

MARKET BASED CAPABILITIES AND RESULTS: INFERENCE FOR TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICE BUSINESSES IN NIGERIA

Akinbola, Olufemi Amos

Department of Business Administration, College of Management Sciences,
Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria

Adegbuyi, Omotayo Adeniyi

Department of Business Management, College of Development Studies,
Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

Otokiti, Bisayo Oluwatosin

Department Of Business Administration
Kwara State University, Malete, Kwara State, Nigeria

Abstract

This research is aimed at measuring the effect of market based capabilities on corporate result. The objectives of the study were to determine the relationship between market capabilities and market share, the relationship between information technology and productivity, and the relationship between customer relationship management and brand loyalty. Series of questions were asked using the questionnaire adopted by the research and three hypotheses were proposed and tested in the study. To determine the capabilities and organization performance, a sample of 100 consumers and 50 employees were drawn respectively. The data was analyzed using simple frequency tables, regression analysis and Pearson product moment correlation. Finally, the analysis shows that market capabilities has a large influence on organizational performance in its industry. Based on the above findings, there is need for organizations to recognize their capabilities that will ensure organization performance.

Keywords: Market Capabilities, Customer Relationship Management, Information Technology, Market Share

1.0 Introduction

Market based capabilities is a very critical part in the evaluation of the performance of any organization be it small or large in any sector most especially the service organization. The background of this study comes

from the resource based view theory of firm and how it helped identify the tangible and intangible entities available to a firm to effectively and or efficiently use it to its advantage and the strategic orientation decision to make use of.

According to Day, (1990) capability is a resource available to the firm which draws from resource based view of internal capacity of a firm. The shift of competitive advantage to business process from ability to create customer life time value and use of information technology databases like sales force automation to improve sales force productivity, and the use of market capabilities also referred to has market knowledge and skill application.

Recently, telecommunication organization that came into Nigeria and are still experiencing the industry boom are usually valued by the external environment but recently according Michael portal five forces of evaluating firm competitive environment, bargaining powers of buyers have increased because customers can switch service from one mobile network to another, threat from competitions bring about reduction in price of call rates pushing new entrants out of the market, soon the market returns will reduce because of competitions, there will be need to move to the internal capability programs of a firm that are rare, in-imitable, non substitutable and valuable to competitive advantage .

A typical example is the shift made by GLO telecommunications limited to the use of celebrity endorsement to gain brand loyalty, because it seemed at that time the focus was on gaining market share by most of the industry players and not brand loyalty, analyses of the market showed rivals only competed for largest customers and not patronage, a GLO customer can be an ETISALAT customer tomorrow, but with effective market link program they effectively captured that patronage was better than market share rivalry while making sure that its profitable customers are targeted alongside other competitors is an example of application of market capability that enhances competitive advantage.

1.2 Statement of Problem

The source of competitive advantage has shifted from physical to intellectual and knowledge based resource or capabilities (Prahalad & Hamel 1990). The challenge facing most firms today is the ability to identify the set of intangible market based capabilities as the ground to establishing sustainable market performance. In practical most of the capabilities available to the firm are heterogeneous and numerous in nature, but because for a resource to have and gain advantage it must be valuable, rare, in-imitable and non substitutable, it is only when these scarce resource or

capability is identified and the appropriate program is developed to meet the above criteria before an organization can have competitive advantage.

In most organization the ultimate goal of customer relationship management is brand loyalty, but its depends on the ability to identify and design effective program that will position customers and in cases where it will cost the customer absolute zero amount to switch product or service there is need for competitive advantage.

It is when these capabilities are resourcefully managed through a mixture of proper skills and knowledge before they can exhibit the characteristics that will help them gain sustainable competitive advantage.

There as being subsequent shift by management to adopt information technology in organizations and the functional departments of an organization, in most cases efficient use is important so is effective use because information technology can be used routinely but not using the technology fully will not enhance performance.

Organizations which are now based on knowledge and resource have to identify that skill and management knowledge application, planning, and implementation that will determine how market capabilities skills form competitors, segment and target markets, advertising and pricing and integrated market activity know how will be used properly.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study include:

1. To establish that a good customer relationship management program will lead to brand loyalty.
2. To make known that effective use of information technology will ensure personnel productivity.
3. To establish that market capability management will lead to increase in market share.

1.4 Research Questions

1. How will a customer relationship management program affect brand loyalty in service organization?
2. How will information technology affect personnel productivity in service organization?
3. How will market capabilities lead to market share increase in service organization?

1.5 Research Hypothesis

H₀: Customer relationship management program does not affect brand loyalty significantly in service organization.

H₀: Information does not affect the personnel productivity significantly in service organization.

2.0 Literature Review

The concept of recognizing marketing as key to the long term performance of firm as being recognized by many researchers in marketing but the ability to deduct the base area that marketing as to offer in firm value. There is need to understand the capabilities that influence business processes since market competition as increased and changed in fundamental ways, the source as shifted from tangible assets to intellectual and knowledge-based resources and capabilities (Prahalad and Hamel 1990) while capabilities are the complex bundles of skill and accumulated knowledge.

The research is based on the function of marketing to the addition of firm value, many at times other department of the organization have argued the fact on the amount of finance spent on marketing, most especially advertising and how can really see the process in the long run.

2.1.2 Resource Based Asset Creation

The Resource-Based View of the firm has been used to explain how firms allocate their scarce resources to obtain and exploit competitive capabilities.

Capabilities have been broadly defined as “complex bundles of skills and accumulated knowledge that enable firms [or SBUs] to coordinate activities and make use of their assets” (Day, 1990) suggest that “it is not possible to enumerate all possible capabilities, because every business develops its own configuration of capabilities that is rooted in the realities of its competitive market, past commitments, and anticipated requirements.” In this article, we focus on four important firm capabilities: technology, information technology (IT), market-linking, and marketing capabilities.

2.1.3 Firm Capability

To create economic value, sustain competitive advantage, and achieve superior profitability, an organization requires a wide range of capabilities (Day, 1994).

The Resource-Based View of the firm has been used to explain how firms allocate their scarce resources to obtain and exploit competitive capabilities. The RBV suggests that the mere possession of capabilities is a necessary but not sufficient condition for superior performance.

Rather, invests in capabilities that complement the existing capability base, will be best able to exploit its distinctive competencies. The firm that does this will be rewarded with sustainable competitive advantage and improved long-term performance.

According to the RBV, then, firms should allocate their scarce resources to solidifying and developing capabilities that are consistent with their strategic type

2.1.4 Technology Capabilities

Technology capabilities concern the manufacturing processes, technology, new product development, production facilities, and the forecasting of technological change in the industry. These skills are contained within the organization and are activated by market, competitor, and external challenges and opportunities. By allowing increased efficiency in the production process, they can reduce costs and improve consistency in delivery and, therefore, competitiveness.

Technology capabilities are important for all strategic types but most especially for prospectors, who thrive in unstable, changing environments, particularly those marked by rapid technological change, such as biotechnology, medical care, and aerospace (Walker et al., 2003). Since prospectors use a first-to-market strategy and typically operate within a broad product-market domain that undergoes periodic redefinition (Dodge and Robbins, 1992), they must be able to develop new technologies, products, and markets rapidly to address latent market needs (Conant, Mokwa, Varadarajan 1990 ; McDaniel & Kolari, 1987). note that prospectors require strength in product research and development cum product engineering, and they perform best when the amount spent on product R&D is high. The Resource based view would suggest that prospectors should prioritize development of technology capabilities in order to achieve sustainable competitive advantage. Because defenders typically locate and maintain a secure niche in a relatively stable product or service area, they tend to be less interested in developing new products and technologies and, therefore, less dependent on technology capabilities.

2.1.5 I.T Capabilities

A firm active in product development must be able to gather technical and market information effectively and disseminate it throughout the organization. IT capabilities facilitate internal communication and cross-functional integration.

Better IT is associated with greater strategic flexibility and, ultimately, with better financial performance and greater organizational success notes that the more creative use of IT would lead to better financial performance of firm. Others find that greater information transmission across functional areas leads to more successful new products.

2.1.7 Market Capabilities

Marketing capabilities include knowledge of the competition and of customers, as well as skill in segmenting and targeting markets, in advertising and pricing, and in integrating marketing activity. Conant et al. (1990) found that prospector firms have distinctive competencies in marketing planning, allocation of marketing resources, revenue forecasting, and control of marketing activities.

Although both prospectors and defenders require skills in Marketing and market research in order to succeed (Walker et al., 2003), Srivastava, Shervani and Fahey (1999) have identified three processes as being crucial to the creation of customer of value. These include:

1. A NPD process that aims to create solutions that customers need and want,
2. A SCM process that manages acquisition of physical and informational inputs and converts them into customer solutions in an efficient manner, and
3. A CM process that manages identification of customers, creation of customer knowledge, shaping of customer perceptions of the organization's products and image, building customer relationships through rich and satisfactory experience, and maximizing customer responses for optimal revenue and profit growth.

2.1.2.1 Firm Performance

Firm-based view of innovativeness effects are among the positive firm-based effects that could impact the marketplace performance of an innovative offering which are the following.

One is that producing highly innovative products that are new-to-the-firm or the marketplace can foster a spirit of innovation in the company that helps attract or retain creative employees and improve worker productivity.

Costs, employee turnover, and discontinuities in idea generation can be lowered as a consequence (Urban, Weinberg, & Hauser, 1996). Second, new-to-the-market innovativeness can create first-mover barriers (e.g., patents or pre-emption of competitive space) that preclude competitors from entering the marketplace with new goods of their own.

Being first can further give the firm a head start in developing, or allow it to capitalize on, unique competencies and experience curve effects that increase return on investment and lead competitors to invest in ventures where comparative expertise may be lacking.

Third, research shows that new-to-the-firm or new-to-the market offerings are more successful when the company can capitalize on synergies with marketing, management, engineering, and production.

And finally, the success of new and innovative products can be augmented when sales and marketing skills in the company are high (Cooper, 1979), so that promotional strategies properly emphasize customer education whenever innovative offerings are difficult to adopt and advertising strategies properly emphasize emotional campaigns whenever innovative offerings demand a great deal of consumer learning (Lee & O'Connor, 2003).

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Resource Based Theory

The resource-based view was popularized by Hamel and Prahalad in their book “Competing for the Future” (1994). Essentially, the view conceptualizes the firm as a bundle of resources. It is these resources, and the way that they are combined, that make firms different from one another and in turn allow a firm to deliver products and services in the market.

The **resource-based view (RBV)** is a business management tool used to determine the strategic resources available to a company. The fundamental principle of the RBV is that the basis for a competitive advantage of a firm lies primarily in the application of the bundle of valuable resources at the firm's disposal. To transform a short-run competitive advantage into a sustained competitive advantage requires that these resources are heterogeneous in nature and not perfectly mobile. Effectively, this translates into valuable resources that are neither perfectly imitable nor substitutable without great effort. If these conditions hold, the firm's bundle of resources can assist the firm sustaining above average returns. The VRIN model also constitutes a part of RBV.

The key points of the theory are:

1. Identify the firm's potential key resources.
2. Evaluate whether these resources fulfill the following criteria (referred to as *VRIN*):

Valuable – A resource must enable a firm to employ a value-creating strategy, by either outperforming its competitors or reduce its own weaknesses. Relevant in this perspective is that the transaction costs associated with the investment in the resource cannot be higher than the discounted future rents that flow out of the value-creating strategy.

Rare – To be of value, a resource must be rare by definition. In a perfectly competitive strategic factor market for a resource, the price of the resource will be a reflection of the expected discounted future above-average returns

In-imitable – If a valuable resource is controlled by only one firm it could be a source of a competitive advantage. This advantage could be

sustainable if competitors are not able to duplicate this strategic asset perfectly.

Non-substitutable – Even if a resource is rare, potentially value-creating and imperfectly imitable, an equally important aspect is lack of substitutability. If competitors are able to counter the firm's value-creating strategy with a substitute, prices are driven down to the point that the price equals the discounted future rents (Barney, 1996) resulting in zero economic profits. Care for and protect resources that possess these evaluations, because doing so can improve organizational performance (Crook, Ketchen, Combs, and Todd, 2008).

2.3 Empirical Framework

2.3.1 There is recognition that market-based capabilities contribute to a firm's financial performance, the exposition is largely conceptual (Srivastava et al. 1999). Using a resource based view of the firm, the present study proposes that, market-based assets and capabilities of a firm impacts, performance in three market-facing business processes (new product development, information technology and market capabilities), which in turn, influence, the firm's performance. According to the learning theories in competitive advantage of organization by (Hunt and Morgan 1996), they believe that it is important complex resources of the firm or organization that will create competitive advantage because it helps in improving market information processing. Studies from the theories shows us that an organization depends on strategy it takes to evaluate its market place, and organization who make use of strong market orientation and learning process have strong sustainable advantage.

Firms that are involved in market orientation are likely to engage in aggressive product development, notably, distinctive capabilities contribute to superior strategy selection and to sustainable competitive advantage, the more the process involved in underlying superior strategies and the wider it cuts across functional groups of the organization, the more difficult it would be to imitate by competitors, superior skills and resources, combined with high quality tactics, programs, and implementation systems, determine to a long way positional advantage (Day, 1988).

2.3.2 Service industries are based on delivery of promised and exchange of mutual benefit at a profit to the organization. According to (Berry 1995) it is focused on targeting profitable consumer and marketing to employees and other stakeholders using trust as a marketing tool.

Findings by Sheth and Parvatiyar (1995) relationship marketing is of the view that consumers want to reduce the risk associated with choices there making room for marketers to have long term relationship with them, and building their relationships around motives and needs of the individual

around their goals and desire leading to innovation and develop because maintaining a long term relationship is the goal of the marketers.

Every organization must have a business process that facilitates how a product or service will move its beneficiaries. The ultimate aim of customer relationship is brand loyalty, why would an organization think about short term profitability when one can go the long run.

3.0 Methodology

In other to get respondents to test the influence of market based capabilities and the results on corporate performance, the study adopted the simple random sampling technique by drawing sample from the Population that can be infinite, unconceivable and uncounted. This means that all elements that make up a population cannot be ascertained due to the large nature of the size of customers and employees of telecoms firms in Nigeria. The population considered for this study are and top managers, employees and customers from three top telecommunications industry organizations i.e. Airtel, MTN and Globacom. The Minimum Returned Sample Size Table for Continuous Categorical Data by Barlett, Kotrilik and Higgins (2001), was considered for this research and the yard's formula was used for sample size determination and calculated below:

The yard's formula

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n= sample size

N=population

e=margin of error (0.05)

Sample size for the three service organization Consumers;

$$= \frac{134}{1 + 134(5\%)^2}$$

$$= 134 / 1.335 = 100 \text{ respondents}$$

Sample size for Employees of the three service organization;

$$= \frac{57}{1 + 57(5\%)^2}$$

$$= 57 / 1.425 = 39.80 \text{ respondents per organization}$$

- 100 consumers and 50 employees of Airtel Nigeria
- 100 consumers and 50 employees of Globacom Nigeria
- 100 consumers and 50 employees of MTN Nigeria

Data Analysis and Interpretation

A total of 450 questionnaires were distributed but 363 questionnaires were retrieved. Relevant questions relating to the objectives of the study was asked and analyzed in the questionnaire. This section also covers the personal information of respondents, they include; gender, age, marital

status, qualification, working experience. A simple analysis of data collected is given below. Analysis on the return rate of questionnaires is presented below:

Category	No of questionnaire administered	Percentage of total response (%)
No of Returned	363	80.7
No of Not Returned	87	19.3
Total no of Questionnaires	450	100

This table shows the number of questionnaires distributed and the total number returned. 450 questionnaires were distributed, 363 were returned all were filled at a percentage of 80.7% which is a sufficient response rate for an applied research of this nature.

Category	Globacom	MTN	Airtel	Total
Employees	40	39	42	121
Consumers/Subscribers	70	97	75	242
Total	110	139	117	363

Field Survey (2013)

Table shows the distribution between the case studies, of a total of 50 employees for each case study and 100 consumer respondents the result is displayed in this table.

The respondents are classified according subscribers to GSM network, 28.6% are GLO, 40.8% are MTN Nigeria, 30.6 are Airtel Nigeria subscribers.

The respondents are classified according employees of GSM network, 33.1% are GLO, 32.2% are MTN Nigeria, 34.7 are Airtel Nigeria employees.

4.3 Psychometric Properties of Scale

All items were examined for scale reliability. And the scale reliability was measured using the Cronbach alpha coefficient. All the scales have acceptable reliability coefficients as shown in the table below:

Table 4.3.1: Confirmatory Cronbach Alpha Analysis Result

Measurement of Variables	Range of Cronbach Alpha	Cronbach Alpha
Market capability	0.445-0.788	0.756
Customer relationship management	0.754-0.869	0.800
Information technology	0.466-0.800	0.812
Market share	0.705-0.930	0.757
Personnel productivity	0.682-0.748	0.732
Brand loyalty	0.418-0.789	0.711
Market based capabilities	0.571-0.826	0.783
Organization performance	0.724-0.705	0.702
All Variables	0.705-0.956	0.855

Source: Field Survey 2013

Market capabilities has the value of 0.756, customer relationship management and information technology having a value of 0.80 and 0.812, market share having value of 0.757, personnel productivity of 0.732, brand loyalty of 0.711, respectively. Market based capabilities of 0.783 and organization performance of 0.855. The overall Cronbach for all the variables is 0.856. Therefore this shows that there is less internal consistency of the overall homogeneity of all the variables comprising the scales.

4.4.1 TEST OF HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis One

H₀: Customer relationship management program does not affect brand loyalty significantly in service organization.

Presentation of Results

The mean is the average value of a set of data and the measurement of the maximum and minimum value also indicate the range of data, while the standard deviation and variance measures the degree of dispersion, the error provides information about uniformity of series and reliability of other statistics obtained from the sample.

Table 4.4.1.1: Score Range, Means and Standard Deviations for Telecommunication Firms, Airtel, Globacom, and Mtn.

Product	Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	S
All	Brand Loyalty	245	7	20	17.00	2.756
	CRM	121	14	19	16.93	1.365
Airtel	Brand Loyalty	75	9	20	16.88	2.913
	CRM	42	15	19	16.86	1.260
GLO	Brand Loyalty	70	7	20	17.19	2.645
	CRM	40	14	19	17.00	1.414
Mtn	Brand Loyalty	100	8	20	16.97	2.732
	CRM	39	14	19	16.95	1.450

Source: Field Survey (2013)

Table 4.4.1.1 reflects the number of respondents for each products as well the score range, means and standard deviation for the two variables; market capabilities and organization performance. It also shows a score range and mean value of 13 and 17.00. For Airtel, Glo and Mtn the table reveals a score range of 6, 7, 6, a mean value of 16.80, 17.19, 16.97 and a standard deviation of 2.913, 2.645, 2.732 respectively for brand loyalty while customer relationship management range is 15, 14, 14, the mean is 16.86, 17.00, 16.97 and the standard deviation is 1.260, 1.414, 1.450.

Table 4.4.1.2: Regression Analysis of significance customer relationship management to brand loyalty

Products	R	Adjusted R ²	F	Sig	H ₀
All	0.356	0.104	5.654	.001	Reject
Airtel	0.429	0.119	2.852	.005	Reject
Glo	0.440	0.127	2.889	.000	Reject
Mtn	0.456	0.115	3.067	.000	Reject

Source: Field Survey 2013

Table 4.4.1.2 reflects significance of customer relationship management to brand loyalty for the service organizations, Airtel, Glo and Mtn products. The adjusted R² showed .104 i.e. (10.4 %) of the variation in market capability is caused by market share in all organizations investigated. 11.9% of the variation in market capability is caused by the market share for Airtel, 12.7% of the variation in market capability is caused by the market share for Glo, 11.5% of the variation in market capability is caused by the market share for Mtn.

Hypothesis Two:

H₀: Information technology does not affect the personnel productivity significantly in service organization

Presentation of Results

The mean is the average value of a set of data and the measurement of the maximum and minimum value also indicate the range of data, while the standard deviation and variance measures the degree of dispersion, the error provides information about uniformity of series and reliability of other statistics obtained from the sample

Table 4.4.2.1: Score Range, Means and Standard Deviations for Telecommunication Firms, Airtel, Globacom, and Mtn.

Product	Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	S
All	Information Technology	121	14	19	16.35	1.442
	Personnel Productivity	121	14	20	16.35	1.542
Airtel	Information Technology	42	14	18	16.29	1.298
	Personnel Productivity	42	14	17	15.86	1.138
Glo	Information Technology	40	5	14	16.50	1.432
	Personnel Productivity	40	6	14	16.43	1.678
Mtn	Information Technology	39	5	14	16.50	1.432
	Personnel Productivity	39	14	19	16.29	1.618

Source: Field Survey 2013

Table 4.4.1.1 reflects the number of respondents for each products as well the score range, means and standard deviation for the two variables; market capabilities and organization performance. It also shows a score range and mean value of 5, 6 and 16.35. For Airtel, Glo and Mtn the table

reveals a score range of 4, 9, 9, a mean value of 16.29, 16.50, 16.50 and a standard deviation of 1.298, 1.432, 1.432 respectively for information technology while personnel productivity is 3, 8, 5, the mean is 15.86, 16.43, 16.29 and the standard deviation is 1.168, 1.678, 1.618.

Table 4.4.2.2: Regression Analysis of Significance between information technology and personnel productivity?

Products	R	Adjusted R ²	F	Sig	H ₀
All	.560	.296	17.786	.000	Reject
Airtel	.457	.147	3.348	.029	Reject
Glo	.694	.439	11.176	.000	Reject
Mtn	.898	.789	48.357	.000	Reject

Source: Field Survey 2013

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.4.2.2 reflects relationship between information technology and personnel productivity for all products, Airtel, Glo and Mtn products. The adjusted R² showed .296 i.e. (29.6 %) of the variation in market capability is caused by market share in all organizations investigated. 14.7% of the variation in market capability is caused by the market share for Airtel, 43.9% of the variation in market capability is caused by the market share for Glo, 78.9% of the variation in market capability is caused by the market share for Mtn.

Table 4.4.2.3 reflects relationship between information technology and personnel productivity for all products, Airtel, Glo and Mtn service organizations. It reveals a relationship between information technology and personnel productivity with a Pearson correlation coefficient of .525 for Airtel of moderate correlation, .400 and .352 show weak correlation for Mtn which is statistically significant at 0.01 and 0.05 level of significance. The null hypotheses are rejected.

Table 4.4.3.3: Correlation Analysis of the Relationship between information technology and personnel productivity?

Product	Pearson Correlation	Sig.
All	.494	.000
Airtel	.447	.003
Glo	.531	.000
Mtn	.432	.000

Source: Field Survey 2013

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.4.3.3 reflects relationship between market capability and market share for all service organizations, Airtel, Glo and Mtn products. It reveals a relationship market capability and market share, with a Pearson correlation

coefficient of .432, .447 shows weak correlation for Airtel and Glo, while .531 for Mtn, and represent moderate correlation statistically significant at 0.01 and 0.05 level of significance. The null hypotheses are rejected.

Summary, Recommendations and Conclusion

Theoretical findings include:

1. There is to identify that peculiar capability that will fit the industry or the organization, has what applies to the service industry defers in product industry.
2. Due to the lack of understand of ability to convert intangible capabilities to physical market, most of the organization have opted for a moderate use of capabilities.
3. Any capability that will create advantage as to be rare, in-imitable, non-substitutable by competitors.
4. In real life no organization can have ultimate capacity advantage, competitors can easily copy strategies.
5. Intangible capabilities if used well will serve as a resource advantage that can be converted to end assets that will yield performance results.

5.2.2 Empirical Findings

These findings include details discovered during the course of field work and subsequently in the analysis of obtained data. In the research work, it was discovered that there are more female respondents for both employees and consumers from the three service industries, it was discovered that mostly MTN consumers returned their questionnaires filled, less attitude from consumers of Airtel and Globacom services.

1. Another discovery was that all three service organization exhibited at least 40 percent variation on brand loyalty.
2. Mtn exhibited the highest personal productivity, while Glo came in second, Airtel can in less in its application showed the way information technology is being utilized in each organization.
3. In market share analysis Mtn share topped in the rankings with over 10 percent a wide range while Glo coming behind Mtn and Airtel exhibiting low market share in the service industry.
4. It was also discovered that the service industry identifies brand loyalty has among each of three service organization customers felt indifferent to certain brand loyalty questions. But in the overall measure there was significant acceptance in the industry.
5. It was also discovered that informational technology is one of the highest capability tool used by the service organizations, followed

- by market share accumulation and then customer relationship management.
6. It was also discovered that individually all the three service organization exhibited the same sequence in capability adaptation because of the changing market environment.
 7. It was also discovered that personnel productivity were taken in consideration and which has considerable showed in the significant in increase in its market share.

Recommendations

As a result of the empirical findings organizations should ensure that there is an opening and continuing space for new positions of the C.I.O (Chief Information Officer) and C.R.M (Customer Relationship Management) management offices and task team to enable the focus and utilization of the information coordination and management.

Organizations and firm alike should endeavor to encourage and disburse funds into the training of employees in the organization; all training should ensure that it is integrated with any system that comes into the organization in order to ensure maximum productivity.

The management should ensure that programs are develop by this three respective offices; of the Marketing manager, the Chief information officer, and the Customer relation manager, it is when this offices have being integrated proper to generate the appropriate program that will fit the organization demand which in turn will be communicated to other department in the organization, it this program when proper managed and controlled will lead a strategy that will ensure sustaining competitive advantage over other competitors in the industry.

Intellectual skills and knowledge no how's and this era of Dot com's and "information superhighway" it is evident that every organization must gradual adjust its system to fit this new phenomena, investment must be made in creating these intangible assets that in turn yield long term profitability for and organization. It is also important to note that manager market capability is every important because this manager will determine the future value of their organization if they cannot adjust to the dynamic business environment facing everyday business today.

The business managers of organizations must ensure that long term performance is what the firm should be focused on and not short term, seeking for only market share in an industry should not be the only focus but the focus should be in converting its market share in loyal customers, because it is this loyal customer that will ensure profit in the long run when the industry curve begins to fall the organization will be able to maintain its

own share of the industry profit but only by ensure that the customers are their top market priorities and not just competition advantage.

5.3 Conclusion

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this study that has implications on strategy development for the organization under study and similar organizations operating these services. To a very large extent the level customer relationship management will affect the function of brand loyalty in many organizations, proper coordination and communication to sales representatives, marketers and various management positions of the firm are to ensure that the personalization and customer focus management commitment is first which is evident by the relative use of it by the studied firms.

Every firm or any organization exist in an industry, the studied case study exist in an industry where competition is fierce and large capital is needed for introduction and survival, studies have shown that with time the profitability of the industry will soon begin to dwindle with constant reduction in price by these service organization, the question of what will happen tomorrow if prices as low as 1kobo to make a phone call, for an organization that cannot focus on an approach that will ensure profit, will find itself gradually losing to the industry profit available, an organization that takes its market share to a level will ensure long term performance.

References:

- Barney, J.B., & Hesterly, W. (1996). "Organizational Economics: Understanding the Relationship between Organizations and Economic Analysis", in *Clegg S.R., Hardy*
- Bartlett, J.E., Kotrlik, J.W., Higgins, C. (2001 spring). *Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research*. Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, Vol. 19, No. 1, 43-50.
- Berry, Leonard L. (1995). 'Relationship marketing of services – growing interest, emerging perspectives'. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(4), 236-245.
- Cooper, R.G (1979) "The Dimensions of Industrial New Product Success and Failure' *Journal of Marketing*" 43(3): 93-103
- Conant, J., Mokwa, M., Varadarajan, R. 1990. Strategic types, distinctive marketing competencies and organisational performance: a multiple measures based study. *Strategic Management Journal* 11 (No issue number), 365-383.

- Crook, T.R., Ketchen Jr., D.J., Combs, J.G. & Todd, S.Y. (2008). Strategic resources and performance: a metaanalysis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(11), 1141-1154.
- Day, G.S. & Wensley. R. 1988, 'Assessing advantage: A framework for diagnosing competitive superiority', *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 52, April, pp. 1–20.
- Day, G.S. 1990, *Market Driven Strategy, Processes for Creating Value*, The Free Press, New York.
- Day, G.S. 1994, 'The capabilities of market-driven organisations', *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 58, October, pp. 37–51.
- Dodge, H.R. & Robbins, J.E. 1992, 'An empirical investigation of the organizational life cycle model for small business development and survival', *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 27-37.
- Hamel, Gary and Prahalad, C.K. 1994. *Competing for the Future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hunt, S. D. & Morgan, R. M. (1996) "The Resource-Advantage Theory of Competition: Dynamics, Path Dependencies, and Evolutionary Dimensions." *Journal of Marketing*, 60: 107-114.
- Lee, Y., O'Connor, G.C., (2003). The impact of communication strategy on launching new products: The moderating role of product innovativeness. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 20 (1), 4-21.
- McDaniel, Stephen W. and James W. Kolari (1987), "Marketing Strategy Implications of the Miles and Snow Strategic Typology", *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 19-30
- Prahalad, C. K. & Hamel, G. (1990) The core competence of the corporation, *Harvard Business Review*, May– June, pp. 79–91.
- Sheth, J. N. & Parvatiyar, A. (1995b) "The Evolution of Relationship Marketing." *International Business Review*, 4 (4), 397-418.
- Srivastava, R., Shervani, T.A., Fahey, L., 1999. Marketing, Business Processes and Shareholder Value: An organizationally Embedded View of Marketing Activities and the Discipline of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 63 (Special issue), 168-179.
- Urban, Glen L., Bruce Weinberg and John R. Hauser (1996), "Premarket Forecasting of Really-New Products," *Journal of Marketing*, 60,1, (January), 47-60. Abstracted in the *Journal of Financial Abstracts*, 2, 23A.
- Walker, W., Harremoës, P., Rotmans, J., van der Sluijs, J., van Asselt, M., Janssen, P. &
- Krayer von Krauss, M. (2003), 'Defining uncertainty: A conceptual basis for uncertainty management in model-based decision support', *Integrated Assessment* 4 (1), 5–18.