# Collaborative Marketing and Business Wellness of Global System of Mobile-communication (GSM) Service Providers in Nigeria

**Brown Walter Ateke**
College of Graduate Studies, University of Port Harcourt;
Nigeria
Email: ateke5019@gmail.com

**Prof. Sylva Ezema Kalu**
Department of Marketing, University of Port Harcourt
Nigeria

***Abstract***

*Rapid variations in customer requirements, market conditions and pressures from competitors have continued to instigate shifts in the business landscape. Yet, the fundamental principle of survival has continued to spell the programmes and activities of marketers. Firms are increasingly faced with the challenge of fulfilling the value requirements of customers and investors amidst scarce resources; yet they are expected to keep their businesses in good health. The current study sought to examine the nexus between collaborative marketing and business wellness of Global System of Mobile-communication (GSM) service providers in Nigeria. The study adopted an explanatory research design and employed the use of questionnaire as instrument of primary data collection. Data collected from ninety-eight (98) respondents was utilized in the final analysis. The study employed descriptive statistics at the primary level of analysis, while the P(r) was used to test the hypotheses, relying on SPSS version 20.0. Based on the analyses, the study found that collaborative marketing through resource sharing and risk sharing positively correlates with business wellness, through sales growth, market share and profitability. The study therefore concluded that business wellness is significantly influenced by collaborative marketing; and recommends that GSM service providers in Nigeria that seek to improve the wellness of their businesses should invest in collaborative marketing initiatives that allows resource sharing and risk sharing arrangements.*

***Keywords:*** *Collaborative marketing, business wellness, market share, profitability resource sharing, risk sharing, sales growth.*

## 1. Introduction

Contemporary business firms operate in a highly complex environment (Davis & Sumara, 2010) as markets have become intensely competitive and increasingly demanding. The consumers have become sophisticated in their fickleness (Nwulu & Asiegbu, 2015) because they have greater access to many channels and choices (Ateke, 2015; Ateke et al, 2015). Competitive pressures from national and international actors are on the increase due to globalization (Ateke & Elvis, 2013) and the power of information and communication technology which has rendered national boundaries impotent in insulating firms from global competition (Ateke, 2015; Nwulu & Asiegbu, 2015). Also, recent shifts in the global business landscape have raised the bar of competition (Hsu & Tang, 2010) to levels where only agile and resilient firms can survive.

Firms have increasingly found it uneasy to manage the demands of the modern day business environment on their own due to limited marketing resources and technical capability (Hsu & Tang, 2010). In the light of this, Baker et al (2005) suggests that developing collaborative marketing relationships that integrates the skills and capabilities of each firm in order to improve their competitiveness is one strategic avenue available for firms to surmount these challenges. Such collaborative marketing relationships must involve resource sharing and risk sharing arrangements in order to give firms the advantage of withstanding the uncertainties and adverse turns in the business environment (Walden, 1999) as they seek to achieve set goals in the volatile business environment (Agundu & Olotu, 2011).

The term "resource sharing is used to describe formal arrangements wherein firms jointly use materials and services in a cooperative fashion in order to provide one another with resources that might otherwise not be accessible to a firm acting alone (Walden, 1999). The term is original to library services but has since been adopted and used in other fields of learning (Walden, 1999). Resources often shared include information, technical capability, skills, infrastructure etc. Risk sharing on the other hand refers to mutual insurance between firms in a collaborative relationship designed to lower tax liabilities, increase debt capacity or to reduce the risks of bankruptcy (Khanna, 2000). Firms in a risk sharing arrangement invest jointly and reap the profits and losses associated with such investments (Khanna, 2000; Walden, 1999).

As managers increasingly realise the importance of exploring new ways of driving business wellness in terms of profitability, long-term survival and growth; they have invested resources in various programmes that they suspect, might hold the key to improving business wellness. The interest in identifying the core drivers of business wellness is premised on the conviction that only a healthy firm fulfils the value requirements of stakeholders (Ateke et al, 2015). This interest in determining the key drivers of business wellness has prompted several studies among scholars (e.g. Ateke & Iruka, 2015; Ehret et al, 2013; Benson-Rea et al, 2013; Terblanche et al, 2013; Fauzi et al, 2010; Richard, 2009; Bahadir et al, 2008; Gunasekaran et al, 2005; List & Machaczek, 2004; Gunasekaran et al, 2004a). However, none of these studies used collaborative marketing as the predictor variable, or Global System of Mobile-communication service providers as the data base. With the intent of contributing to the discourse on collaborative marketing therefore, the current study investigates the nexus between collaborative marketing and business wellness of GSM service providers in Nigeria.

## 2. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

### 2.1 Collaborative Marketing

It is very unlikely that any firm can be found in the business landscape that thrives without relationships. Relationships are indeed the soul of life (Salami & Emueje, 2015). In a business environment that is continually evolving (Kosmala & Blach, 2013); firms require resources to remain in business. Most of these resources take the form of human resources, skills, technical competence and knowledge about the business landscape (Yildirim & Cakar, 2015) and are not always readily available or within the reach of individual firms. Collaborative marketing relationships thus offer firms the opportunity to access such resources that are otherwise inaccessible to firms individually but can be exploited in collaborative ventures.

Collaborative marketing in the view of Solis (2011) is the course of actions and activities that allows a firm to coordinate its skills, interests and resources with other non-competing firms in order to achieve more than the firm could be able to do if it has acted solo. It has been a practice in promotional activities of firm for a long time. In this context, the concept permits firms that are not in direct competition and who offer products that complement each other, to combine their budgets on promotion so as to cut the cost that could have been incurred if parties acted individually. Thus, collaborative marketing does not only allow for cost saving, but also offers collective strength and credibility to parties in the collaboration.

Fea (2007) view collaborative marketing a concept that exists mostly in the mind, and is used in describing how a business process that involves at least two firms having related, bet non-competing value offerings to contribute to the assets they have at hand or skills and competences to enhance synergy and better the relationship. It is thus a relationship that works for the mutual benefit of the parties involved. It can take the form of very simple and informal one-time projects or very formal and long-lasting ventures or the bringing into being of a new firm (Solis, 2011).

All that is required for collaborative marketing to succeed is a shared interest (Shimizu, 2003). When firms pull resources together to serve a common market, they bond themselves in a number of ways to command market presence that could be greater than what they could achieve individually. Thus, collaboration increases brand awareness/recognition, customer value and customer retention for each of the participating firms (Shimizu, 2003). It requires various organisations to work together as a realistic solution for firms that seek access to larger markets but do not have the infrastructure or resources to individually serve such markets.

In collaborative marketing, several likeminded firms join resources formally to exploit a market opportunity, but not necessarily under the governance or control of one partner. Collaborative marketing may influence many areas of the firm. Because by choosing to go into collaboration with other firms, the firm may adjust its operations, policies and processes to accommodate the overall interest of the collaboration (Samiee, 2008). It is usually not a decision to be taken lightly (Bititci, et al, 2004). In fact, establishing some type of business collaboration may be one of the more complicated decisions the management of a firm can make (Solis, 2011; Hsu & Tang, 2010; Baker et al, 2005; Shimizu, 2003).

Ochterski (2012) identified the success factors in marketing collaboration to include like-mindedness, communication, enhanced market opportunities and improved bottom line. He asserts that marketing collaboration demonstrates its strength in economic terms with reduced labour and marketing expenses. Since the essence of collaborative marketing is to achieve shared goals and values, collaborating firms have to agree on the principles of their marketing strategy as well as how it is executed and how success is to be measured (Bititci, et al, 2004). From the forgoing, it is apparent that collaborative marketing involves, but not limited to resource and risk sharing joint investment between and among like-minded firms. This study therefore treats resource sharing and risk sharing as indicators of collaborative marketing.

### *2.1.1 Resource sharing*

Resource sharing relationships connotes understanding between firms to make their assets available to one another, including collective sharing of functions, processes, ideas, information, manpower, infrastructure, technical competence, skills etc. (Rabiu, 2012). In other words, resource sharing describes a situation whereby at least two firms work together to offer advanced services to customers, such that the end service delivered to the customer is far better than it would have been if the firms attempted to serve the customers individually. It attempts to expand the accessibility of specialized skills and rare competencies that are outside the reach of a single entity (Rabiu, 2012). Resource sharing alleviates the shortcomings of firms as it provides an avenue for them to source information, infrastructure, technical and other resources associated with their operations from other like-minded non-competing firms.

Given that no firm can afford to conveniently and effectively serve the entirety of a given market segment (Dannelly, 1995), firms often resort to interfirm relationships wherein resource sharing is encouraged and used to complement one another (Campbell, 2006). Thus, it can be assumed that limitations in manpower, infrastructure and technical resources and the desire of firm to gain good market presence is what informs collaborative enterprises. Though the competitive nature of modern day business environment suggests that firms must be secretive, firms that pursue long-term survival usually focus adequately on long-term preservation issues and collaboration between like-minded non-competing firms is one strategic posturing that strengthens collaborating firms and weakens competitors (Jackson, 2005).

### *2.1.2 Risk sharing*

Risk sharing in collaborative marketing is a term used to describe distribution of business losses and uncertainties among parties in a collaborative arrangement. Risk sharing in this sense involves exchanges that allow adequate flow of funds to match the fixed investment plans and the common sharing of the risks associated with the investment (Khanna, 2000; Khanna & Palepu, 2000; Ghemawat & Khanna, 1998). The extent of risk sharing that exists between collaborating firms is important because it encourages firms to venture into risky and often shunned investments.

Risk sharing business relationships among key players in industries helps firms to accommodate shocks in particular sectors of an economy (Chang & Hong, 1999). This position is in harmony with business theories that holds that relationships serve roles of risk sharing and mutual insurance in less-developed markets (Chang & Hong, 1999). Thus, collaborative marketing relationships confers benefits to participating parties by making risk sharing possible through the transfer or exchange of resources from viable units to struggling ones during challenging times (He et al, 2013).

To make long-term survival possible in interfirm relationships, member firms assist each other in times of adverse economic condition (Prowse, 1992), hence a party in the relationship that is not doing well may fall back on other parties for funding, skills or technologies that can protect it from the chastising of the business environment (Shin & Park, 1999). According to Chang and Hong (2000), in profitable interfirm relationships, firms that are prospering help the ones that are performing poorly, using transactions that are within the relationship such as debt guarantees and cash injection.

Indeed, risk sharing provides firms with various sources of income and shields them from financial crisis. The numerous benefits that accrue to members in a risk sharing relationship notwithstanding, risk sharing has received very little empirical attention from researchers and business executives (Khanna, 2000; Khanna & Palepu, 2000; Weinstein & Yafeh, 1995; Chang & Choi, 1988). The current study therefore intends to complement existing literature on the benefits of risk sharing relationships for firm.

## 2.2 Business Wellness

Business wellness describes the health of a business as an outcome of management processes measured against stated corporate goals or compared to the health of competing firms. To Daft (1991) business wellness is a measure of a company's capacity to achieve set goals by employing or utilizing scarce resources effectively and efficiently; while Fauzi (2010) and Richard et al (2009) suggests that business wellness captures the outcome of management processes and organizational performance in terms of performance outcomes in relation to set goals of the firm and other considerations that are broader than what is usually captured in the firm's assessment and economic valuation by stakeholders. A business organization is said to be healthy if it is able to cope, survive and make progress (Amah et al, 2013) amidst the competitive pressures and market demands of the modern day business environment.

Business wellness as a concept is abstract and difficult to measure directly. Hence organizations select indirect indices to denote it. Such indirect indices of performance measurements include market share, sales turn-over, customer satisfaction, profitability, productivity, cost minimization and development (Richard et al, 2009). Business wellness is viewed form operational, market and financial perspectives in strategic management literature (Fauzi et al, 2010; Nwokah & Maclayton, 2006; Venktrakaman & Ramanugan, 1986; Lenz, 1980). The operational perspective considers product quality, marketing effectiveness etc., the market perspective considers sales growth, market share etc. while the financial perspective considers stock price, dividend pay-out, earnings per share, etc. (Fauzi et al, 2010).

This categorization points to the fact that different aspects of business wellness hold different levels of importance in management, marketing and accounting research (fauzi et al, 2010); organization structure, control system, business environment and strategy are such other constructs that this categorization have bearing on (fauzi et al, 2010; Langfield-Smith, 1997). A balanced assessment of business wellness will therefore look at business performance in relation to financial, market and operational based business goals (Venktrakaman & Ramanugan, 1986). Thus, the balance scorecard as an extended measurement of corporate performance was coined by Kaplan and Norton (1992); whose core idea is to strike a balance between financial and non-financial aspects of corporate performance measurement.

From the forgoing, it is evident that business wellness is a concept with multiple indicators, and can be used in differing contexts between profit and non-profit oriented organisations. In the current study however, business wellness is viewed from the profit oriented perspective, and is measured through sales growth, market share and profitability.

### *2.2.1 Sales growth*

Sales growth is an incremental change in the sales of a firm's product over a given time interval, often expressed as a percentage. It is an important indicator of business wellness and sustainability, and is closely associated with the marketing function (Morgan & Rego, 2006; Ambler, 2003). Sales growth is a strong metric of marketing performance and by implication, business wellness. The wellness of an organization may be evaluated by the rate at which its sales grow (Didia & Nwokah, 2015). Successful new products contribute to company profit via sales growth. Sales growth is therefore an essential parameter of business wellness (Nwokah, 2008).

Sales growth describes the rate at which a firm's sales revenue increases. It is a key metric that firms must monitor over succeeding accounting periods in order to have a fair grasp of trends because it constitute a necessary component of forecasting and facilitates managerial decision making. As a measure of business wellness, sales growth provides business executives with an evaluation of the firm's competitiveness (Klipfolio, 2015). This metric of business wellness can be further broken down to indicate how salespeople can contribute to the achievement of organizational goals.

### *2.2.2 Market share*

In order to ascertain the performance of an organization, a set of core measures are identified. These core measures include profitability and market share (Gunasekaran et al, 2005). While profitability is the ability of a firm to earn profit, market share in marketing discourse is the quotient of a total market that a firm is able to capture and service (Nwokah & Didia, 2015; Bell et al, 2008). Gunasekaran et al (2005) suggests that market share as an index of business wellness assesses how well consumers patronize the product of a given brand in the market environment. These authors further suggest that market share is sometimes used to denote the market position of a firm in relation to other firms in an industry; implying that a bigger market share means better organizational health.

Also, as a measure of business wellness, market share is a measure used to assess the efforts of the marketing function (Morgan & Rego, 2006). It is considered to be among the best indices of the wellness of a firm. This is because it abstracts from variables that pertains to an entire industry (Nwokah & Maclayton, 2006), also because it is the portion of the market potential of the industry that an individual firm retains. Mostly, market share is gained through satisfied and retained customership (Didia & Nwokah, 2015). Thus, to improve its market share, the firm must reinforce customer retention (Ateke, 2015; Ateke & Iruka, 2015; Iruka & Ateke, 2014), provide a focal point of differentiation and optimize media presence (Mack, 1996) in Didia and Nwokah (2015). The concept of market share and the concept of prospect are important to firms because they indicate the additional business that a brand can win and how and when to obtain it (Richard, 2009).

### *2.2.3 Profitability*

Profit is the monetary earning a business firm achieves after all costs associated with the operations of the firm have been deducted. Such costs may include salaries, wages, expenses and other operating costs (Nickels et al, 2011). Profitability is thus the ability of a business undertaking to make profit or the degree to which a business is profitable. Profitability is a quantitative and financial metric often used to assess a firm's ability to generate earning in excess of the combination of all the expenses it incurred on a given investment during a specific accounting period. According to Ejoh and Iwara (2014), scholars have identified Return on Assets (ROA) and Return on Equity (ROE) as the commonly agreed indicators of profitability; though anyone of them can be used to measure profitability depending on the objective of the user.

Profitability is a very important concept in business; and has caught the interest of managers, shareholders and academic researchers alike (Ejoh & Iwara, 2014) since the dawn of commerce. Also of interest to businesses, are the factors that determine profitability (Athanasoglou, et al, 2005). Profitability is no doubt a fundamental goal of business ventures; because the long term survival of a business concern is closely tied to its ability and capacity to make profit (Farris et al, 2010). Though managers often resort to profitability as a common measure of business wellness, it is relevant to note that business wellness that results in enhanced profit is determined by quantitative and non-quantitative indices. Also, it is observable that a greater percentage of performance indices used in practical marketing are financial and quantitative (Pont & Shaw, 2003); even though these do not seem adequate, especially when measuring important elements of marketing performance that are qualitative (Lehmann, 2004).

## 2.3 Collaborative Marketing and Business Wellness

Literally, collaboration denotes working together. It is a term used to describe an arrangement where individuals or firms work in cooperation to achieve a common purpose. Thus, collaborative enterprise is used to describe two or more firms that work together to exploit an available market opportunity. Bititci et al (2004), adopting a network point of view, perceive collaborative enterprise as distinct organizations that work in equity and trust; exchanging information and other resources and complementing each other's capacity for mutual benefit.

Firms in today's globalized economy are making efforts to renew their processes in order to sustain their edge in the competition; and collaboration is one avenue that has helped in this effort (Baker et al, 2005; Bititci et al, 2004). Thus, value chains, extended enterprises, supply chains are becoming common-placed collaborative marketing practices (Bititci et al, 2004). However, collaboration just for the sake of it may not be enough; if businesses are to achieve and maintain competitive advantage and sustained business wellness, collaboration should result in creation of new and unique value propositions based on a unified approach to value creation (Bititci et al, 2004).

The proposition underpinning the concept of collaborative value creation between organisations is that there should be a win-win situation for all parties concerned (Morgan, 2015; Ochterski, 2012); since collaboration works on the understanding that value creation in networks such as supply chains leverage on the individual and collective capabilities and competencies of the parties involved (Bititci et al, 2004). The primary goal and fundamental principle of business is survival (Gilaninia et al, 2013); much as the sustainability and profitability of every firm is anchored on identifying and satisfying the value requirements of customers. Hence, due to developments arising from technology and market conditions; transformation of business practices, expectations of partners in value networks and customers' demand for greater value (Lancioni et al, 2003); most firms are adopting collaborative marketing with a view to responding effectively and timeously to challenges and opportunities in the business environment.

Several studies on collaboration have been reported in literature, especially in the fields of supply chain management, production management, construction engineering, etc. (e.g. Pollack, 2012; Rajabzadeh et al, 2010; Hsu & Tang, 2010; Samiee, 2008; Gunesekaran et al, 2004; Bititci et al, 2004; Normann & Ramírez, 1993) and most of these studies suggest positive effects of collaboration on company fortunes. Gunesekaran et al (2004) aver that marketing alliances will remain an important success factor for companies in this decade since the success of companies in the fast changing global business environment depends highly on value network efficiency and their capabilities to provide value for the customers.

Firms pursue a number of different performance objectives simultaneously (Morgan & Rego, 2006; Greve, 2003; Hauser & Katz, 1998) and monitors the achievement of these objectives, using financial, customer, internal, and learning-based metrics (Morgan & Rego, 2006), with relative importance attached to some metrics more than others, depending on the firm's strategic vision and strategy (Ambler 2003). It is the supposition of this paper that companies that work in collaboration with other like-minded companies with a common goal are likely to achieve optimal capacity utilization, production efficiency, reduced lead time and customer satisfaction (Rajabzadeh et al, 2010; Hsu & Tang, 2010; Bititci et al, 2004), which informs sales growth, increased market share and increased profitability. Hence the paper proposes as follows:

**Ho$_1$**: Resource sharing does not have significant relationship with sales growth of GSM service providers.

**Ho$_2$**: Resource sharing does not have significant relationship with market share of GSM service providers.

**Ho$_3$**: Resource sharing does not have significant relationship with profitability of GSM service providers.

**Ho$_4$**: Risk sharing does not have significant relationship with sales growth of GSM service providers.

**Ho$_5$**: Risk sharing does not have significant relationship with market share of GSM service providers.

**Ho$_6$**: Risk sharing does not have significant relationship with profitability of GSM service providers.

## 3. Methodology

The onus of this study was to investigate the nexus between collaborative marketing and business wellness of Global System of Mobile-communication (GSM) service providers in

Nigeria. The study is explanatory in nature and was conducted in a non-contrived setting. It adopted a quantitative approach in its methodology which allows the use of questionnaire as instrument of primary data collection. A purposefully designed questionnaire was thus used as the instrument of inquiry. The instrument required respondents to tick from 1-5 on a scale, where 1= very low extent; 2= low extent 3= moderate extent; 4= great extent; 5= very great extent.

The study collected data from top and middle level management staff of GSM service providers in Nigeria. The choice of this class of managers is hinged on the premise that they are more knowledgeable and better informed about the strategic directions and major operational activities of the firms. A total of one hundred (100) respondents made up of twenty-five (25) managers from each of the four (4) GSM service providers in Nigeria participated in the study. However, the study utilized responses from ninety-eight (98) respondents in the final analysis, as two of the retrieved questionnaires were deemed not appropriately completed.

The validity of the study instrument in terms of clarity of words, relevance of items and appropriateness of sentences was confirmed through expert jury opinion, consisting of members of the academia and practitioners with adequate knowledge of the subject of the study. The internal consistency of the measurement items of the instrument was ascertained through the Cronbach's Alpha test of reliability with a threshold of 0.70 set by Nunnally (1978). The test statistic used in testing the hypotheses is the Person Product Correlation (PPMC). The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance in a 2-talied test relying on SPSS version 20.0.

In determining the strength of relationship between the variables under focus, the study took a cue from Agundu and Olotu (2011) by adopting the categorization scheme set by Evans (1996) as follows:

- ± 0.00 - ± 0.19 = Very Weak
- ± 0.20 - ± 0.39 = Weak
- ±0.40 - ± 0.59 = Moderate
- ± 0.60 - ± 0.79 = Strong
- ± 0.80 - ± 1.00 = Very Strong.

The interpretation process was subject to 0.01 (two tail) level of significance.

## 4. Results

**Table 2: Summary of Result of Analyses of Correlation between Dimensions of Collaborative Marketing and Metrics of Business Wellness**

| Test Statistic | Variables | Statistics | Sales Growth | Market Share | Profitability |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| P(r) | Resource Sharing | Correlation Coefficient | .720** | .768** | . 814** |
| | | Sig (2-tailed) | 000 | 000 | 000 |
| | | N | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| | Risk Sharing | Correlation Coefficient | .520** | .633** | .763** |
| | | Sig (2-tailed) | 000 | 000 | 000 |
| | | N | 98 | 98 | 98 |

## 5. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The test of hypotheses revealed that collaborative marketing and business wellness are positively correlated, and the correlation is also found to be statistically significant. This finding can be admitted as reality because collaborative marketing enables firms to respond effectively and timeously to challenges and opportunities in the business environment. Such timely response to market demands and customer expectations enables companies to accomplish their primary and fundamental goal of survival (Gilaninia et al, 2013).

Also, the finding of this study largely cohere with the position of Gunesekaran et al (2004) who states that marketing alliances constitute critical success factor for firms in the fast changing global business environment. Further, the finding of the current study agrees with the statement of Baker et al (2005) and Bititci et al (2004) who suggests that collaborative marketing do not only offer companies the avenue to re-create their businesses; but also allows them to create and maintain a competitive edge in today's global economy where market conditions and customers' demand for greater value (Lancioni et al, 2003) dictate the tempo and rhythm of business decisions and actions.

Based on the above, this study concludes that collaborative marketing informs business wellness and that business wellness is significantly influenced by collaborative marketing. The study thus recommends that GSM service providers that seek business wellness through improved sales growth, increased market share and profitability must invest in collaborative marketing enterprises that allow resource sharing and risk sharing arrangements. Such arrangements should encourage business relationships wherein competencies and skills are frequently exchanged to complement one another in serving their customers; and allow marketing information sharing, and joint marketing efforts like research and development exercises in which business opportunities and uncertainties are evenly shared. It is the considered view of this study that arrangements like these will endow firms with unique and sustainable competitive advantages that will guarantee their long-term survival and growth.

**References**


Agundu, P. U. C., & Olotu, O. A. O. (2011). Corporate relationship marketing in developing economies: Sustainability tonic for Nigerian banks. *African Research Review*, 5(2), 72-86.

Amah, E., Daminabo-Weje, M., & Dosunmu, R. (2013). Size and organizational effectiveness: Maintaining a balance. *Advances in Management & Applied Economics*, 3(5), 115-123.

Ambler, T. (2003). *Marketing and the Bottom Line.* 2nd Edition. London: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.

Ateke, B. W., Elvis, I. C. (2013). Positioning in corporate Nigeria: How Nigerian organisations compete for a share of the consumers' mind. *African Social and Policy Journal*, 5(3), 49-55.

Ateke, B. W. (2015). Customer involvement management as a correlate of customer retention in the hospitality industry. *IIARD-International Journal of Marketing Research*, 1(1), 1-9.

Ateke, B. W., & Iruka, H. C. (2015). Investigating the relationship between customer involvement management and marketing performance in the manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 2(9), 22-34.

Ateke, B. W., Ogonu, G. C., & Ishmael, E. C. (2015). Perceived justice initiatives and customers' post-complaint satisfaction in the fastfood industry. *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, 14, 117-125.

Athanasoglou, P. P., Sophocles, N. B., & Matthaios D. D. (2005). Bank-specific, industry-specific and macroeconomic determinants of bank profitability. *Bank of Greece*

*Working Paper*, No. 25.
Bell, D. E., Keeney, R. L., & little, J. D. C. (2008). A market share theorem. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12(2), 10-17.
Bahadir, S. C., Bharadwaj, S. G., & Srivastava, R. K. (2008). Financial value of brands in mergers and acquisitions: Is value in the eye of the beholder? *Journal of Marketing*, 72(6), 49-64.
Baker, S. M., Faircloth, J. B., & Simental, V. (2005). Perceptions of university-corporate partnership influences on a brand. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 13(2), 32-46.
Benson-Rea, M., Brodie, R. J., & Sima, H. (2013). The plurality of co-existing business models: Investigating the complexity of value drivers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(5), 717-729.
Bititci, U. S., Martinez, V., Albores, P., & Parung, J. (2004). Creating and managing value in collaborative networks. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, 34(3-4), 251-268.
Campbell, S. A. (2006). To buy or not to buy, that is the question. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery and Electronic Reserve*, 16(3), 35-39.
Chang, S. J., & Hong, J. (2000). Economic performance of group-affiliated companies in Korea: Intragroup resource sharing and internal business transactions. *Academic Management Journal*, 43, 141-158.
Chang, S., & Choi, U. (1988). Strategy, structure, and performance of Korean business groups: A transaction cost approach. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 37, 141-158.
Daft, R. L. I. (1991). *Management*. Chicago: Dryden Press.
Dannelly, G. N. (1995). Resource sharing in the electronic era: Potentials and paradoxes. *Library Trends*, 43(4), 663-678.
Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2010). If things were simple...: Complexity in education. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 16(4), 856-860.
Didia, J. U. D, & Nwokah, G. N. (2015). Customer service integration and business performance in the telecommunication industry in Nigeria. *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, 13, 99-108.
Ehret, M., Kashyap, V., & Wirtz, J. (2013). Business models: Impact on business markets and opportunities for marketing research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42, 649-655.
Ejoh, N., O., & Iwara, U., Ubi. (2014). The impact of capital adequacy on deposit money banks' profitability in Nigeria. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 5(12), 7-15.
Evans, J. D. (1996). *Straightforward statistics for the behavioural sciences*. Pacific Groove, California: Brook/Cole Publishing.
Farris, P. W., Neil, T. B., Phillip, E. P., & David, J. R. (2010). *Marketing metrics: The definitive guide to measuring marketing performance*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
Fauzi, H., Svensson, G., & Rahman, A. B. (2010) Triple bottom line as sustainable corporate performance: A proposition for the future. *Sustainability*, 2, 1345-1360.
Fea, C. (2007). What is collaborative marketing? Retrieved January 2015 from www.ezinearticles.com.
Fornell, C. (1995). The quality of economic output: Empirical generalizations about its distribution and relationship to market share. *Marketing Science*, 14(3), G203-G211.
Ghemawat, P., & Khanna, T. (1998). The nature of diversified business groups: A research design and two case studies. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 46, 35-61.
Gilaninia, S., Ganjinia, H., & Mahdikhanmahaleh, B. A. (2013). Difference between internal and external supply chain risks on its performance. *Singaporean Journal of Business,*

*Economics and Management Studies*, 1(8), 12-18.
Greve, H. R. (2003). *Organizational learning from performance feedback*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Gunasekaran, A. H., & Ngai, E.W. T. (2004b). Information systems in supply chain integration and management. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 159, 269-295.
Gunasekaran, A., C., Patel, C., & McGaughey, R. E. (2004a). A framework for supply chain performance measurement. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 87, 333-347.
Gunasekaran, A. H., Williams, J., & McCanghey, R. E. (2005). Performance measurement and costing system in new enterprise. *Technovation*, 25(5), 523-534.
Hauser, J., & Katz, G. (1998). You are what you measure! *European Management Journal*, 16(5), 516-528.
He, J., Mao, X., Rui, O. M., & Zha, X. (2013). Business groups in China. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 22, 166-192.
Hsu, H., & Tang, J. (2010). A Model of marketing strategic alliances to develop long-term relationships for retailing. *International Journal of Business and Information*, 5(2), 151-172.
Iruka, H. C., & Ateke, B. W. (2014). Customer involvement management practices and customer retention in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 5(8), 61-72.
Jackson, M. E. (2005). Re-examining the future of resource sharing. *Interlending and Document Supply*, 33(4), 212-223.
Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1992, January–February). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 71-80.
Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (2000). Is group membership profitable in emerging markets? An analysis of diversified Indian business groups. *Journal of Finance*, 55, 867-891.
Khanna, T. (2000). Business groups and social welfare in emerging markets: Existing evidence and unanswered questions. *European Economic Review*, 44, 748-761.
Klipfolio, (2015). Sales growth. Retrieved September 2015 from http://www.klipfolio.com/resources/kpi-examples/sales/sales-growth
Kosmala, M. W., & Blach, J. (2013). The need for insurance education among non-financial companies in Poland: Survey result. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 2938-2946.
Kueng, P. (2000). Process performance measurement system: A tool to support process-based organizations. *Total Quality Management*, 11, 214-223.
Lancioni R., Schau, H. J., & Michael, F. S. (2003). Internet impacts on supply chain management, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 32, 173-175.
Langfield-Smith, K. (1997). Management control systems and strategy: A critical review. *Accounting Organisation Society*, 22, 207-232.
Lehmann, D. R. (2004). Linking marketing to financial performance and firm value. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 73-75.
Lenz, R.T. (1980). Environmental strategy, organization structure and performance: Pattern in one industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1, 209-226.
List, B., & Machaczek, K. (2004). Towards a corporate performance measurement system. *Journal of Cooperative Information Systems*, 7(2&3), 215-247.
Montgomery, C. A., Wernerfelt, B. (1991). Sources of superior performance: Market share versus industry effects in the US brewing industry. *Management Science*, 37(8), 954-959.
Morgan, N. A., & Rego, L. L. (2006). The value of different customer satisfaction and loyalty

metrics in predicting business performance. *Marketing Science*, 25(5), 426-439.

Morgan, R. (2015). Examples of companies with a highly effective value network. Retrieved January 2015 from http://www.smaillbusiness. chron.Com/examples-of-companies-with-highly-effective-value-networks-12804.html.

Nickels, G., McHugh, J. M., & McHugh, S. M. (2011). Understanding business. 9th Edition. New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Normann, R., & Ramírez, R. (1993, July/August). From value chain to value constellation: Designing interactive strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 65-77.

Nwokah, N. G. (2008). Strategic market orientation and business performance: The study of food and beverage organizations in Nigeria. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42 (3/4), 279-289.

Nwokah, N. G., & Maclayton, D. W. (2006). Customer focus and business performance: the study of food and beverages organizations in Nigeria. *Measuring Business Excellence: The Journal of Organizational Performance Management.* 10(4), 65-76.

Nunally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. 2nd Edition. New York; McGraw-Hill.

Nwulu, C. S., & Asiegbu, I. F. (2015). Advancement inclination behaviors and university academic staff patronage of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 2(6), 94-104.

Ochterski, J. (2012). *Collaborative marketing for small farms: Selling and working together for profitability*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Pollack, G. J. (2012). The power of partnerships in brand marketing. Retrieved January 2015 from http://www.pbmmarketing.com.

Pont, M. & Shaw, R. (2003). Measuring marketing performance: A critique of empirical literature. *Journal Business Research*, 13(2), 153–172.

Prowse, S. D. (1992). The structure of corporate ownership in Japan. *Journal of Finance*, 47, 1121-1140.

Rabiu, A. M. (2012). The roles of library and librarian in information resource sharing in the emerging information society. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 2(7), 79-85.

Rajabzadeh, A., Hassanzadeh, A. R., Nalchigar, N., & Nalchigar, S. (2010). Providing model of factors affecting risk in electronic supply chain and its impact on organizational performance. *Journal of Information Technology Management*, 2(4), 59-78.

Richard, D. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Toward methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 4(2), 19 -28.

Salami, C. G. E., & Emueje, I. (2015). Customer relationship management and competitive advantage in the Nigerian telecommunication industry. *Being a paper presented at the 2015 annual conference of the faculty of management sciences of the Delta State University*, Nigeria.

Samiee, S. (2008). Global marketing effectiveness via alliances and electronic commerce in business-to-business markets. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37(1), 3-8.

Shimizu, K. (2003). *Symbiotic marketing strategy*. 4th Edition. Japan: Souseisha Book Company.

Shin, H., & Park, Y. S. (1999). Financing constraint and internal capital markets: Evidence from Korean "Chaebols". *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 5, 169-191.

Solis, B. (2011). Engage: *The complete guide for brands and businesses to build, cultivate and measure success in the web*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Terblanche, N. S., Gerber, C., Erasmus, P., & Schmidt, D. (2013). A marketing perspective on the impact of financial and non-financial measures on shareholder value. *SAJEMS*, 16(2), 216-230.

Venktrakaman, N., & Ramanugan, V. (1986). Measurement of business performance in strategy research: A comparative of approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 801-814.

Walden, B. L. (1999). Resources sharing among north American libraries past, present and future: A model for export? Retrieved October 2015 from www.Stub.Unifrankfurt.Demesse/Proceeding/Walden

Weinstein, D., & Yafeh, Y. (1995). Collusive or competitive? An empirical investigation of keiretsu behavior. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 43, 359-376.

Yildirim, I., & Cakar, L. R. (2015). A study on the collaboration opportunities between Universities and insurance industries in Turkey. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 2(9) 163-172.