DIFFERENTIATION STRATEGIES AND ITS EFFECTS ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF SELECTED HEALTHCARE FIRMS IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

Olayemi, Olufemi Olabode[a]; Okonji, Patrick Sunday[b]; Akinsanya, Damilola Omowunmi[c] and Ogunleye, Joseph Monsuru[d]

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Lagos

[a]ooolayemi@unilag.edu.ng, [b]sokonji@unilag.edu.ng, [c]omololakin5@gmail.com, [d]Josephoguns@yahoo.com

[a]Corresponding Author: [a]ooolayemi@unilag.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

Effective strategies are more vital than ever in today's rapidly evolving global landscape with heightened competition and demanding clientele. This study examined how differentiation strategies affect the performance of a healthcare firm, making a valuable contribution to the field of strategic development. It focused on differentiation strategies as deployed by health companies. Non-probability purposive sampling was employed, targeting customers of the Healthcare firm who were deemed capable of providing meaningful responses regarding the relationship between adopted differentiation strategies and organisational performance. The findings revealed a low level of consistency among the four key constructs: differentiation strategy (0.797), organisational performance (0.862), customer loyalty (0.836), and customer patronage (0.831). While differentiation strategies strongly impact organisational performance, they do not appear to be the primary driver of customer loyalty and patronage within the Healthcare firm. The study recommends that organisations delve into customer insights to identify the factors that foster customer loyalty and patronage.

Keywords: Differentiation, Organisational-performance, Customer-loyalty, Competition, Strategy

1. INTRODUCTION

In the global world today, the pharmaceutical sector is ultimately challenged by rapid changes in the economy, swift technological advancement, high demand, and duly informed customers who are becoming more technologically oriented and want to be constantly satisfied. This has caused intense competition in the sector to the extent that many pharmaceutical companies are constantly crafting strategies to survive these challenges. Moreover, a cutthroat strategy is becoming more imperative in this present-day changes and globally challenging environment due to increased rivalry among pharmaceuticals and unsatisfied customers (Mitroulis & Kitsios, 2016).

Competition today is a crucial capability for organisations and can be achieved through competitive advantage by adopting market orientation to help grow successful innovation management. An organisation must be flexible to be innovative. It is easier for flexible organisations to adapt to any environment, giving them an advantage over their competitors (Mbugua & Kingua, 2019). This can be accomplished by consistently aligning with the demands of their customers through adopting a market orientation strategy. Businesses that apply distinctive and difficult-to-replicate features to their products and services would have a competitive advantage and be more profitable than their competitors. Differentiation strategy helps organisations gain a competitive advantage by maintaining a unique position through an increased perceived value of their product and services compared to their competitors (Adimo, 2018). This is similar to the argument of Ghemawat (1986) that some types of competitive advantages cannot be easily duplicated and can, therefore, bring about an unrelenting, superior organisational performance action required to achieve its competitive advantage. Moon, Hur, Yin and Helm (2014) maintained that the most valuable tactics of an enterprise are directly proportional to the firm's unique resources, which reflect the mission statement, goals, market positioning and the environment in which the firm operates.

Differentiation strategy aims to improve an organisation's innovativeness and performance by creating a distinctive image from its competitors. Although much work has been done on the linkage amidst uniqueness in approach and organizational performance in the pharmaceutical market, the pharmaceutical industry faces new global challenges, including globalization, digitalization, emerging markets, energy crisis, diversified customer taste and evolving pharmaceutical-related technology. These developments in the pharmaceutical industry may pose a challenge to the competitive generic strategic models in explaining organisational performance and profitability. Factors such as technological advancements, shifting consumer preferences, complex regulatory changes, and the rise of data analytics are reshaping the industry's dynamics.

The business world is heterogeneous in operations, and no one player can readily meet the needs of all and sundry. It is important to note that competition in the business world is stiffer and has taken another dimension, quite different from what it used to be, as many authors and management scholars have given cradle in their numerous articles on how organisation tends to survive and be on top of their games, by employing the use of various strategies to maintain relevance in the dynamic and complex environment. To remain competitive, pharmaceutical companies must embrace more adaptable and nuanced strategic approaches that account for these multifaceted developments, ensuring they can navigate this intricate terrain to achieve sustained success. However, companies have been in search of how to better differentiate their products from their rivals's products and to better position their products in the hearts of their customers by using the right business tools to better compete in the industry. This leads some companies to imitate the products and services of competitors in the industry or make slight differences to their products or services to confuse the customers, thereby making for stiffer competition.

In line with the foregoing, this study aims to assess differentiation strategy and its effects on organisational performance with the following objectives: assess the effect of differentiation strategies on the organisational performance of healthcare firms; evaluate differentiation strategies as a means of attracting customer loyalty to healthcare firm; and ascertain the influence differentiation strategies have on the customer patronage of healthcare firm.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Conceptual Framework

The strategy combines competitive gestures and business techniques managers use to please clients, perform efficiently, execute operations, and achieve organisational goals. The strategy must be implored to sustain competitive advantage. Kiama and Kagiri (2016) describe strategy as a manager's sizeable, near-term approach to engaging with fierce competition. These concepts illustrate that planning is a top responsibility for leadership, and it cuts through every part of an organisation's operations. A strategy is also a long-term, forward-looking, and imaginative approach motivated by a desire for competitiveness. The focus of business strategy is to create a competitive edge, which was invented due to competition.

Adhiambo (2019) pinpoints the merits of designing and executing a business organisation plan. He mentioned that it guides an organisation's entire management by making clear what the company wants to do, what it must do and the directions it must take in order to be where it wants to be on the market; it promotes the disciplined recognition and assessment of market opportunities and guides the organisation's evolving and changing relationship with its environment. It enables a company to be proactive, maintain a good balance with its climate, and make some breakthroughs in strategic advances. Organisational performance is the ability of an organisation to achieve set goals, such as top-benefit, high-quality items, enormous pieces of the sector, excellent budgetary results, and pre-decided sustainability using a significant exercise scheme (Mbugua & Kingua, 2019). Performance thinking can be advantageous if an employer takes a strategic approach that is consistent with its current situation. The interaction of strategy with the evolving corporative environment is one of the most common components in the definitions of strategy. An organization needs to leverage its resources over its rivals in the most resourceful fashion. This is the entire core of an organisational plan. Strategy is about designing action plans that permit an organisation to position its resources within its compass of business operations. Strategy can only accomplish its goal(s) when critical thinking is embraced in the face of competition.

Competitive strategy aims at building a long-term competitive advantage over the organisation's competitors. According to Kiama and Kagiri (2016), competitive strategy involves competing successfully in a specific market. It is about how a business can achieve competitive advantage by interacting uniquely. Looking carefully at the competitive strategy, it is essential to remember that choices produce results-generating activities. In other phrases, organisational outcomes are the implications of their rulers' choices. Strategy is the structure which drives and supports these choices. Competitive strategy is called the context that drives strategic placement choices. The approach for differentiation involves producing an object that is considered one of a kind. The rationale of differentiation strategy requires a firm to be novel at something or be seen as one of a kind. Mbugua and Kingua (2019) suggested that distinctive interventions are focused on offering something unique to customers and that the strategic positioning of the company's offerings is in a unique form, unlike competitors’ own. When the commodity is of higher quality, superior value is generated in some respects, vastly superior, and it comes with better value, or in some implied ways, it has a unique appeal. Differentiation effectively provides a significant benefit by creating patronisation loyalty amidst the end users of a given offering and quality. Furthermore, once they are fulfilled, customers are less likely to opt for other alternative goods.

Differentiation is a wellspring of competitive advantage. As a result, strategic distinction should strive to achieve marginal cost proximity compared to rivals by retaining lesser charges in areas not synonymous with differentiation and not investing too much to achieve differentiation (Adhiambo, 2019). Subsequently, any firm that is set out to pursue differentiation should know that differentiation in its entirety is not a conclusion. In the quest for innovative approaches, healthcare providers should be diligent in improving the relevant and specific strengths of their operations and their ability to increase the overall competitiveness of their potential benefits. Achieving a competitive edge in the market will boost performance and generate loyalty, resulting in a significant boost in repeating patronage of the firm's products. Furthermore, the fact that a high-quality product could improve the business's potential market share is another benefit of competitive product differentiation (Adimo, 2018). The achievement of an organisation's objectives solely depends on developing and implementing distinctive strategies that will efficiently withstand aggressive elements. Distinctiveness, cost control and concentration strategy were three aggressive approaches implemented by Micheal Porter to help organisations achieve their goals and objectives. Therefore, measuring organisational performance may be an exceptionally critical angle of operational exercises that the supervisors of an organisation must not dismiss.

The independent variable (Differentiation strategy) consists of two major constructs, which include Product innovation through Product design and Product quality, respectively. Conversely, the dependent variable comprises only one construct (Organizational Performance) which is measured in terms of customer loyalty and patronage.

Theoretical Framework

A few theoretical approaches have been reviewed in past works to understand the concept of differentiation strategy as a means of competitive advantage towards increased organisational performance. This study adopted Porter's theory of generic strategy. Porter's Theory of Generic Strategies: This concept was described by Michael Porter in the year 2000 and is underpinned by the concept of business strategy. This research defines Porter's generic policies (2000) as appropriate to the subject and applicable to the factors at stake in this research. As postulated by Porter, the generic strategies reveal how a company adopts competitive advantage across the range of its industry. Three specific approaches exist: either low cost, distinguished, or focused. A company is set to achieve one of two kinds of competitive advantage, either through reducing its expenses from its rivalry or by distinguishing itself by customer-valued size to place a greater cost. One of two kinds of range is also chosen by a business to concentrate (provides its products to a chosen business sections) or to be industry-wide, thereby providing its items across several market segments. He further argued that a generic strategy should be followed with singleness of mind, and applying more than one generic strategy simultaneously will result in poor performance. The descriptive approach of this theory represents competitive advantage and the breadth of the choice from the customer. Based on this, this theory was adopted to serve as a framework for this study.

Fig. 1. The Porter's Generic Competitive Strategies

		Lower Cost	**Differentiation**
COMPETITIVE SCOPE	Broad Target	Cost Leadership	Differentiation
	Narrow Target	Cost Focus	Differentiation Focus

Source: Adapted from Competitive Advantage by Porter (1985:11)

Firms that seek to be distinct from their chosen business by considering the features immensely appreciated and desired by customers must embrace differentiation. It helps in selecting one or more attributes that may be appealing to the needs and value of buyers in its industry and distinguishes itself to satisfy those desires. A firm that chose differentiation would charge a premium price as the reward for its uniqueness.

Empirical Framework

Anekwe, Onudugu, Ndubuisi and Akagbobi (2021) examined the Differentiation Strategy and Organizational Growth of Manufacturing Firms in Ebonyi State. The study further assessed the relationship between product differentiation and market share to determine the effect of personnel differentiation and competitive advantage. The study revealed a statistically significant relationship between product differentiation and market share and that personnel differentiation significantly positively affects competitive advantage. Adhiambo (2018) examined the influence of differentiation strategy on the performance of pharmaceutical companies operating in Kenya. The study revealed a positive relationship between the differentiation strategy and the performance of pharmaceutical companies adopted in the study. The study results showed that service strategies are mainly applied by employing qualified personnel who sell to targeted consumers.

Mbuagua and Kinyua (2019) completed a study to determine the effect of product differentiation strategies on organisational competitiveness strategies adopted by EABL Kenya. The study revealed that product process differentiation in EABL involves meeting observable characteristics of a product that are relevant to customers' preferences and choice processes. The study established that product market differentiation positively affects competitive advantage.

3. METHODOLOGY

A descriptive research design was adopted for use in this study. A descriptive research design was adopted with the aim of systematically obtaining information to identify the relationship between differentiation strategy and organisational performance. For this study, the walk-in distributors of healthcare firms constituted the study population. The selected healthcare firm has over 450 walk-in distributors (SMEDAN 2021). The non-probability sampling technique was adopted, and it majored on purpose. Non-probability purposive sampling was adopted to enable the researcher to adequately administer questionnaires to the walk-in distributors of the selected healthcare firm based on the subjective judgment of their ability to give adequate responses on the relationship between differentiation strategy and organisational performance. Using Yamane's formula for determining population size,

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

where N = Population Size = 450, e = Significant level of error (0.05), and n = Sample Size. The sample size is calculated to be two hundred eleven respondents. However, the usable instrument in this study was one hundred respondents based on the responsiveness of the walk-in distributors of a selected healthcare firm in Lagos State.

Data obtained from the questionnaire administration was checked with the help of Cronbach's alpha statistic using the analytical software package Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 20). The items measure the same construct when they have high inter-correlations. The primary source of data formed the basis of this research work. The regression method was used in analysing the gathered data and to test the research hypotheses with the use of an analytical software package: Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version

20). The linear regression method focuses on establishing the existing degree of relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Statistical Test of Hypotheses

H_{01}: Differentiation strategy does not influence the organisational performance of selected healthcare firms in Lagos State.

A regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of differentiation strategy on organizational performance. The findings are presented below.

Table 1.1: Results of Regression Analysis for Hypothesis One

MD	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	ANOVA		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standard Coefficient	T	Sig	DW
				F	Sig	B	Std.error	Beta			
1	.377[a]	.142	.133	15.07	0.000[b]	15.46 .308	1.582 .079	.377	9.770 3.882	.000 .000	1.17

a. Predictors: (Constant), Differentiation Strategy

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Source: Field Survey (2022)

The findings in Table 1.1 above shows a moderate linear relationship (R=0.377) between differentiation strategy and organizational performance. The R Square shows that differentiation strategy accounts for 14.2 per cent variance in consumer buying behavior. ANOVA test was used for the findings where the significance (Sig F=0.000) of the Fisher ratio (F=15.071) was less than the critical significance of 0.05. Hence, this shows that differentiation strategy affects the organizational performance of healthcare firms. This evidence is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. The analysis of the coefficient of differentiation strategy has a value of 0.308. This means that differentiation strategy accounted for 30.8 per cent of the organisational performance of healthcare firms. This value is high and indicates that differentiation strategy has a significant influence on organisational performance. Furthermore, the standard error (S.E) of estimate (β_1) of differentiation strategy (.079) in Table 1.3 is less than half of the parameter estimate ($\beta/2$).308/2= 0.154, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. This means that the parameter estimate is statistically significant, a relevant variable affecting organisational performance. This implies, therefore, that the parameter estimate (i.e., differentiation strategy) is statistically different from zero; hence, it is a relevant variable for the determination of the organizational performance of healthcare firms.

The t-statistic for the differentiation strategy variable is 3.882, which has a significance level of 0.000. Thus, the finding supports the fact that differentiation strategy contributes to the organizational performance of healthcare firms (i.e., differentiation strategy has a significant effect on organisational performance). Hence, differentiation strategy affects organisational performance.

The computed DW (Durbin-Watson) is 1.166; this reveals that there is no serial correlation between successive values of differentiation strategy and the organizational performance of a healthcare firm. This means that differentiation strategy influences organizational performance.

H_{02}: Differentiation strategy does not attract customer loyalty to selected healthcare firms in Lagos State.

To determine whether a differentiation strategy attracts customer loyalty, regression analysis was conducted. The data for Differentiation strategy measurement and index of customer loyalty were created by summing the items for each of the variables to create a new variable. Findings are presented in the following.

Table 2.1: Results of Regression Analysis for Hypothesis Two

MD	R	R2	Adj.R2	ANOVA		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standard Coefficient	T	Sig	DW
				F	Sig	B	Std.error	Beta			
1	.099	.010	-.001	.898	0.346	19.50 .063	1.315 .066	.099	14.836 .948	.000 .346	1.95

Source: Field Survey (2022)

The findings in Table 2.1 above present the results of a test of hypothesis two. In Table 2.1, the finding shows a moderate linear relationship (R=0.099) between differentiation strategy and the perception that differentiation strategy attracts customer loyalty. The R Square shows that differentiation strategy accounts for a 1 per cent variance in perception of differentiation strategy attracts customer loyalty. ANOVA test was employed to test the variables, giving the significance (Sig. F=0.346) of the Fisher ratio (F=0.898) greater than the critical significance at 0.05. Therefore, it was concluded that differentiation strategy does not significantly affect the perception that differentiation strategy attracts customer loyalty. The findings indicate variations in participants' perceptions of whether differentiation strategy attracts customer loyalty. The analysis of the coefficient of differentiation strategy has a value of 0.063. This value indicates that differentiation strategy produced about 6.3 per cent change in the perception that differentiation strategy attracts customer loyalty. This value is low and below 10 per cent; this implies that the differentiation strategy does not attract customer loyalty. However, this part must be interpreted with care because the participants do not possess adequate information regarding data gathered by the organisation from the differentiation strategy employed. The internal validity of the findings must be taken with absolute caution. Furthermore, the standard error (S. E) of estimate (β_1) of differentiation strategy (.066) in Table 2.1 is greater than the parameter estimate ($\beta/2$); .63/2 = 0.119; therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that the parameter estimate can be said to be statistically insignificant. This implies that the parameter estimate (i.e., differentiation strategy) is not statistically different from zero in this case. The t-statistic for the differentiation strategy variable is 0.948, which has a significance level of 0.346. Therefore, the finding shows that the celebrity differentiation strategy does not attract customer loyalty as the participants perceive. The computed DW (Durbin-Watson) is 1.953; this means there is an apparent absence of serial correlation between successive values of differentiation strategy and the perceptions of participants on what influences their loyalty to stay with the selected healthcare firm. Results show that the selected healthcare firm cannot rely on strategy to attract customer loyalty.

$H_{0\,3}$: There is no influence of differentiation strategy on customer patronage.

Similarly, to determine whether differentiation strategy influences customer patronage, regression analysis was conducted. The data for differentiation strategy and customer patronage were created by summing (aggregating) the items for each variable to create a new variable. Findings are presented in the following table.

Table 3.1: Results of Regression Analysis for Hypothesis Three

MD	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	ANOVA		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standard Coefficient	T	Sig	DW
				F	Sig	B	Std.error	Beta			
1	.176	.031	.020	2.911	0.091	21.67 -.139	2.55016	-.176	13.390 -1.706	.000 .091	1.64

Source: Field Survey (2022)

The findings in Table 3.1 present the results of the test of hypothesis three. The findings also show a moderate linear relationship (R=0.176) between Differentiation strategy and customer patronage. The R Square shows that differentiation strategy accounts for 3.1 percent variation in customer patronage. The results were subjected to an ANOVA test to give the significance (Sig F=0.091) of the Fisher ratio (F=2.911) above the critical significance at 0.05. Therefore, it was concluded that the differentiation strategy does not influence customer patronage of healthcare firms.

The coefficient of differentiation strategy, as shown in Table 3.1, was estimated as -.139. This value implies that additional expenditures incurred in the differentiation strategy bring about a -13.9 per cent change in customer patronage. This value implies that the differentiation strategy does not influence customer patronage. Therefore, it can be concluded that other factors are responsible for the customer patronage healthcare firm is currently enjoying, but not differentiation strategy.

In addition, the standard error (S.E) of estimate (β_1) of differentiation strategy was (.081) as reflected in table3.1 and is higher than the whole of the parameter estimate ($\beta/2$); -.139; the null hypothesis is therefore accepted, and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. This means that the parameter estimate of the differentiation strategy can be said to be statistically insignificant. This implies that the parameter estimate (i.e., differentiation strategy) is statistically less than zero. Hence, differentiation strategy is a relevant variable but not influencing customer patronage. The t-statistic for the differentiation strategy variable is -1.706, which has a significant level of 0.091. Therefore, the finding shows that the differentiation strategy does not influence customer patronage.

The computed DW (Durbin-Watson) is 1.636, which means that there is a clear absence of serial autocorrelation between successive values of differentiation strategy and customer patronage. This implies that the study can accept a decision on the influence of differentiation strategy on customer patronage.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, efforts were made to assess differentiation strategies and their effects on organisational performance using a selected healthcare firm as a case study. The study discovered that differentiation strategy positively affects organisational performance; however, it was further revealed that differentiation strategy has immensely contributed to competing with rivals in the industry. It was equally believed that differentiation strategy is a means of achieving organisation goals, and this has helped the company under review stay afloat in the industry.

Companies must understand when and how to use differentiation strategy to meet the organisation's desired goals. It is also worth noting that the company must be able to communicate the differentiation strategy to be employed to its staff for a proper understanding of its effects. It was reviewed that products sell themselves with or without a differentiation strategy. Such as the company's products under review. Every health product sells itself so long as it brings about the well-being of the customers. The study also revealed that organisational performance can be measured using financial and non-financial indices and that positive financial indicators show that the organisation is performing.

It was further revealed that differentiation strategy doesn’t really attract customer loyalty, and it does not fully influence customer patronage. There are other factors that could be responsible for this. Therefore, management must know the right strategy to attract customer loyalty, leading to customer patronage.

From the above conclusion, the following recommendations were made.

i. Management needs to be careful when using a differentiation strategy. This is because when differentiation strategies are not properly selected, it can give rival firms an edge, and customer patronage will be negatively impacted.

ii. Management should, therefore, get to know the extent of the differentiation strategy that will make customers loyal, and embracing it can lead to customer patronage.

iii. Management should not overlook other essential strategies even as they work to get the best out of differentiation strategy. Management should be more innovative in adopting a differentiation strategy of any kind.

iv. Academia and practitioners should encourage people to use other means of marketing communication. Researchers should investigate a way of helping to design a differentiation strategy that will not just positively affect organisational performance but also help attract customer loyalty and influence customer patronage.

Finally, not all differentiation strategies are worthwhile. Further research that will help reshape and elevate differentiation strategies to an enviable position in which they will achieve their original aim should be carried out.

References

Adhiambo, O. W. (2019). *Influence of differentiation strategy on performance of pharmaceutical companies operating in Kenya*. An Unpublished Master of Business Administration Research Project, University of Nairobi.

Adimo, A. A. (2018). Relationship between product differentiation strategies and organizational performance in Sameer Africa Kenya Limited. *British Journal of Marketing Studies, 6* (3), 60-72.
Anekwe, R. I., Onudugu, V., Ndubuisi, O. P., & Akagbobi, A. (2021). Differentiation Strategy and Organizational Growth of Manufacturing Firm in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 61*(3), 175-181.
Bryson, J. (2018). *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations* (5th ed.).New Jersey: Wiley Publishing.
Ghemawat, P. (1986). Sustainable advantage. *Harvard Business Review, 64*, 8-53.
Kiama, M. P., & Kagiri, W. K. (2016). Influence of differentiation strategy on performance of pharmaceutical companies operating in Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Strategic Management, 1*(1), 117-133.
Lawal, F.M., Elizabeth, O. O., & Oludayo, O. (2012.) Effect of strategic issue management on organizational performance. *Transnational Journal of Science and Technology*, *2*(10), 17-29.
Mbugua, J. W., & Kinyua, G. M. (2019). Personnel differentiation and organization performance: An empirical analysis of deposit taking micro-finance institutions in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 3(7), 485-495.
Mitroulis, D., & Kitsios, F. (2016). Fostering a Competitive Differentiation Strategy for Sustainable Organizational Performance. In E. Grigoroudis & M. Doumpos (Eds.), *Operationa Research in Business and Economics* (pp. 85-112). Cham: Springer.10.1007/978-3-319 33003-7-5.
Moon, H., Yur, Y., Yin, W., & Helm, C. (2014). Extending Porter's generic strategies: from three to eight. *European Journal of International Management, 8*(2), 205-225.
Muogbo, U. S. (2013). The impact of strategic management on organizational growth and development: A study of selected Manufacturing Firms in Anambra State. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 7*(1), 24-32.
Mutindi, U. J., Namusonge, G., & Obwogi, J. (2013), Effect of strategic management drivers on the performance of hotel industry in Kenyan coast. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, *2*(1), 63-92.
Ndhiwa, G. O. (2010). *The relationship of competitive strategies and firm performance in the mile telecommunication service industry: A case of Safaricom Kenya Limited*. An Unpublished Master of Business Administration Research Project, University of Nairobi.
Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. New York: Free Press.
Porter, M. E. (2000). *Competitive Strategy.* New York: The Free Press.
Porter, M. E. (2005). *Competitive Advantage strategies: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance with a New Introduction*. New York. The Free Press.
SMEDAN/ NBS (2021). Report on national survey of micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs). *National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)/Small & Medium Enterprises Agency of Nigeria (SMEDAN), Abuja*, 1-186.
Thompson, A.A., Gamble, J. E., & Strickland, A. J. (2004). *Strategy: Winning the Marketplace*. New York: McGraw-Hill.