenues and costs, but in financial services risk quality is inseparable from marketing value. A customer who responds well to an offer may still create low or negative value after defaults, claims, or compliance costs are considered. Research that combines acquisition analytics with risk-adjusted CLV would therefore be especially valuable. (Persson et al., 2014; Payne and Frow, 2005).

Third, scholars should examine channel effects with greater precision. The multichannel literature established that customers use multiple channels, but the financial services context invites finer questions about sequence, trust transfer, and assisted conversion. For instance, how does a digital comparison visit influence later branch conversion? Which channel combinations produce the highest long term value rather than the cheapest immediate acquisition? These are strategic questions with practical importance for banks and insurers. (Neslin et al., 2006; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

Fourth, the paper suggests that onboarding deserves more research attention in the acquisition literature. Most acquisition studies focus on getting the customer in, while retention studies focus on what happens later. In financial services, the early period after sign-up can determine whether the customer activates, trusts, and deepens the relationship. Research that models acquisition and onboarding as an integrated process would improve both theory and managerial practice. (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990; Kumar and Reinartz, 2012).

Fifth, more work is needed on organizational capability. The literature often treats analytics as a technical asset, but this paper indicates that its impact depends on cross-functional alignment, measurement systems, and governance. Research into the organizational conditions that enable firms to use analytics effectively would help explain why similar technologies produce different performance outcomes across institutions. (Boulding et al., 2005; Day, 2011).

For managers, the practical implications are direct. The first is that acquisition strategy should be redesigned around value, not volume. Marketing teams should move beyond metrics such as raw response or gross account openings and adopt measures that estimate future value, activation potential, and service economics. This does not mean abandoning short term metrics. It means nesting them within a broader value framework. (Blattberg and Deighton, 1996; Rust et al., 2004).

The second managerial implication is that data architecture matters. Many firms possess large amounts of customer data but still make weak acquisition decisions because the data is fragmented across products, channels, and departments. Investment in integration can produce substantial gains by

allowing marketers to identify the kinds of prospects who will become profitable customers rather than merely responsive leads. In financial services, integration with risk and service data is especially important. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Reinartz et al., 2004).

Third, firms should align acquisition channels with customer needs and value potential. Not every prospect requires the same channel path. Some customers are comfortable with fully digital journeys, while others need reassurance through human contact. Analytics can support more intelligent channel design by identifying which prospects justify advisory time, branch appointments, or premium onboarding and which can be served efficiently through self-service channels. (Neslin et al., 2006; Persson et al., 2014).

Fourth, managers should treat onboarding as part of acquisition investment. The moment after acquisition is often where value is won or lost. Customers who fail to activate a card, fund an account, set up direct debit, download the mobile app, or understand product terms may never become profitable. Analytical systems should therefore flag newly acquired customers who need targeted onboarding support. (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990; Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

Fifth, institutions should review incentives. If marketing, sales, branch, and product teams are rewarded only for short term volume, even advanced analytical tools will be undermined. Incentives should encourage acquisition quality, relationship development, and sustainable profitability. This is consistent with the broader literature on marketing accountability and CRM implementation. (O'Sullivan and Abela, 2007; Hanssens et al., 2009).

Sixth, managers should preserve room for strategic judgment. Analytics improves decision quality, but it should not eliminate managerial interpretation. Models are based on past data and can miss emerging segments, social changes, or new strategic opportunities. The most effective organizations use analytics to discipline judgment, not to replace it entirely. (Day, 2011; Davenport and Harris, 2007).
Finally, trust should remain central. Financial services customers are sensitive to privacy, fairness, and clarity. Analytics that improves relevance and reduces friction can strengthen trust. Analytics that feels opaque or manipulative can weaken it. Firms therefore need governance standards for data use, targeting practices, and communication design. In a sector built on confidence, this is not a peripheral issue. It is part of acquisition strategy itself. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

Managers should also think carefully about measurement timing. Some acquisition campaigns look disappointing in the first weeks because conversion is slower among high-value prospects who need more information or advisory contact. Other campaigns look strong initially but deteriorate when the acquired customers fail to activate or remain. A sensible measurement design therefore includes staged review points, from application and approval through early use and later profitability. This helps avoid premature judgments and better reflects the lifecycle nature of value in financial services. (Gupta et al., 2004; Kumar et al., 2006).

Another practical implication is the need for experimentation. While analytics often emphasizes prediction, acquisition strategy also improves through controlled tests of message framing, channel sequence, pricing structure, and onboarding journeys. Financial institutions that combine predictive modelling with disciplined experimentation are likely to learn faster than those that rely on either approach alone. Experimentation is especially important when new channels emerge or customer behaviour shifts, because historical models may then be less reliable. (Davenport and Harris, 2007; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

For practice, there is also a talent implication. Effective analytics-led acquisition requires more than technical analysts. It requires managers who can translate customer insight into campaign design, compliance specialists who understand data use boundaries, and service leaders who can act on post-acquisition signals. Institutions should therefore develop hybrid capability rather than isolate analytics in a specialist unit that remains detached from customer-facing decisions. (Day, 2011; Kumar and Reinartz, 2012).

For researchers, the paper indicates that conceptual progress will depend on stronger bridges between marketing theory and industry-specific realities. Financial services offers a rich context because customer value, trust, regulation, and risk intersect directly. Studies that examine these intersections can refine general marketing theory while also producing findings with strong applied relevance. (Bolton et al., 2004; Ngai et al., 2009).

CONCLUSION

This paper examined marketing analytics in financial services and its impact on customer acquisition strategies through an integrative review of literature published up to 2016. The central conclusion is that analytics improves acquisition most effectively when it reorients the firm from campaign volume thinking to customer value thinking. In financial services, where profitability unfolds over time and depends on trust, service quality, risk, and relationship depth, acquisition cannot be evaluated adequately through immediate response metrics alone. (Rust et al., 2004; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).
The review showed that the strongest analytical contribution lies in linking data resources, predictive methods, and measurement systems to the broader task of building profitable customer relationships. Analytics improves prospect selection, supports better channel and offer decisions, strengthens onboarding prioritization, and enables organizational learning from long horizon outcomes. Yet these benefits are contingent on integration and alignment. Firms need connected data, relevant metrics, cross-functional coordination, and governance that links marketing to service and risk considerations. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Kumar et al., 2006).

The paper also argued that acquisition in financial services should be treated as a portfolio design problem. Every acquisition decision shapes the future composition of the customer base and therefore the economics of service delivery, cross-selling, and retention. From this perspective, analytics is not merely an operational aid. It is a strategic capability that helps firms decide which relationships to begin, how to begin them, and how to convert initial contact into enduring value. (Gupta et al., 2004; Rust, Lemon and Zeithaml, 2004).

For researchers, the paper offers a framework that integrates customer equity, CRM, services marketing, multichannel management, and data mining into a focused account of analytics-enabled acquisition. For managers, it highlights a practical message: the value of analytics does not lie in more dashboards or more precise response prediction alone. Its value lies in aligning acquisition choices with profitable, trusted, and sustainable customer relationships. (Blattberg et al., 2001; Bolton et al., 2004; Ngai et al., 2009).

Future Research

Several directions for future research emerge from this study. First, empirical work should test the propositions developed here using longitudinal customer data from banks, insurers, and investment firms. Such work would help quantify the effect of value-based acquisition on profitability, retention,

and customer equity. Second, scholars should develop sector-specific CLV models that integrate marketing, service, and risk variables more explicitly. This would improve acquisition decision making in categories where profitability is highly sensitive to claims, delinquency, or advisory intensity. (Persson et al., 2014; Wedel and Kannan, 2016).

Third, future work should examine acquisition in digitally transforming financial services markets. By 2016 the channel system had already become more complex, but subsequent developments make it even more important to understand mobile journeys, platform intermediation, and digitally assisted selling. Historical studies grounded in the 2016 environment can provide a useful benchmark for that evolution. (Neslin et al., 2006; Day, 2011).

Fourth, more research is needed on the micro-processes of onboarding. Future studies should examine how activation, education, trust formation, and first service experiences influence the realized value of acquired customers. Fifth, research should investigate fairness and transparency in analytics-driven acquisition, especially where marketing targeting intersects with pricing, eligibility, or advisory decisions. Sixth, comparative research across financial service categories would help identify which analytical practices are transferable and which are product-specific. (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990; Kumar and Reinartz, 2012).

Future scholarship that addresses these issues will deepen understanding of how analytics can support both effective marketing and responsible customer management in financial services. (Payne and Frow, 2005; Day, 2011).

REFERENCES

Ambler, T. (2003). Marketing and the Bottom Line: Creating the Measures of Success (2nd ed.). London: FT Prentice Hall.

Berger, P.D. and Nasr, N.I. (1998). Customer lifetime value: Marketing models and applications. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 12(1), 17-30. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6653(199824)12:1<17::AID-DIR3>3.0.CO;2-K

Blattberg, R.C. and Deighton, J. (1996). Manage marketing by the customer equity test. Harvard Business Review, 74(4), 136-144.

Blattberg, R.C., Getz, G. and Thomas, J.S. (2001). Customer Equity: Building and Managing Relationships as Valuable Assets. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Bolton, R.N., Lemon, K.N. and Verhoef, P.C. (2004). The theoretical underpinnings of customer asset management: A framework and propositions for future research. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 32(3), 271-292. https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070304263341

Boulding, W., Staelin, R., Ehret, M. and Johnston, W.J. (2005). A customer relationship management roadmap: What is known, potential pitfalls, and where to go. Journal of Marketing, 69(4), 155-166. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.2005.69.4.155

Davenport, T.H. and Harris, J.G. (2007). Competing on Analytics: The New Science of Winning. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Day, G.S. (2011). Closing the marketing capabilities gap. Journal of Marketing, 75(4), 183-195. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.75.4.183

Farquhar, J.D. and Panther, T. (2008). Acquiring and retaining customers in UK banks: An exploratory study. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 15(1), 9-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2007.02.001

Gupta, S. and Lehmann, D.R. (2003). Customers as assets. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 17(1), 9-24. https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.10045

Gupta, S., Lehmann, D.R. and Stuart, J.A. (2004). Valuing customers. Journal of Marketing Research, 41(1), 7-18. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.41.1.7.25084

Hanssens, D.M., Rust, R.T. and Srivastava, R.K. (2009). Marketing strategy and Wall Street: Nailing down marketing's impact. Journal of Marketing, 73(6), 115-118. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.6.115

Hogan, J.E., Lemon, K.N. and Rust, R.T. (2002). Customer equity management: Charting new directions for the future of marketing. Journal of Service Research, 5(1), 4-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670502005001002

Kumar, V. and Reinartz, W. (2012). Customer Relationship Management: Concept, Strategy, and Tools (2nd ed.). Berlin: Springer.

Kumar, V., Aksoy, L., Donkers, B., Venkatesan, R., Wiesel, T. and Tillmanns, S. (2010). Undervalued or overvalued customers: Capturing total customer engagement value. Journal of Service Research, 13(3), 297-310. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375602

Kumar, V., Lemon, K.N. and Parasuraman, A. (2006). Managing customers for value: An overview and research agenda. Journal of Service Research, 9(2), 87-94. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670506293558

Neslin, S.A., Grewal, D., Leghorn, R., Shankar, V., Teerling, M.L., Thomas, J.S. and Verhoef, P.C. (2006). Challenges and opportunities in multichannel customer management. Journal of Service Research, 9(2), 95-112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670506293559

Ngai, E.W.T., Xiu, L. and Chau, D.C.K. (2009). Application of data mining techniques in customer relationship management: A literature review and classification. Expert Systems with Applications, 36(2, Part 2), 2592-2602. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2008.02.021

O'Sullivan, D. and Abela, A.V. (2007). Marketing performance measurement ability and firm performance. Journal of Marketing, 71(2), 79-93. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.2.79

Payne, A. and Frow, P. (2005). A strategic framework for customer relationship management. Journal of Marketing, 69(4), 167-176. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.2005.69.4.167

Persson, A., Ryals, L., Samuelson, L.A. and Nordman, C. (2014). Making customer relationship decisions: Analytics versus rules of thumb in commercial banking. Journal of Business Research, 67(8), 1725-1732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.02.019

Reichheld, F.F. and Sasser, W.E. Jr. (1990). Zero defections: Quality comes to services. Harvard Business Review, 68(5), 105-111.

Reinartz, W., Krafft, M. and Hoyer, W.D. (2004). The customer relationship management process: Its measurement and impact on performance. Journal of Marketing Research, 41(3), 293-305. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.41.3.293.35991

Reinartz, W.J. and Kumar, V. (2003). The impact of customer relationship characteristics on profitable lifetime duration. Journal of Marketing, 67(1), 77-99. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.1.77.18589

Rust, R.T., Ambler, T., Carpenter, G.S., Kumar, V. and Srivastava, R.K. (2004). Measuring marketing productivity: Current knowledge and future directions. Journal of Marketing, 68(4), 76-89. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.4.76.42721

Rust, R.T., Lemon, K.N. and Zeithaml, V.A. (2004). Return on Marketing: Using Customer Equity to Focus Marketing Strategy. New York, NY: AMACOM.

Shaw, M.J., Subramaniam, C., Tan, G.W. and Welge, M.E. (2001). Knowledge management and data mining for marketing. Decision Support Systems, 31(1), 127-137. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9236(00)00123-8

Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. Journal of Marketing, 68(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036

Verhoef, P.C. (2003). Understanding the effect of customer relationship management efforts on customer retention and customer share development. Journal of Marketing, 67(4), 30-45. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.4.30.18685

Wedel, M. and Kannan, P.K. (2016). Marketing analytics for data-rich environments. Journal of Marketing, 80(6), 97-121. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0413