AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

ISSN: 2576-5973
Vol. 6, No. 2, 2023

Product Differentiation and Organizational Performance: A Study of Mtn Nigeria, Uyo

DR. IME ROBSON NSEOBOT
Department of Business Administration, Akwa Ibom State Polytechnic, Ikot Osurua, Ikot Ekpene, Nigeria | Email: nseobot857@yahoo.com | Phone Number: +234 8034255040

IBANGA, ATAUYO EDEM Ph.D
Department of Business Administration & Management, Akwa Ibom State Polytechnic, Ikot Osurua, Ikot Ekpene, Nigeria | Email: realvoicenignet@gmail.com

NKPODOT, UKEME CHARLSE
Department of Accounting, Akwa Ibom State Polytechnic, Ikot Osurua, Ikot Ekpene, Nigeria

Abstract: In order to better understand the connection between product differentiation and organisational success, this research employed MTN Nigeria, Uyo as its case study. The study's null hypotheses were based on the study's stated aims. This study is using a survey as its research method. Two hundred ninety-five (295) employees from MTN Nigeria, Uyo were included in the study's population. One hundred and fifty-nine people were chosen at random from the total population. A questionnaire was the means through which information was gathered. Completed surveys were analysed using descriptive statistics and linear regression. Product differentiation strategy, as the results showed and concluded, is to provide goods and services with features that set them apart from rivals and are highly appreciated by customers. According to the findings, product design may have a positive effect on an organization's performance, hence it is advised that management pay more attention to it. In order to increase profits and aid consumers in making purchasing decisions, businesses should advocate for strong product branding.

Keywords: Product; Differentiation; Organization; Performance; MTN

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

INTRODUCTION

Changes in the business environment during the last few decades have been related to studies of corporate strategy since these shifts have compelled companies to adapt their tactics in order to remain competitive. When examining corporate strategies, researchers often highlight the importance of being competitive. Generic competitive strategy is the greatest competitive advantage a business has (Porter, 2008). Several scholars have written extensively on environmental dynamics and the challenges they provide to corporate and firm competitiveness in light of Porter's five-force model (Certo and Peters, 2013).

Previous methods mainly looked at how things like competition and consumer demand impacted a company's success. Barney's (2012) resource-based business perspective argues against this strategy. The authors state that their success and longevity stem from their ability to develop strategies that provide value that is difficult to replicate or prohibitively costly to reproduce. According to Chandler (2009), rivalry emerges as a natural consequence of expansion. His contributions reduced transaction costs and boosted the competitiveness of organisations by better connecting their organisational frameworks, geographic locations, and technological capabilities. In his research, he looked at successful businesses that expanded into new areas and flourished thanks to backward vertical integration, economies of scale, and diversification.

Deploying existing resources and skills to untapped market niches is a tried-and-true strategy for company growth.Academics have long recommended that businesses find ways to set themselves apart from the competition by offering superior want-satisfying solutions (Wernerfelt and Montgomery, 2008). According to research by Raduan, Jegak, Haslinda, and Alimin (2009), businesses with distinctive offerings are more likely to thrive in the market.

Company success has also been connected to strategic choices, the use of cutting-edge technology, and the production of high-quality goods. Research shows that a company's growth and competitiveness are influenced by its strategy (Sandlberg, 2006). Various frameworks for developing and implementing competitive strategies have been offered and subjected to empirical testing (Hayes and Schmenner, 2008). Strategic management literature has been profoundly impacted by Porter's (1980) generic strategy framework since it is the most effective at generating exceptional results. It provides a solid foundation upon which to build the rest of this research.

Johnson, Scholes, and Whittington (2008) The goal of the differentiation strategy is to get an economic edge over the competition. The business is able to set itself apart in a variety of ways (Kotler & Keller, 2014). When it comes to advertising and sales, the corporation may also come up with something special. The term "retail mix" refers to the combination of products, pricing, marketing, sales, and shop atmosphere (Fairhust & Moore, 2013).

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

A differentiation strategy cannot be developed without first identifying the key customers and main rivals (Hitt, Ireland, & Hoskisson, 2012).

The success of the industry is a result of the operators' efforts to provide consumers with cutting-edge and reasonably priced goods and services. The competition from other businesses is quite high in the telecom market. Government pricing limits, foreign currency limitations, and investment freedom have all contributed to the rise of marketing wars. The telecoms industry in Jordan is struggling and could use some strategic advice to help it expand more quickly. The differentiation of products and the effectiveness of businesses are the focus of this research.

PROBLEM OF THE STUDY

Differentiating from rivals' offerings is a common strategy used by businesses to get an advantage in the marketplace. To successfully sell clients on sustainable goods, businesses must conduct an honest assessment of the competitive situation. Product differentiation is a marketing tactic used by businesses to set their wares apart from the competition in ways other than price. Because customers' impressions of the organisation are important, it is crucial that they hear the USP.

Despite the fact that businesses in this market need to distinguish their goods to develop and maintain competitive advantage and that the degree of difference determines the competitive dynamics inside the organisation, few companies in this sector seem to make use of differentiation. Competitor protection and profit maximisation strategies based on product differentiation seem to be moving at a snail's pace. The purpose of this research is to determine whether and how product differentiation impacts the efficiency of businesses.

Concept of Product differentiation

Changes in the business environment during the last few decades have been related to studies of corporate strategy since these shifts have compelled companies to adapt their tactics in order to remain competitive. When examining corporate strategies, researchers often highlight the importance of being competitive. Generic competitive strategy is the greatest competitive advantage a business has (Porter, 2008). Several scholars have written extensively on environmental dynamics and the challenges they provide to corporate and firm competitiveness in light of Porter's five-force model (Certo and Peters, 2013).

Previous methods mainly looked at how things like competition and consumer demand impacted a company's success. Barney's (2012) resource-based business perspective argues against this strategy. The authors state that their success and longevity stem from their ability to develop strategies that provide value that is difficult to replicate or prohibitively costly to reproduce. According to Chandler (2009), rivalry emerges as a natural consequence of expansion. His contributions reduced transaction costs and boosted the competitiveness of organisations by better connecting their organisational

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

frameworks, geographic locations, and technological capabilities. In his research, he looked at successful businesses that expanded into new areas and flourished thanks to backward vertical integration, economies of scale, and diversification.

Deploying existing resources and skills to untapped market niches is a tried-and-true strategy for company growth.Academics have long recommended that businesses find ways to set themselves apart from the competition by offering superior want-satisfying solutions (Wernerfelt and Montgomery, 2008). According to research by Raduan, Jegak, Haslinda, and Alimin (2009), businesses with distinctive offerings are more likely to thrive in the market.

Company success has also been connected to strategic choices, the use of cutting-edge technology, and the production of high-quality goods. Research shows that a company's growth and competitiveness are influenced by its strategy (Sandlberg, 2006). Various frameworks for developing and implementing competitive strategies have been offered and subjected to empirical testing (Hayes and Schmenner, 2008). Strategic management literature has been profoundly impacted by Porter's (1980) generic strategy framework since it is the most effective at generating exceptional results. It provides a solid foundation upon which to build the rest of this research.

Any good differentiation strategy should aim to provide customers with unique benefits from the product or service they purchase. "Johnson, Scholes, and Whittington" (2008) The goal of the differentiation strategy is to get an economic edge over the competition. The business is able to set itself out in a variety of ways (Kotler & Keller, 2014). When it comes to advertising and sales, the corporation may also come up with something special. The term "retail mix" refers to the combination of products, pricing, marketing, sales, and shop atmosphere (Fairhust & Moore, 2013). A differentiation strategy cannot be developed without first identifying the key customers and main rivals (Hitt, Ireland & Hoskisson, 2012).

The success of the industry is a result of the operators' efforts to provide consumers with cutting-edge and reasonably priced goods and services. Competition from other businesses is quite high in the telecoms market. Government pricing limits, foreign currency limitations, and investment free market play have all contributed to the rise of marketing wars. The telecoms industry in Jordan is struggling and could use some strategic advice to help it expand more quickly. Differentiation of products and the effectiveness of businesses are the focus of this research.

Product Differentiation Strategies

For a product to stand out from the crowd, its differentiating factors must demonstrate that it is capable of doing the same things offered by similar products while providing additional value to consumers. Below, you'll find some examples of differentiating tactics.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

There are two ways in which price serves to distinguish items. like Cost, which draws in thrifty shoppers by consistently having the market's best pricing. Businesses may use price tags similar to those seen on a Bugatti sports car to convey a sense of superiority and elegance. Durability and dependability are what set items apart. The number of years a battery is expected to work reliably is a major selling point for consumers.

Local businesses have an advantage over their national counterparts because of their advantageous location and high quality of service to the community. Most of the staff at these restaurants are locals, and they get most of their ingredients from nearby farms and businesses.

Product design and organisational performance

For corporate sustainability, fresh product design is crucial. Companies must carefully create new products to succeed globally. Many new products fail. Thus, understanding consumer demands, markets, and rivals is essential to creating more valuable products. Client-driven NPD is crucial to customer satisfaction. NPD drives company growth, profit performance, and short- and long-term business performance (Ahmad, 2015).

Products, specifications, applied technology, and design capacity drive NPD in enterprises. New product development results in product design. To avoid production issues, new product designs should be properly examined. However, high failure rates and significant capital requirements make product development dangerous. Due to their increased cost, many new R&D products cannot compete with current products (Ahmad, 2015).

Product design considers client needs from function, use, manufacture, and communication to technical issues. Product design involves creativity, strategy, and the market. Good design may attract consumers, differentiate products, and boost competitiveness (Rahmah, 2018).

However, design affects new product performance. Process design converts product design into technical qualities and operating operations to make the product (Melton, 2015). Product and process design differ. Process design often conflicts with product design, affecting quality and productivity. Thus, product specifications must be tested throughout manufacture. Designers should collaborate with production staff to create products that fit manufacturing processes. Process design is often underestimated in product production (Karim, 2018). Pisano and Wheelwright (2016) found that process design caused several production issues, even though many companies spent most of their money. The main issue is that the product design does not match the manufacturing process, and the designer did not develop the new product based on process or machine performance. Manufacturing cannot handle new product designs.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Product Branding and Organizational Performance

Branding now dominates company strategy. It's also the most misinterpreted. Branding is sometimes regarded as just another form of advertisement (Low & Bloisb, 2012). Many managers and business writers believe branding is about product image management, a separate responsibility from product management communications. A branding strategy creates differentiated brands to reduce market substitutes. Brand differentiation increases brand equity and lowers price elasticity, allowing the company to raise prices and boost profits. Competitive brand positioning, value chain development, and brand equity management form branding strategies.

Brands reduce customer safety, societal risk, and financial risk when buying items. These dangers help consumers evaluate a product before buying it (Doaei, Kazemi, & Hosseini Robat, 2011). The company will prosper in the market and gain a competitive edge (Lee & Back, 2010; Low & Bloisb, 2012). Market research and the identification of consumer requirements help organisations survive in today's competitive market. As a result, analysing the marketing mix in any organisation can aid in the achievement of goals (Fakhimi Azar, Akbari Vanehabad, & Rasouli, 2011).Any marketing affects brand loyalty, and managers and decision-makers can regulate marketing mix factors. If these characteristics and brand loyalty, especially its facets, are determined, company decision-makers can readily choose elements of the marketing mix to maximise brand value and profit. An appropriate marketing mix helps business marketing strategies achieve these goals (Khodadad Hosseini & Rezvani, 2019).

The mobile phone industry relies on brand loyalty to choose products and services according to their features. Thus, branding's central role in the country's industry and brand loyalty's relevance in the mobile phone industry necessitate the research of successful brand loyalty elements in markets, especially in the mobile phone sector, whose goods are more sophisticated and require specific support services. The Ghanaian mobile phone sector is highly competitive, so product and service distinction through good branding tactics is the only way to stay connected to customers and improve marketing performance.

Brands provide value to customers and companies, making them the centre of consumer markets (Keller, 2013). However, more emphasis must be placed on developing a systematic approach to products and brands, as well as how pricing decisions, promotion, services, and distribution are linked to the product with the help of brand managers in order to build brand loyalty and influence customer decision-making (Karbasi, 2011).

Product Packaging and Organizational Performance

Packaging's ability to elevate a product's perceived value in the eyes of the customer is critical to gaining sales. The price of the packaging may be more than the price of the product itself. Packaging is an essential part of the four Ps: product, location, promotion, and price (Soroka, 2012). According

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by “Global Research Network LLC”
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of
Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license,
visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

to Diana (2015), people make purchases based on presentation. Since this is the case, attractive packaging is crucial for luring first-time buyers. If it didn't come in enticing packaging, no one would purchase it just to test it. An unsuccessful market debut is fatally compromised by unattractive packaging (Soroka, 2012).

According to Olayinka and Aminu (2016), the term "package" refers to the whole process of designing and manufacturing a product's packaging. All the materials used to seal, cushion, ship, and display an item are considered packaging by Kottler (2013). The process of designing, evaluating, and manufacturing a package ensures the safety of a product throughout transport, storage, retail, and consumer usage. Preparing goods for sale, transport, and storage all fall under the umbrella of "packaging." Its usage spans the realms of government, institutions, businesses, and individuals (Diana, 2015).

To "preserve product integrity," packaging safeguards food from "climatic, bacteriological, and transportation hazards" (Stewart, 2015). In 1957, Pilditch used the term "silent salesperson" to describe packets and said that they should "come alive" throughout the buying process (Vazquez, 2003). Lewis (2011), writing 30 years after Pilditch, said that "good packaging is considerably more than a salesman; it is a flag of identity and a declaration of beliefs." Packaging is one of the most crucial vehicles for communicating the brand message directly to the target customer, since only a tiny percentage of enterprises can afford national advertising (Nancarrow et al., 2018). In today's competitive retail market, packages must work harder to attract customers' attention (Milton, 2011).

Choi (2017) contends that manufacturers and distributors, who may be held liable for transportation damage, should invest in more robust packaging.7). Damages of this kind may be covered by transportation authorities. A damaged shipment might cause production delays and lost revenue. Frankling argues that packaging serves to both safeguard products and promote businesses (2014). Stores claim that better packing has reduced losses due to spoilage, breakage, shrinkage, discoloration, and theft (Chaneta, 2012). Modular, stackable, and compact packaging streamlines the process of adding prices, enhances product visibility, and reduces storage requirements. According to Chaneta (2012), including smaller or larger sizes, more multipacks, improved product images, use illustrations, and colour utilisation can all help increase sales.

Product Pricing and Organizational Performance

Relative product advantage and competitive intensity influence pricing practises and firm performance. First, relative product advantage refers to the advantage of a supermarket's product over competitors (Simon, 2016).Relative product advantage consistently predicts organisational performance. product market's competitive intensity In marketing strategy literature, competitive intensity is seen as a major force that erodes the firm's ability to benefit from the customer value it creates, e.g., Agwu (2015).

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Value-Informed Pricing Practice: Firms can use the perceived benefits and unique features of the product being presented to the customer to set prices. Management examines customer value and price. Value-informed pricing drives customer attraction, retention, profitability, and sustainability (Imoleayo, 2010).

Competitive Pricing: The competitor's price determines an organization's pricing. Competition-informed pricing uses consumer expectations from existing and potential competitors to set prices. This method has drawbacks. Demand is rarely considered, which increases the risk of a market price war. Its advantage is operating within competitors' actual pricing situations (Simon, 2016).

Organizations use cost-informed pricing the most. Its thriftiness and planning make it popular. Cost-informed pricing involves margining costs. Products and services get a standard percentage. Sales proceeds, unit and total costs, and pricing that meets the company's profit goals are determined (Thomas, 2019).

The price-setting committee or team must justify prices to customers. Contingencies Modify (intense competition and relative product advantage).First, customers distinguish brands by their relative product advantages. Managers can price products with a high relative advantage at their discretion (Monroe, 2014). Thus, value-informed pricing, performance, and sustainability increase as the relative product advantage increases. However, intense competition erodes product advantage, reducing the impact of upper boundary price discretion (Imoleayo, 2010). Customer value information becomes less important in determining the upper boundary of price discretion.

Again, low-relative-advantage products are hard to distinguish from competing brands, making it easier for customers to use competitor prices to compare products. Competition-informed pricing determines the upper limit of price discretion. As a company's relative product advantage declines, competition-informed pricing is used to better understand price discretion and improve performance, and vice versa.Value-informed pricing may not affect company performance when a high-relative-advantage product is sold in a competitive market. Relative product advantages boost performance-based pricing (Monroe, 2014).

Product Distinction

In 1933, Edward Chamberlin introduced the marketing concept in the Theory of Monopolistic Competition. Product differentiation makes a product more appealing to a target market by distinguishing it from competitors' or the firm's own products (Anderson, De Palma, & Thisse, 1992). Different packaging, advertising, sales promotions, or distribution chains can differentiate products because buyers perceive a difference. Product differences include:

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Functionality differences

It can also manipulate product availability. To make the product rarer, it can produce a small number, produce it a few times a year, or sell it in a few special stores. Price can differentiate. Comparing goods is easier because they are packaged with similar characteristics. Prices and characteristics are usually related. Product features determine the price. A product must be unique to be differentiated by price. Differentiation shows customers that the product is unique and valuable. The company can differentiate its product from substitutes based on non-price factors instead of just price. This will give the company a competitive advantage, and it can use its unique selling proposition to advertise (Moine & Lloyd, 2002). Customers will develop brand loyalty if they understand how the product differs from competitors'. The long-term goal of product differentiation is to make customers loyal to the brand in order to change the demand curve (a graph that shows the relationship between a product's price and the number of units consumers are willing to buy for that price).

Impact of Product Differentiation on Organizational Success

Few studies have directly linked differentiation strategy to organisational performance. Most of those studies were done in developed nations. Several previous research studies on the differentiation strategy and organisational performance, however, are as follows: Cost leadership, differentiation, and their combination are profitable, according to Acquaah and Yasai-Ardekani (2008). However, combination strategy firms perform similarly to differentiation strategy firms.

Coherent competitive strategies—combination, cost leadership, or differentiation—also boost performance. Amoako-Gyampah and Acquaah (2008) found that competitive and manufacturing strategies of cost, delivery, flexibility, and quality positively affect firm performance. Quality is the only manufacturing strategy component that indirectly affects performance. TQM is positively and significantly related to differentiation strategy, but it only partially mediates the relationship between differentiation strategy and the three performance measures, according to Prajogo and Sohal (2006).

Prajogo (2007) found that differentiation strategy predicts product quality but not cost leadership strategy. Allen and Helms (2002) believed that different reward practises better complement generic strategies and are significantly related to organisational performance. Finally, Mosakowski (1993) found that firms with focus and differentiation strategies outperformed others. Overall, differentiation improves organisational performance.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Michael Porter's Competitive Business Strategy Theory

Michael Porter created the competitive business strategy typology in 1980. Porter advises firms to choose one of three strategies—cost leadership, differentiation, or focus—to avoid wasting resources. Lu, Shem, and Yam (2008) argue that Porter's theory can help explain an organization's

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

competitiveness by showing that competitive strategies address an organization's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. According to Anupkuma (2005), Porter's (1980) strategic theory states that firms must use generic competitive strategies like cost leadership, differentiation, and focus to succeed. Profitability depends on a firm's industry position. Sustainable competitive advantage underpins long-term profitability. Firms can have low-cost or differentiation-based competitive advantages. Cost leadership, differentiation, and focus are three generic strategies for industry outperformance based on the two basic types of competitive advantage and the scope of activities a firm pursues.

Porter (2008) claims that a narrow competitive scope within an industry is the "generic focus strategy." The focuser chooses a segment or group of segments in the industry and tailors its strategy to serve them exclusively. Cost-focused and differentiation-focused strategies are available. Cost focus seeks a cost advantage in its target segment, while differentiation focus seeks differentiation. Both focus strategies focus on differences between a focuser's target segment and other industry segments. Target segments must either have unusual buyers or a unique production and delivery system. Cost focus exploits segment cost behaviour, while differentiation focus exploits segment buyer needs. Researchers accept Porter's generic strategies. The literature criticises his typology, especially the claim that generic strategies are mutually exclusive.

EMPRICAL STUDIES

Kamau (2013) examined how differentiation strategy affects supermarket sales in Nakuru town's central business district. The study examined how differentiation strategies affected Nakuru CBD supermarket sales. The study hypothesised that retail supermarket product differentiation strategies do not affect sales performance. The study used purposive and simple random sampling to get the sample size for the non-experimental research survey. The study found that product and physical differentiation boost supermarket sales annually. The study suggested supermarkets increase product and physical differentiation strategies to compete in the growing market. Kamau (2013) studied retail markets that sell products from different manufacturers and distributors. Since supermarkets vary in size and products, the researcher does not state how they were stratified and sampled. This paper's study area, Sameer Africa (K) Limited, had no product heterogeneity compared to Kamau's (2013) retail industry in Nakuru CBD. This paper differentiates products using quality, design, and variety.

Shafiwu and Mohammed (2013) examined how product differentiation affects petroleum industry profitability in Ghana. The study examined how differentiation and profitability in the petroleum industry affected Effimax sales. Correlation research was used. It targeted 15 government-owned and 14 private Ghanaian oil marketing companies. Cluster sampling selected one company. The study found that even though the petroleum industry is not seen as having differentiated products, differentiation is a profitable strategy for the industry. Other factors may explain the low adoption. Shafiwu and Mohammed (2013) advise product awareness.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Atikiya et al. (2015) found that broad product offerings, a strong brand reputation, and innovative product introductions improved manufacturing firm performance. To make differentiation a significant practise in the sector, the researcher advises firms to look into how to make uniqueness less expensive. Atikiya et al. studied cost leadership, focus strategies, and differentiation strategies. The author used differentiation strategy as a variable without distinguishing between product and service differentiation strategies and concluded based on product differentiation.

Haarla (2003) examined a Finnish printing paper company's product differentiation advantage. The study was resource-based. The survey was descriptive. 37 in-depth personal interviews from 1999–2000 provided empirical data. Four Finnish paper companies, their customers, suppliers, and consultants were sampled. Qualitative, conceptual, and action-analytic research methods were used. Product differentiation is now driven by both manufacturer and customer technology, according to research.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilizes the Survey Research Design. This design is chosen to aid the researcher get information directly from a sample of a larger population and is useful in describing the characteristics attributed to the subject under study of a large population.

Population of the Study

Population here can be explained as the entire set of circumstances the researchers wants to make a broad view of (Simons, 2016). The total population for this study is made up of two hundred and ninety (295) staff of MTN Nigeria, Uyo.

Sampling Techniques

The simple random sampling technique was employed in selecting 159 staff for this study. This method gave each member of the population an equal chance of being picked.

Sources of Data Collection

This study used both the primary and secondary source of data. While primary data sources include soliciting responses by employing questionnaire or personal interviews, secondary data were sourced from literatures, textbooks, journals, published sales records of the marketers, etc.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of two sections. Section A measured the participants' demographic details which included race, age, gender, tenure and job level. Section B measures the construct of independent and dependent variables.

Validation of Instrument

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

In justifying the validity of this study, a number of steps were taken. First, the use of random sample provided the study with rich information that enabled the generalization of finding to wider population. Secondly, the data collection methods through the use of questionnaire and interview ensured excellent results.

Reliability of Instrument

The researcher adopted Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis to determine the reliability of the instruments. In the trial testing, a total of 20 staff who were not part of the main study were randomly selected from the the study area. The data collected were analyzed and the result of the showed 0.72 reliability coefficient. This indicated that the instrument was reliable for use.

Method of Data Collection

We distributed 170 questionnaires among the staff of MTN Nigeria, Uyo. on the spot method. This method adopted by the researcher to ensure that time was judiciously utilized and to avoid missing copies of the questionnaire. At the end, all the copies distributed were collected for subsequent analysis.

Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

Table1: Gender Distribution of the respondent

	Frequency	**Percent**
Male	92	58%%
Female	67	42%
Total	**159**	**100%**

Source: Field Survey

From table 2 showed that out of the 159 respondents, 92 representing 58% were male and 67 representing 42% were female.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Table 2: Age distribution of the respondents

	Frequency	percentage
20-25years	29	18%
26-30years	34	22%
31-35years	37	23%
36- 40	23	14%
41-45	22	14%
46 years and above	14	9%
Total	**159**	**100%**

Source: Field survey

With respect to age distribution, 29 respondents representing 18% were between 10 – 25 years of age, 34 representing 22% respondents were between 26-30 years of age. Those between 31 – 35 years were 37 representing 23%, those between 36 – 40 were 23 representing 14%, 41 – 45 were 22 representing 14% and those above 46 years and above were 14 representing 9% of the respondents.

Table 3: Respondents' highest Educational Level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
V	FSLC	41	25.8	25.8	25.8
	WAEC/GCE	19	11.9	11.9	37.7
	NCE/OND	44	27.6	27.6	65.3
	HND	35	22.0	22.0	67.5
	B.Sc	20	12.5	12.5	100
	MBA/ MA	-	-	-	-
	Ph.D	-	-	-	-
	Total	159	100.0	100.0	

Source: Fieldwork

From the analysis on table 6 shows 41 representing 25.8% of the respondents were holders of FSLC; and 19 representing 11.9% were holders of WAEC/NECO; 44 respondents representing 27.6% were NCE/OND; 35 representing 22% of the respondents were HND and 20 representing 12.5% were holders of B.Sc holders. The above analysis shows that the respondents were mature enough to understand the subject matter and respond accordingly.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of
Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license,
visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Table 4: Marital Status

	Frequency	Percentage
Single	47	30%
Married	109	68%
Separated	-	-
Widowed	3	2%
Divorced	-	-
Total	**159**	**100%**

Source: Field survey

The statistics above shows that 47 representing 30% were single, 109 representing 68% were married, while 3 representing 2% were widowed

Table 5: Working Experience

	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 5	21	13%
6 – 10	37	23%
11 -15	43	28%
16 and above	58	36%
Total	**159**	**100%**

Source: Fieldwork

The table above shows that 21 representing 13% were between 1 – 5 years, 37 representing 23% were 6-10, 43 representing 28% were 11-15 while 58 representing 36% were 16 years and above.

Hypothesis One:

There are no significant effects of product design on organizational performance.

Table 6: Regression analysis of product design on organizational performance

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.762[a]	.845	.801	.44420

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

a. Predictors: (Constant), product design

Table 7: Analysis of variance of the difference in the influence exerted by each independent variable

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.445	1	49.445	62.587	.000[b]
	Residual	50.576	164	.790		
	Total	100.021	165			

Table 8: Coefficient analysis of the influence of each of independent variable on the dependent variable.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.470	.089		6.430	.000
	product design	.556	. 021	.762	12.827	.000

a. Dependent Variable: organizational performance

Table 6's model summary shows an R-value of 0.845. Indicative of product design's beneficial impact on business results. The R square-value of 0.845% indicates that differences in organisational performance accounted for that percentage of total variance in product design. The F-value of 62.587 and the associated P-value of 0.00 in the ANOVA table show that the regression model makes a substantial prediction of the dependents variable. This suggests that the design of products has a considerable impact on the efficiency of businesses. In addition, the 0.556 B-coefficient indicates that for every 1 unit improvement in organisational performance, the model predicts a 0.556 unit improvement in product design.

Hypothesis Two:

There are no significant effects of product branding on organizational performance.

Table 9: Regression analysis showing result for product branding on organizational performance

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

1	.972[a]	.779	.774	.43220

a. Predictors: (Constant), product branding

Table 10: Analysis of variance of the difference in the influence exerted by each independent variable

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.445	1	49.445	62.587	.000[b]
	Residual	50.576	164	.790		
	Total	100.021	165			

Table 11: Coefficient analysis of the influence of each of independent variable on the dependent variable

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.570	.089		6.430	.000
	product branding	.766	. 021	.972	12.827	.000

The model summary in table 9 shows an R- value of 0.799. This suggests a strong effect of product branding and organizational performance in MTN Nigeria, Uyo. The R square- value of 0.774 shows that 77.4% variation in product branding was accounted for by variations in organizational performance. The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model significantly predicts the dependents variable given the F- value of 62.587 and its corresponding P- value of 0.00. This implies that product branding affect organizational performance. Also, the B-coefficient of 0.766 implies that holding every other thing constant, the model predict 0.766 unit increase in product branding given a unit increase in organizational performance.

Hypothesis Three:

There are no significant effects of product packaging on organizational performance.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Table 12: Regression analysis showing result for product packaging on organizational performance

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.652[a]	.771	.571	.43420

a. Predictors: (Constant), product packaging

Table 13:Analysis of variance of the difference in the influence exerted by each independent variable

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.445	1	49.445	62.587	.000[b]
	Residual	50.576	164	.790		
	Total	100.021	165			

a. Dependent Variable: organizational performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), product packaging

Table 14: Coefficient analysis of the influence of each of independent variable on the dependent variable

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.570	.089		6.430	.000
product packaging	.546	. 021	.652	12.827	.000

a. Dependent Variable: organizational performance

Table 12 indicates that the model summary has an R-value of 0.771. This points to the fact that product packaging has a significant impact on the success of businesses. An R2 of 0.771 indicates that changes in packaging that account for 57.1% of the total variance have a significant impact on productivity within an organisation. The F-value of 62.587 and the associated P-value of 0.00 in the ANOVA table show that the regression model makes a significant prediction of the dependent variable. This suggests that product packaging has a substantial impact on the efficiency of businesses. When controlling for other factors, the model predicts that an increase of 0.546 units in product packaging has on organisational performance.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Discussion of the Findings

The model summary in Table 9 shows an R-value of 0.845. This suggests a positive effect of product design on organisational performance in MTN Nigeria, Uyo, and Akwa Ibom State. The R squared value of 0.8459 shows that 84.5% of the variation in product design was accounted for by variations in organisational performance. The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model significantly predicts the dependent variable, given the F-value of 62.587 and its corresponding P-value of 0.00. This implies that there is a significant effect of product design on organisational performance. Furthermore, the B-coefficient of 0.556 indicates that the model predicts a 0.556-unit increase in product design for every unit increase in organisational performance.

The model summary in Table 10 shows an R-value of 0.799. This suggests that product branding has a significant impact on organisational performance in MTN Nigeria, Uyo.The R squared value of 0.774 shows that 77.4% of the variation in product branding was accounted for by variations in organisational performance. The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model significantly predicts the dependent variable, given the F-value of 62.587 and its corresponding P-value of 0.00. This implies that product branding affects organisational performance. Also, the B-coefficient of 0.766 implies that, holding every other thing constant, the model predicts a 0.766-unit increase in product branding given a one-unit increase in organisational performance.

The model summary in Table 11 shows an R-value of 0.771. This suggests that product packaging has a significant impact on organisational performance at MTN Nigeria, Uyo.The R squared value of 0.771 shows that 57.1% variation in product packaging affects organisational performance. The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model significantly predicts the dependent variable, given the F-value of 62.587 and its corresponding P-value of 0.00. This implies that there is a significant effect of product packaging on organisational performance. Furthermore, the B-coefficient of 0.546 indicates that the model predicts a 0.546 unit increase in product packaging on organisational performance while holding all other variables constant.

CONCLUSION

A product differentiation strategy seeks to provide products or services that offer benefits that are different from those of competitors and that are widely valued by buyers. The aim of using a product differentiation strategy is to achieve competitive advantage. There are different product differentiation strategies for the company to choose from; they can be product design, product branding, product packaging, and product pricing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM
Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

- The management of organisations should pay attention to product design as it helps enhance organisational performance.
- Business organisations should promote effective product branding, which is vital to improving profitability and assisting buyers in their decision-making.
- Organizations create packages that are capable of arousing consumers' interest in their products.
- The management of an organisation should use product pricing as a means to promote customer retention and bring about profitability and sustainability.

REFERENCES

1. Acquaah, R . & Yasai-Ardekani, D . (2008) Does the imple-mentation of a combination competitive strategy yield incremental performance benefits? A new perspective from a transition economy in Sub-Saharan Africa. Journal of Business Research, 61: 346–354.
2. Agwu, S. (2015). Antecedents to management accounting change: A structural equation approach", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28: 675-698.
3. Ahmad, C. (2015). Product differentiation and market performance in producer goods industries. Journal of Business Research, 33: 115–127.
4. Allen, N . & Helms, H . (2002) Interdependencies in organization design: A test in hospitals", Journal of Management Accounting Research, 13: 107-129.
5. Amoako-Gyampah, G. and Acquaah, J. (2008). Linking Strategic Practices and Organizational Performance to Porter's Generic Strategies. Business Process Management, 12(4), 433-454.
6. Anderson, M . De Palma, S . & Thisse, D . (1992) The effects of the interactive use of management control systems on product innovation", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 29: 709-737.
7. Anupkuma, F . (2005) The consequences of customization on management accounting system design", Accounting Organizations and Society, 25: 221-241.
8. Atikiya et al.'s (2015) The relationship between strategic priorities, management techniques and management accounting: An empirical investigation using a systems approach", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 23 (3): 243-264.
9. Atikiya, V . Elegwa, W . & Waiganjo, J . (2015) Flexibility: the next competitive battle: The manufacturing futures survey", Strategic Management Journal, 10 (2): 135-144.
10. Barney, F. (2012). Create image, gain a public confidence. Consulting to Management, 17(2), 27-29.
11. Baum & Mezias, (1992). "Strategy, organizations and control: Some possibilities for accounting research", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 15: 3-24.
12. Beath, T. & Katsoulacos, W. (2011). Discrete choice theory of product differentiation. US: MIT Press Massachusetts.
13. Bordes, U . (2009) The New Performance Challenge: Measuring Operations for World-Class Competition, Homewood, IL: Dow Jones Irwin. Emerson, J., 2003, "The blended value proposition: Integrating social and financial returns", California Management Review, 45/4, 35-51.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

14. Certo, D. and Peters, S. (2013). Corporate Strategy: An analytical approach to business policy for growth and expansion. New York: McGraw Hill.
15. Chandler, M. (2009). Environmental determinants of generic competitive strategies: Preliminary evidence from structured content analysis of Fortune and Business Week articles(1983-1984). Human Relations, 42(4), 353-369.
16. Chaneta, F . (2012) An empirical study of performance measurement in manufacturing firms", International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 54(5/6): 410-438.
17. Choi, D . (2017) A contingency approach to strategy implementation at the business-unit level: Integrating administrative mechanisms with strategy", Academy of Management Journal: 828-853.
18. Deephouse, H . (1999), "Impact of output versus behaviour controls and resource sharing on performance: Strategy as a mediating variable", Academy of Management Journal, 33: 259-285.
19. Diana, H. (2015) Linking control systems to business unit strategy: Impact on performance", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 10 (1): 51-66.
20. Doaei, A. Kazemi, E., & Hosseini, P. Robat, W. (2011). Scale and scope: the dynamics of industrial capitalism. MA, USA: Harvard University Press
21. Dwivedi, 2006). Advances and challenges in strategic management", International journal of Business 12(1): 11-32.
22. Fairhust, C. and Moore, O. (2013). The explicit economics of image management for banks. Industrial and Corporate Change, 9(2), 211-53.
23. Fakhimi Azar, G . Akbari Vanehabad, J . & Rasouli, Y . (2011). Product development cycle time and organizational performance", Journal of Marketing Research, 34: 13-23.
24. Frankling, U . (2014) Quality strategy, strategic control systems, and organizational performance", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 22 (3/4): 293-317.
25. Haarla, S . (2003) "Innovations in performance measurement: Trends and research implications", Journal of Management Accounting Research, 10: 205-238.
26. Hayes, G. and Schmenner, E. (2008). Porter's generic strategies as determinants of strategic group membership and performance. Academy of Management Journal, 26(2), 467-488.
27. Hitt, E . Ireland, T . & Hoskisson, Y .(2012). The balanced scorecard – Measures that drive performance", Harvard Business Review, (Jan.-Feb): 71-79.
28. Imoleayo, A . (2010). Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system", Harvard Business Review, (Jan.- Feb.): 75-85.
29. Johnson, O . Scholes, M . & Whittington, U . (2008) Generic manufacturing strategies: A conceptual synthesis", Strategic Management Journal, 10(3): 211-231.
30. Kamau's, S. (2013). The role of image building in the strategic change consultancy process: The case of Sir John Harvey-Jones. Strategic Change, 9(5), 275-285.
31. Karbasi,G. (2011). Organizational Image Management. Academy of Management Review, 21(1), 254-285.
32. Karim, J. 2018). Differentiation versus low cost strategies in Romania, Management and Marketing 5(2), 135-142.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

33. Keller, H. (2013). Strategic management theory: an integrated approach. Boston, NY: Houghton Miffin Company.
34. Khodadad, L . Hosseini, L . & Rezvani, K . (2019). Assessing generic strategies: an empirical investigation of two competing typologies in discrete manufacturing industries", Strategic Management Journal, 16: 75-83.
35. Kothari, M . (2011) Relating Porter's business strategies to environment and structure: Analysis and performance implications", Academy of Management Review, 31 (2): 280-308.
36. Kotler P. & Keller, G. (2014). Services Marketing. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill publishing company.
37. Kotler, N . (2002) Trading off between value creation and value appropriation: The financial implications of shifts in strategic emphasis", Journal of Marketing, 67: 63-76.
38. Kottler, L . (2013) Integrated performance measurement: Management accounting to support the new manufacturing realities", Journal of Management Accounting Research, 4 (Fall): 1-19.
39. Lee, S. & Back, S. (2010). What is strategy – and does it matter? USA: Thomson Learning.
40. Lewis (2011) Lewis, B. (2011). Organizational strategy, structure and process. New York, NY: McGraw-hill.
41. Low, W. & Bloisb, W. (2012). Customer-focused manufacturing strategy and the use of operations-based non-financial performance measures: A research note", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 22 (6): 557-572.
42. Lu, J . Shem, I . & Yam, J . (2008) The role of management control systems in creating competitive advantage: New perspectives", Accounting, Organizations and Society: 127-143.
43. Melton, E. (2015). Impact of innovation on realizing competitive advantage in banking sector in Jordan. American Academic and Scholarly Research Journal, 4(5), 1-9.
44. Milton, O. (2011). Early contractor involvement in building procurement: contractors, partnering and project management. Chicester: Wiley Blackwell.
45. Moine, L . & Lloyd, M . (2002). Strategic Performance Monitoring and Management: Using Non-financial Measures to Improve Corporate Governance, Canada: Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants.
46. Monroe, I . (2014). The adoption of continuous improvement and innovation strategies in Australian manufacturing firms", Technovation, 20: 539- 552.
47. Mosakowski, O . (1993) Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation model", In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), Sociological methodology 1982 (pg. 290- 312).
48. Nancarrow et al., (2018). , Levers of Control, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press. Simons, R., 2000, Performance Measurement and Control Systems for Implementing Strategy. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
49. Nolega, G . Oloko, Y . & Oteki, Y . (2015) Accounting control systems and business strategy: An empirical analysis", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 12: 357-374.
50. Olayinka, L . & Aminu, S . (2016) Assessing generic strategies: An empirical investigation of two competing typologies in discrete manufacturing industries. Strategic Management Journal, 16: 75–83.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

51. Otike, S. (2010). Management, strategic Management theories and the linkage with organisational competitive advantage from the Resource- based perspective. European Journal of Social Sciences. 11(3), 402-418.
52. Pisano, K . & Wheelwright, F . (2016) Managing multiple dimensions of manufacturing performance—an exploratory study. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 27: 497–529.
53. Porter, A. (2008). An exploration towards a production theory and its application to construction. VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland.
54. Porter's, J . (1980) Competitive strategy. Strategic Management Journal, 10: 135–144.
55. Prajogo, O . (2007) The relationship between competitive strategies and product. Quality Industrial Management and Data Systems, 107: 69–831.
56. Raduan, P . Jegak, T . Haslinda, D . & Alimin, Q . (2009) The impact of manufacturing flexibility on management control system design", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 20: 241-258.
57. Rahmah, V. (2018). The dynamics of strategic change. New York, NY: Blackwell.
58. Ravi, O. P. (2011). Strategic management and competitive advantage: Concepts and Cases. New Tersey, Pearson Prentice Hall.
59. Reddy, D. Srinivasu, W. Rikkula, F. and Rao, S. (2019). Corporate Strategy (3rd ed.), Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.
60. Sandlberg, C. (2006). Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage. USA: Prentice Hall.
61. Shafiwu, O . & Mohammed, K . (2013) Antecedents to management accounting change:A structural equitation approach. Accounting Organizations and Society, 28: 657–698.
62. Similarly, I . & Porter, Y . (2008) Generic manufacturing strategies: A conceptual synthesis. Strategic Management Journal, 10: 211–231.
63. Simon, A. (2016). Exploring corporate strategy.(5th ed.), New Jersey: Prentice Hall
64. Sohal, W . K. (2006) The relationship between strategic priorities, management techniques and management accounting: An empirical investigation using a systems approach. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 23: 243–264.
65. Soroka, P . (2012). Ownership structure and firm performance: The case of Jordan. Journal of Business Administration, 1: 1–27.
66. Stewart, L. W. (2015). Manufacturing strategy, competitive strategy and firm performance: An empirical study in a developing economy environment. International Journal of Production Economics, 1 1 1 : 575-592.
67. Vazquez, F. G. (2003). Marketing Management. (14thedition).India: Prentice Education.
68. Weintraub, I . Owens, O . & Jedinak, I . (2013). Employee perceptions of the relationship between strategy, rewards and organizational performance. Journal ofBusiness Strategies, 19: 115–139.
69. Wernerfelt, P . & Montgomery, T . (2008). Product differentiation and market performance in producer goods industries. Journal of Business Research, 33: 115–127 Prajogo, P. (2007). Principles of Management: An Analysis of the Contributions of Various Thinkers to the Field of Management, and a Review of the Management Practices of Five Companies. *Journal of Business and Market.* 6 (3) 150-155

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

70. Rahmah, V. (2018). *The dynamics of strategic change.* New York, NY: Blackwell.
71. Ravi, O. P. (2011). *Strategic management and competitive advantage: Concepts and Cases*. New Tersey, Pearson Prentice Hall.
72. Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2001).A multidimensional model of venture growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 292-303.
73. Reddy, D. Srinivasu, W. Rikkula, F. and Rao, S. (2019). *Corporate Strategy* (3rd ed.), Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.
74. Sandlberg, C. (2006). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage*. USA: Prentice Hall.
75. Simon, A. (2016). *Exploring corporate strategy*.(5th ed.), New Jersey: Prentice Hall
76. Simon, D. (2016). *The Economic Theory of Product Differentiation,* US: McGrsw Hill.
77. Soroka, B. (2012). The consulting process in action. *Academy of Management Review,* 1(4), 24-34.
78. Vazquez, F. (2003). *Marketing Management.* (14thedition).India: Prentice Education.

ISSN 2576-5973 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC"
under Volume: 6 Issue: 2 in Feb-2023 https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/AJEBM

Copyright (c) 2023 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/