International Research Journal of Management, IT & Social Sciences
Available online at https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/irjmis/
Vol. 7 No. 5, September 2020, pages: 1-12
ISSN: 2395-7492
https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v7n5.965

Competitive Advantage and Organisational Performance in Selected Firms

Ogala Sunday Christian[a]

Article history:

Submitted: 09 May 2020
Revised: 18 June 2020
Accepted: 27 July 2020

Keywords:

competitive advantage
firm strategic
organizational performance
research development
resource availability

Abstract

This study examined competitive advantage and organizational performance in, Delta State. A 12-item validated structured questionnaire served as the research instrument to 125 staff and customers of the selected firms in Delta State. Two objectives and hypotheses to examine the impact of resource availability on organizational performance and to determine the effect of research and development performance guided the study. The major analytical tools used were correlation and multiple regression analysis. Primary data was used on a sample of 125 members of staff. It was found that there is a strong relationship between Resource availability, Research and development, and firm performance. The researcher, therefore, concluded that Resource availability positively affects the firm strategic performance in the firms selected. Bringing together expertise and capabilities from various organizations improves the performance of a product. Combining financial resources and strategic alliances help in improving the performance of a product. The strategic resources, however, which are generally intangible, are neither easily identifiable nor rapidly developed. Hence, the researcher recommends that there is a need for management of these manufacturing firms to enhance their Resource availability as this will lead to organization performance.

International research journal of management, IT and social sciences © 2020.
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Corresponding author:
Christian, O.S.
Department of Arts And Humanities (GNS), Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku, Nigeria
Phone: +2348063733887
Email address: anthony.kifordu@yahoo.com

[a] Department of Arts And Humanities (GNS), Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku, Nigeria

1 Introduction

An organization's strategy consists of the moves and approaches devised by management to produce successful organizational performance. A strategy is thus a management game plan for the business (Kugun, Wanyonyi, & Sangoro, 2016). With a growing business, there came the disenchantment period which was characterized by dissatisfaction planning because there was increased environmental turbulence, reduced Business opportunities, and increased competition. The essence of formulating a competitive positioning is to relate a company to its environment (Ciobota & Velea, 2015). Formulating a competitive brand strategy is an important problem for marketing managers but how these strategies are positioned is more important because strategies can always be replicated by competitors.

Organizations that do adopt competitive positioning tend to be more successful than others. However, research has also shown that competitive positioning can be risky and that failure is the most likely outcome of an organization (Stanley *et al.,* 2013). Siregar & Toha, (2012) argued that the benefits of competitive positioning vary and may not accrue at all. Moreover, from his study, Cooper and Brentani as cited in Tharamba, Rotich & Anyango (2018) have argued that the relationship can be shaped, with high and low levels likely resulting in the highest performance. An organizational strategy is the sum of the actions a company intends to take to achieve long-term goals. Together, these actions make up a company's strategic plan. Strategic plans take at least a year to complete, requiring involvement from all company levels. Top management creates a larger organizational strategy, while middle and lower management adopts goals and plans to fulfill the overall strategy step by step, (Tharamba *et al.,* 2018; Day & Lichtenstein, 2006). A strategy is therefore concerned with long term direction, meeting challenges from the firm's business environment such as competitors and changing needs of customers and using the organizational internal resources and competencies effectively and building on its strengths to meet environmental challenges. Whatever the interpretation is put on strategy, the strategic actions of an organization a widespread and long term consequences for the position of the organization in the market place its relationship with different stakeholders and overall performance.

Competitive positioning is concerned with how business as a whole distinguishes itself in a valuable way from its competitors and delivers value to specific customer segments, (Wickham, 2011; Waggoner *et al.,* 1999; Rahman & Bullock, 2005). "Organization strategic position is concerned with the impact on the strategy of the external environment, internal resources and competences, and the expectations and influence of stakeholders. According to Janiszewska (2012), a consideration of the environment, strategic capability, the expectations of the purposes within the cultural and political framework of the organization provides a basis for understanding the strategic position of an organization. In support of this, (Tamirisa, Johnson, Kochhar & Mitton, 2007). Competitive positioning provides a vehicle for creating organizational focus and a framework for considering resource allocation questions when an organization articulates its perceptual location, the complexities surrounding these decisions are significantly reduced. Organization strategic position is concerned with the impact on the strategy of the external environment, internal resources and competences, and the expectations and influence of stakeholders. Gu & Baomin (2009) states that a consideration of the environment, strategic capability, the expectations of the purposes within the cultural and political framework of the organization provides a basis for understanding the strategic position of an organization. In support of this, Competitive positioning provides a vehicle for creating organizational focus and a framework for considering resource-allocation questions.

Moreover, when an organization articulates its perceptual location, the complexities surrounding these decisions are significantly reduced. The goal of positioning is to locate the brand in the minds of consumers to maximize the potential benefit of the firm (Kotler, 2009; Ruiz-Mercader *et al.,* 2006; Yamin *et al.*, 1997). When a firm or provider establishes and maintains a distinctive place for itself and its offerings in the market, it is said to be successfully positioned. Hassan, George, & Craft, (2005) Positioning must establish a position for the product firm in the customer's mind should be distinctive providing one simple consistent message and must set the product/firm apart from competitors. It should be noted that a firm cannot be all things to all people and therefore must focus. To be successful in the long term, the operations of a firm must be completely different from those traditional business counterparts.

Competitive Positioning is one of strategic management's most critical tasks, for some marketers (Bridoux, 2004), positioning is strictly a communications issue. The product or service is given and the objective is to manipulate consumer perceptions of reality. Positioning is more than just advertising and promotion. Positioning strategies can be conceived and developed in a variety of ways. It can be derived from object attributes, competition, application, types of consumers involved, or the characteristics of the product. Manhas (2010) all these attributes represent a different approach in developing positioning strategies, even though all of them have the common objective of projecting a favorable image in the minds of the consumer.

Statement of the Problem

The manufacturing industry in Nigeria is characterized by many players in the market offering similar products to the consumer, this has called for vigorous product differentiation and heavy investment in technology which is the major industry driver. Initially, there was no stiff competition as such due to the limited number of players. With the entry of competitors, for these firms in the industry to remain competitive and be able to attract new customers as well as retain them extensive marketing of products being offered is required. The dismal performance in some of the participants due to competition calls for the application of new strategic competitive advantage positioning moves to compete for the market by Nigerian manufacturing industries.

With a strong strategic positioning, an organization is poised for ongoing success, sustainability, and a distinct competitive advantage. Some of the parameters around which strategic position is defined as advanced to include service, access, innovation and demographics, and also quality. Nigeria has experienced radial changes as the liberalization process manufacturing organizations and is occasionally faced with challenges that force them to adjust from their normal ways of doing things. Furthermore, the cost of failure is very high when some of the participants fail to change for survival with specific reference to their ownership, distribution, and innovation or product development ensures a match of products to customer needs. Therefore, this study is to examine the dynamics of competitive advantage and organizational performance in selected manufacturing organizations in Delta State.

Objectives of the Study

1) Examine the impact of resource availability on organizational performance.
2) Determine the effect of research and development on organizational performance

Research Question

1) To what extent does the effect of resource availability influence on organizational performance?
2) What is the impact of research and development on organizational performance?

Research Hypotheses

HO_1: Resource availability has no significant relationship with the firm strategic group.

HO_2: Research and development has no significant relationship with a firm strategic group

Review of Related Literature

Conceptual Review

Concept of Competitive Advantage

Maa (2000) posited that competitive advantage and the organizational consequences are two special terms. But there is an apparently complex connection. General work has shown a considerable association between these two variables. (Morgan, Kaleka, & Katsikeas, 2004) also supported this study. In the study of (Rose, Abdullah, & Ismad, 2010) it is inspected that the organizational edge from the resource-based view is as vital as it can be. It is used as a conceptual guideline for the business organization for enhancing their differential advantage position. The Performance via appliance and manipulation of known internal resources of companies is also increased by using competencies. They put into the body of knowledge by using the experimental approach and Resource-Based View. The firm's excellence can be enhanced by using these qualities.

Firms gain a monopoly by capturing high market position in outstanding industries (Rose, Abdullah, & Ismad, 2010). Powell (2003) has examined three industries that have the greatest supremacy. These were pharmaceuticals, brewing, and computers. These are among the industries used to support theories of competitive lead. He argued about it that the performance speculation could easily be manipulated by incorporating fake and unsound models about it as how the performance could be circulated in a fair competitive process. Fahy (2000) argued about the realization of a sustainable position. It can lead to superior presentation usually considered in conservative terms such as a share in the market and fertility. We can state it as the financial performance measurement approach. In other words, if we take this view strictly the competitive circumference and performance are two dissimilar ideas and proportions. Firms have to spotlight their managerial strategies in achieving and supporting a bloodthirsty edge over their competitors. As a result, such a leading position will direct to superior firm performance.

Morgan, Kaleka, & Katsikeas (2004) argued that different resources and capabilities affect the export business enterprise. Different options and the positional improvement achieved in the export market which in turn change export

venture performance. The research reveals that the key resources and capabilities are associated with each other and are directly linked with the export venture's competitive strategy choices. A significant relationship between product quality and performance of the organization has also been acknowledged. Companies experiencing a product based margin on their rivals have been revealed to attain relatively better performance. Morgan, Kaleka, & Katsikeas (2004) measured product competency in terms of higher product quality, packaging, design, and style. Similarly, research illustrated that there is a significant association of services based advantage on the organizational consequences. Companies gained benefits from services as competitive edge contrast to their rivals. For example, more product elasticity, convenience, delivery speed, consistency, and technological support have verified to achieve relatively better performance.

Wang & Lo (2006) have further boasted the linkage of unique advantages and the sales performance of organizations. He measured sale growth performance by the level of sale revenue, profitability, Return on investments, yield, product added value and share in the market. Ismail, Rose, and Abdullah (2010) argued that a unique edge is a part of the institution of high-level performance. This relationship will be exaggerated by moderating variables such as age and size of firms. The moderating effects of these variables provide precious information about strategic management in the attainment of a unique edge and to increase performance. In Ismail studies theoretically and empirically the age of the firm proves a significant moderator. We can explain the findings of Ismail by the straightforward information that experience comes with age, and organizations that have been established for years and have such experience are in a better position to improve their overall performance.

Resource Availability and Organisational Performance

Banks have formed strategic alliances with other organizations, combining resources with other organizations help in the market penetration of a product (Oliver, Maria & Sudhaeshan 2007). Inter-organizational relationships create the opportunity to share the resources and capabilities of firms while working with partners to develop additional resources and capabilities as the function for new competitive advantages. Bringing together expertise and capabilities from various organizations improves the performance of a product. The strategic resources, however, which are generally intangible, are neither easily identifiable nor rapidly developed (Onguko & Ragui, 2014).

The four firms are interdependent in the sense that the behavior of one firm affects the others, in the recent past, price wars have led to reduction of tariffs across the industry; the pricing of the various products is relatively the same. Although Safaricom ltd has continued to lead the industry through innovations such as electronic money transfer and data services, among others, the four firms employ almost similar business practices and the products offered are similar; all these firms use similar marketing strategies; promotional activities such as free airtime on top-up are witnessed across the firms (Mutua & Ngugi, 2012).

The financial resource is the money available to a business for spending in the form of cash, liquid securities, and credit lines. Before going into business, an entrepreneur needs to secure sufficient financial resources to be able to operate efficiently and sufficiently well to promote success (Bentz, 2008). Managers may be inclined to say that their problems would be solved if they just had more money to work with. And having more money to use is certainly better than having too little. But more money may not always result in a greater impact if the money is not well managed. There may be little connection between the quality of program delivery and an organization's system for managing money. Effective organizations tend to know how their money is being spent (Junqueira *et al.*, 2016).

Organizational managers must have enough skills and expertise to keep track of financial resources and spend on profitable programs. The function of management is to plan, organize, staff, lead, and control. Every one of these functions is influenced to a great degree by how much money there is. Managers and program staff simply cannot carry out their assigned responsibilities effectively without understanding their financial constraints (Noreen, 2015). Managers need to have some means for knowing what is happening concerning their financial resources if they are to make informed management decisions. This responsibility is carried out by installing and managing a financial accounting system. That system may well be automated at some point, but a manual system will serve most needs at the outset. But regardless of how reports are produced and records maintained, they should be accurate and produced in a timely fashion so that staff can base their decisions on good information.

Mergers refer to the joining of two companies where one new company will continue to exist. The term acquisition refers to the purchase of assets by one company from another company. In an acquisition, both companies may continue to exist (Patel, 2015). Mergers and acquisitions are very easy and the only option for small or less profit-making organizations to stay and survive in the emerging market. Mergers and acquisitions are a global business strategy that enables firms to enter into new potential markets or to a new business area. Merger and acquisition are not the same

terminologies but often it is used interchangeably. In acquisition one organization purchase a part or whole another organization. While in merger two or more than two organizations constitute one organization (Tharamba *et al.,* 2018).

The merger is the legal activity in which two or more organizations combine and only one firm survives as a legal entity (Tharamba *et al.,* 2018). As per the definition of Georgios, as cited in Tharamba *et al.* (2018) in a merger, two or more firms approach together and become a single firm while in acquisition big and financially sound firms purchase the small firm. It is presented a definition of the merger as two or more firms close together and form one or more firms. It defined mergers and acquisitions as activities involving takeovers, corporate restructuring, or corporate control that changes in the ownership structure of firms.

Research and development (R&D) and Organisational performance

Banks have established research development facilities to improve their products. Research and development facilities influence product performance in the banking industry in Nigeria to a great extent. Also, meeting customers' needs to influence product performance in the banking industry in Nigeria to a great extent (Chang, Fernando, & Tripathy, 2015). The use of new technology influences product performance in the banking industry in Nigeria to a great extent. Additionally, successful products influence product performance in the banking industry in Nigeria to a great extent. During the last few decades, scholars have increasingly stressed the importance of research and development (R&D) in the manufacturing sector. Technology-based companies in this sector put forth large expenditures for R&D to maintain their competitive advantage and ensure their future viability (Lee *et al.,* 1997). This implies that due to increasing competition, firms should innovate at an extraordinary pace by developing and improving new products and services, and by generating ideas expressly intended to become commercially viable and profitable business ventures. Innovativeness is one of the fundamental instruments of growth strategies to enter new markets, to increase the existing market share, and to provide the company with a competitive edge (Gunday *et al.,* 2011).

Companies have become more motivated to carry out R&D as a result of the fact that most of the world`s economies have embarked on policy reforms on market-oriented liberalization aimed at promoting economic performance. Additionally, the spillover effects from R&D are beneficial not only to firms but also to economies. Therefore, corporate R&D activities as well as public R&D activities will produce R&D spillovers that will eventually yield benefits to the entire society. Due to the rising costs of R&D and the increasing dependence of companies on technology for competitive advantage, managers seek evidence of the impact of R&D on performance. Past studies have documented that a firm's R&D investment consistently and positively affects its market value. Corporate R&D investment also plays a vital role in a firm's future growth. As firms and industries continue to evolve, R&D has increasingly become a critical element of firm success and survival (Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2011) and sustainable competitive advantage (Johannessen, 2004). In the last few decades, a large number of studies have attempted to map the channels and mechanisms through which new knowledge is transformed into better performance.

Cost Leadership Strategy

This strategy emphasizes efficiency. By producing high volumes of standardized products, a firm hopes to take advantage of economies of scale and experience curve effects. The product is often a basic no-frills good that is produced at a relatively low cost and made available to a very large customer base. Maintaining this strategy requires a continuous search for cost reductions in all aspects of the business. The associated distribution strategy is to obtain the most extensive distribution possible. The promotional strategy often involves trying to make a virtue out of low-cost product features (Afande & Uk, 2015).

Differentiation Strategy

With the differentiation strategy, the unique attributes or perceptions of uniqueness and characteristics of a firm's product other than cost provide value to customers. The firm pursuing differentiation seeks to be unique in its industry along some dimension that is valued by customers, which means investing in product R&D and marketing. It is the ability to sell its differentiated product at a price that exceeds what was spent to create it that allows the firm to outperform its rivals and earn above-average returns. A product can be differentiated in various ways. Unusual features, responsive customer service, rapid product innovations and technological leadership, perceived prestige and status, different tastes, and engineering design and performance are examples of approaches to differentiation.

Differentiation Strategy

With the differentiation strategy, the unique attributes or perceptions of uniqueness and characteristics of a firm's product other than cost provide value to customers. The firm pursuing differentiation seeks to be unique in its industry along some dimension that is valued by customers, which means investing in product R&D and marketing (Tharamba *et al.,* 2018). It is the ability to sell its differentiated product at a price that exceeds what was spent to create it that allows the firm to outperform its rivals and earn above-average returns. A product can be differentiated in various ways. Unusual features, responsive customer service, rapid product innovations and technological leadership, perceived prestige and status, different tastes, and engineering design and performance are examples of approaches to differentiation.

Strategic positioning

Strategic positioning was a marketing term that described how a company configured the 4 Ps of marketing (product features, price, place, and promotion) so that they appeal to a specific market segment or niche. Primarily, strategic positioning is a differentiation tactic by the customer segment, to dominate one market niche as much as possible, thus matching production costs, locations, prices, and products to maximize the returns on investment (ROI) on that combination (Onguko & Ragui, 2014).

2 Theoretical review

Diffusion theory

Tharamba *et al.* (2018) suggested that a good strategy is one that generates a competitive advantage that differentiates an organization with its competitors by giving it a sustainable edge that is valuable, rare, and not easy to imitate. The strategy ensures continuity in an organization by giving coherence and direction to the growth of the entire organization. The relationship between competitive advantage and organizational performance can be explained by diffusion theory while resource dependency theory will explain the competitive connecting relationships in an organization.

Diffusion Innovation Theory (DIT)

Diffusion is the process by which innovation is communicated through certain channels over some time among members of a certain social system. An innovation is "an idea, practice, or object that is perceived to be new by an individual or other unit of adoption".

Communication is a process in which participants create and share information to reach a mutual understanding (Sahin, Rogers, Rogers, & Rogers, 2006). The theory of DIT has five basic elements which are ideal for this study. The characteristics of an innovation which may influence its adoption; decision-making process that occurs when individuals consider adopting a new idea, product or practice; characteristics of individuals that make them likely to adopt innovation; consequences for individuals and society of adopting an innovation; and communication channels used in the adoption process.

Resource Dependency Theory

The resource-based view of the firm suggests that firms" derive competitive advantages from their preferential access to idiosyncratic resources, especially tacit knowledge-related (based) resources. Approaching alliance formation from a resource-based perspective has, traditionally, meant a focus on existing competencies (or lack thereof) that may propel firms to enter into new alliances rather than the conditions that determine the opportunity set firms may perceive. This internal, static focus implicitly considers firms as atomistic actors engaging in strategic actions in a social context, thereby encapsulating the external context within measures of competitiveness in product or supplier markets Organizational success in resource dependency theory (RDT) is defined as organizations maximizing their power (Kyengo *et al.*, 2016). Research on the bases of power within organizations began as early as Weber and included much of the early work conducted by social exchange theorists and political scientists. Generalization of power-based arguments from intra-organizational relations to relations between organizations began as early as Selznick. RDT characterizes the links among organizations as a set of power relations based on exchange resources.

Empirical Review

Tharamba, Rotich &Anyango (2018) investigate how Strategic positioning is considered a critical requirement for the growth and profitability in the telecommunication industry. In the modern competitive industry, Strategic positioning has a considerable impact on corporate performance leading to an improved market position that conveys competitive advantage and superior performance. Firms in the mobile telecommunication industry in Kenya have been operating in an increasingly competitive, highly regulated, and dynamic market and therefore have to formulate strategies to ensure their survival. The telecommunication industry environment has of late been affected adversely by the changing operating environment that has seen one of the four operators (YU mobile) quit the market after making huge losses and the remaining two (Airtel and Telkom) are trying to rebrand and make a strategic comeback. Interestingly, while Safaricom is making the highest profits in East and Central Africa, Airtel, Telkom (Telkom Kenya) have been struggling a fact that has led to the management of both Telkom and Airtel consider leaving the Kenyan market. This study sought to find out the impact of strategic positioning on the performance of mobile telecommunication firms in Kenya, considering the Firm's marketing, Research and development, Multiple Products and Resource availability as the measurement items. The study considered a descriptive research design using a census approach. The target population of this study comprised of the management staffs working in the marketing and research & development departments at the headquarters of Safaricom limited in Kenya, the sampling frame consisted of Safaricom's top, middle and operational managers. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social sciences (SPSS) version 18 and presented in graphs, tables, and charts. The study established that marketing, research and development, resource availability, and multiple products had a positive influence on organizational performance in the telecommunication industry in Kenya.

Munyoki (2015) investigated the role of organizational autonomy and positioning on the relationship between competitive strategies and performance of Kenyan State Corporations. This study was guided by positivist philosophy. The positivist school of thought is based on the assumption that only one reality exists, though it can only be known imperfectly due to human limitations and researchers can only discover this reality within the realm of probability. The study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional census survey on a population of 187 Kenyan State Corporations across the public sector. The study used primary data collected by questionnaires administered to the Chief Executive Officers of the State Corporations. The study also used secondary data on performance collected from annual performance contract reports for State Corporations for the five performance contracting cycles between 2009 and 2014 from the Department of Performance Contracting in the Ministry of Planning and Devolution. The results indicated that competitive strategies had statistically significant effects on the performance of Kenyan state corporations. The results further indicated that though positioning is an important strategy, it did not mediate between competitive strategies and performance of the Kenyan state corporations but organizational autonomy moderated between competitive strategies and the Kenyan state corporations. The combined effect of the three predictor variables was greater than the individual influence of each predictor variable on the performance of Kenyan state corporations. The stakeholder's theory has gained a substantial boost from the study because Kenyan State Corporations are formed to benefit the stakeholders who in this case are Kenyan citizens. Further, RBV theory has benefited from the findings that, the principle should dedicate enough resources for the State Corporations to achieve their obligations. Structural contingency theory benefits from the study because it is clear that performance is determined by the environment and that autonomy, positioning and competitive strategies deal with technology, people, and work cultures. The strategic conflict model has been supported by the study because some corporations share the same environments and strategies but the outcomes are different because rational thinking is influenced by time and managers'decisions.

3 Methods

The study was a survey that used a random sampling method in arriving at 130 respondents. The primary data were generated and collected from 130 staff and customers using the questionnaire. Out of the 130 sets of questionnaires administered, a total number of 125 (96.2%) were retrieved and 5 were rejected. The major analytical tools used were correlation and multiple regression analysis.

4 Results and Discussions

Table 1
Correlation Matrix among the Dimensions of Competitive Advantage and Performance

	Resources Availability	Research and Development	Organisational performance
Resources Availability	1		
Research and Development	.373**	1	
Organisational performance	.445**	.490**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: Analysis of field survey, 2019

The correlation matrix analysis as shown in the above table 1 reported that Resources Availability exhibited positive correlation with Research and Development (r = .373**, P < .01) Resources Availability (r = .445**, P < .01)organisational performance. Similarly, Resources Availability was positively significantly correlated with Research and Development, and organizational performance.

Table 2
Multiple regression analysis of resources availability, research, and development on organisational performance

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	8.576	1.601		5.357	.624
1	Resources Availability	.114	.086	.126	1.329	.006
	Research and Development	.145	.089	.163	1.618	. 008

Dependent Variable: Firm Strategic Group
Source: Analysis of field survey, 2019

Table 3
ANOVA

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	67.066	3	22.355	7.824	.000[b]
1	Residual	345.734	121	2.857		
	Total	412.800	124			

a. Dependent Variable: Firm Strategic Group
b. Predictors: (Constant), Resources Availability, Research and Development

Table 4
Model summary

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.403[a]	.162	.142	1.6904

a. Predictors: (Constant), Resources Availability, Research and Development
Source: Analysis of field survey, 2019

5 Discussion of Findings

The study is focused on the dynamic of competitive positioning and organizational performance in the selected manufacturing firms in Delta State, Nigeria. The results of the correlation analysis involving all indicators of competitive advantage exhibited an overwhelmingly positive correlation coefficient values among the variables. This is indicative that they are appropriate dimensions and measures of competitive advantage. The results from the multiple Regression analysis (MRA) recorded the dynamic of competitive positioning on a firm strategic group. The two constructs of competitive advantage: Resources Availability ($\beta = .126$, $P < 0.01$), Research and Development ($\beta = .163$, $P < 0.01$) exhibited statistically significant positive effect on firm strategic group.

The result provided support for the H_1 test result which indicated that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between Resources Availability and firm strategic group (P(cal) 0.006 < P(crit) 0.05). These findings are in line with Onguko & Ragui, (2014) posit that inter-organizational relationships create the opportunity to share the resources and capabilities of firms while working with partners to develop additional resources and capabilities as the function for new competitive advantages. Bringing together expertise and capabilities from various organizations improves the performance of a product. The strategic resources, however, which are generally intangible, are neither easily identifiable nor rapidly developed.

Similarly, the findings indicate that Research and Development are found to have a significant positive relationship with the firm strategic group ($\beta = .163$, $P < 0.01$). The findings provided support for the result of H_2 which stated that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between Research and Development and firm strategic group. The finding is inconsonant opined that companies have become more motivated to carry out R&D as a result of the fact that most of the world`s economies have embarked on policies reforms on market-oriented liberalization aimed at promoting economic performance. Additionally, the spillover effects from R&D are beneficial not only to firms but also to economies. Therefore, corporate R&D activities as well as public R&D activities will produce R&D spillovers that will eventually yield benefits to the entire society.

6 Conclusions

From the findings, the study concludes that Research and developments positively affect organizational performance in selected manufacturing organizations. Companies have become more motivated to carry out R&D as a result of the fact that most of the world`s economies have embarked on policy reforms on market-oriented liberalization aimed at promoting economic performance. The study found that Resource availability positively affects organizational performance in manufacturing firms in Delta State. From the findings, the study concludes that Resource availability positively affects the performance of manufacturing organizations. Bringing together expertise and capabilities from various organizations improves the performance of a product. Combining financial resources and strategic alliances help in improving the performance of a product. The strategic resources, however, which are generally intangible, are neither easily identifiable nor rapidly developed.

Recommendations

1) There is a need for management to use more of retained earnings in their investment for Research and developments since this has positive effects on the performance of their organization.
2) The study established that Resource availability positively affects organizational performance. Thus, the enhancement of their Resource availability will lead to organization performance.

Conflict of interest statement

The author declared that he has no competing interests.

Statement of authorship

The author has a responsibility for the conception and design of the study. The author has approved the final article.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

References

Afande, F. O., & Uk, F. (2015). Competitive strategies and firm performance in the mobile telecommunication service industry: A case of Safaricom Kenya limited. *Developing Country Studies*, *5*(3), 2224-2607.

Bentz, V. M., & Shapiro, J. J. (1998). *Mindful inquiry in social research*. Sage Publications.

Bridoux, F. (2004). A resource-based approach to performance and competition: An overview of the connections between resources and competition. *Luvain, Belgium Institut et de Gestion, Universite Catholique de Louvain*, *2*(1), 1-21.

Chang, H., Fernando, G. D., & Tripathy, A. (2015). An empirical study of strategic positioning and production efficiency. *Advances in Operations Research*, *2015*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/347045
Changing World. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ciobota, G. (2015). The Strategic Positioning of the Financial Banking Companies-Key Factor for Achieving Competitive Advantages. *Knowledge Horizons. Economics*, *7*(1), 103.

Day, M., & Lichtenstein, S. (2006). Strategic supply management: the relationship between supply management practices, strategic orientation and their impact on organisational performance. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, *12*(6), 313-321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2007.01.005

Fahy, J. (2000). The resource-based view of the firm: some stumbling-blocks on the road to understanding sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of European industrial training*. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590010321061

Fischer, S., Cooper, R. N., Dornbusch, R., Garber, P. M., Massad, C., Polak, J. J., ... & Tarapore, S. S. (1998). *Should the IMF Pursue Capital-Account Convertibility?* (No. 207). International Economics Section, Departement of Economics Princeton University,.

Gu, X., & Dong, B. (2009). International Capital Flows: Tradeoff at Optimum and Delay in Bargaining. *Available at SSRN 1476184*.

Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G., Kilic, K., & Alpkan, L. (2011). Effects of innovation types on firm performance. *International Journal of production economics*, *133*(2), 662-676. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2011.05.014

Hassan, S. S., & Craft, S. H. (2005). Linking global market segmentation decisions with strategic positioning options. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *22*(2), 81-89. https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760510589244

Ismail, A. I., Rose, R. C., Abdullah, H., & Uli, J. (2010). The relationship between organisational competitive advantage and performance moderated by the age and size of firms. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, *15*(2), 157-173.

Janiszewska, K., & Insch, A. (2012). The strategic importance of brand positioning in the place brand concept: elements, structure and application capabilities. *Journal of International Studies*, *5*(1).

Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation, organizational learning, and performance. *Journal of business research*, *64*(4), 408-417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.09.010

Johannessen, A., Kristoffersen, L., & Tufte, P. A. (2004). Forskningsmetode for økonomiskadministrative fag: Abstrakt forlag.

Junqueira, E., Dutra, E. V., Zanquetto Filho, H., & Gonzaga, R. P. (2016). The effect of strategic choices and management control systems on organizational performance. *Revista Contabilidade & Finanças*, *27*(72), 334-348. https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-057x201601890

Kotler, P. (2009). *Marketing management: A south Asian perspective*. Pearson Education India.

Kugun, G., Wanyonyi, K. W., & Sangoro, O. (2016), Analysis of Strategic Positioning on Organization Perfmance. IJRDO - *Journal of Business Management*, *2*(11), 26–56.

Kyengo, J. W., Ombui, K., & Iravo, M. A. (2016). Influence of competitive strategies on the performance of telecommunication companies in Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, *2*(1), 1-16.

Lee, M. S., Sandler, D. M., & Shani, D. (1997). Attitudinal constructs towards sponsorship. *International Marketing Review*. https://doi.org/10.1108/02651339710170230

Ma, H. (2000). Competitive advantage and firm performance. *Competitiveness review*, *10*(2), 15-32.

Manhas, P. S. (2010). Análisis de posicionamiento estratégico de marca a través de la comparación de percepciones cognigtivas y de conación. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, *15*(29), 15-34.

Morgan, N. A., Kaleka, A., & Katsikeas, C. S. (2004). Antecedents of export venture performance: A theoretical model and empirical assessment. *Journal of marketing*, *68*(1), 90-108. https://doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmkg.68.1.90.24028

Munyoki, C. (2015). *Competitive strategies, organizational autonomy, positioning and performance of Kenyan state corporations* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Mutua, M. T., & Ngugi, K. (2012). Influence of competitive intelligence on profitability of mobile telecommunication companies in Kenya. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development (ISSN 2278–0211)*, *1*(11), 229-205.

Noreen, S. (2015), Relationship among Strategic Positioning, Strategic Customer Relationship Management and Organization's Performance. *International Journal of Management Research and Emerging Sciences*, 5(1), 47–63.

Oliver, F., Maria, T. A., & Sudhaeshan, D. (2007), The impact of resource-strategy correspondence on marketing performance financial performance tradeoffs. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 15(2), 161–183.

Onguko, M. A., & Ragui, M. (2014). The role of strategic positioning on products performance in the telecommunications industry in Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research*, *3*(10), 1309-1314.

Patel, K. K. (2015). A case study on strategic positioning of Vistara: Analysis and forecasting way ahead IES Management College and Research Centre, Mumbai, India. *Journal of Business and Management (IOSRJBM)*, *1*(11), 1-11.

Powell, T. C. (2003). Varieties of competitive parity. *Strategic Management Journal*, *24*(1), 61-86. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.283

Rahman, S. U., & Bullock, P. (2005). Soft TQM, hard TQM, and organisational performance relationships: an empirical investigation. *Omega*, *33*(1), 73-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2004.03.008

Roger, M. (2009). Fundamental theory of institutions: A lecture in honour of Leo Hurwiez. *Review of Economic Design*, *13*, 59-75.

Rose, R. C., Abdullah, H., & Ismad, A. I. (2010). A Review on the Relationship between Organizational Resources, Competitive Advantage and Performance. *Journal of International Social Research*, *3*(11), 488-498.

Ruiz-Mercader, J., MeroñO-Cerdan, A. L., & Sabater-SáNchez, R. (2006). Information technology and learning: Their relationship and impact on organisational performance in small businesses. *International journal of information management*, *26*(1), 16-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2005.10.003

Sahin, I. (2006). Detailed review of Rogers' diffusion of innovations theory and educational technology-related studies based on Rogers' theory. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *5*(2), 14-23.

Siregar, Y. A., & Toha, M. Selection of Strategy Positioning and Formulation Strategies for Improving Business Performance of Bakery XYZ. *Indonesian Journal of Business Administration*, *1*(5), 67504.

Tamirisa, N. T., Johnson, S., Kochhar, K., & Mitton, T. (2007), Malaysian Capital Controls: Macroeconomics and Institutions. *Capital Controls and Capital Flows in Emerging Economies:* Policies, Practices and Consequences (6). http://doi.org/10.5089/9781451863116.001

Tharamba, T. M., Rotich, T., & Anyango, W. (2018). Effect of strategic positioning on the firms performance in the telecommunications firms in Kenya: a case of Safaricom limited. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, *5*(2), 82-105.

Waggoner, D. B., Neely, A. D., & Kennerley, M. P. (1999). The forces that shape organisational performance measurement systems:: An interdisciplinary review. *International journal of production economics*, *60*, 53-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(98)00201-1

Wang, Y., & Lo, H. P. (2003). Customer-focused performance and the dynamic model for competence building and leveraging. *Journal of Management Development*. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710310478486

Wickham, H. (2011). The split-apply-combine strategy for data analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *40*(1), 1-29.

Yamin, S., Mavondo, F., Gunasekaran, A., & Sarros, J. C. (1997). A study of competitive strategy, organisational innovation and organisational performance among Australian manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *52*(1-2), 161-172. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(96)00104-1