

ISSN-2616-1060

Volume 2 Number 2 November/December, 2020

MAUTECH INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP



Published by the
International Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship
Department of Management Technology
Modibbo Adama University of Technology
Yola, Nigeria
Website: www.mijme.blogspot.com
e-mail: ijme.mautech@gmail.com



Mautech International Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship:
Volume 2, Issue2

ISSN: 26161060

Published by:

The Department of Management Technology (MIJME)

School of Management & Information Technology

Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola.

PMB 2076

Adamawa State.

Volume 2, Issue 2

© Department of Management Technology, Mautech

All rights reserved. This journal is copyright and no part of it may be reproduced in any form without the prior written permission of the Department of Management Technology, Mautech, Yola.

***Authors are individually responsible for all issues relating to their articles and do not in any way represent the view of MIJME**

A Publication of Department of Management Technology, MAUTECH, Yola

MAUTECH INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT & ENTREPRENEURSHIP
Vol. 2 Issue II



EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Professor Dauda Abdulsalam
Usman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto

Editor

Dr. D.V Bello
Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola

Associate Editors

Dr. Ibrahim Danjuma (Assoc. Prof)
Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola

Dr. Ibrahim Hassan Bakari (Assoc. Prof)
Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola

Dr. Ejika Sambo
Dr. Haruna I Mohammed
Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola

Dr. Adekunle Simon
University of Benin, Benin

Dr. Omorodion Omoregbe
University of Benin, Benin

Dr. Henry Inegbedion
Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State

Dr. Manu Donga
Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola

Dr. Bashir A. Daneji
Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola

Business Editors

Dr. A.U Alkali
Sharif Habibu
Murtala Ibrahim
Dahiru Dauda Hammawa
Mary V. Augustine



**Mautech International Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship:
Volume 2, Issue2**

Advisory Board

- Professor Aminu A. Ayuba
University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri
- Professor Sani Abdullahi
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
- Professor Mohammed Dahiru Madawaki
University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri
- Professor Bashir Yusuf Maiwada
Abubakar Tafewa Balewa University, Bauchi
- Professor Linus Osuagwu
American University of Nigeria, Yola
- Professor Nur Naha Abu Mansor
UTM-Malaysia
- Professor Bello Sabo
Abubakar Tafewa Balewa University, Bauchi
- Professor Kamal Bello
Nasarawa State University, Keffi
- Professor Mohammed Bazza
University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri
- Professor Hamilton
University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt
- Professor Emmanuel Oni
Federal University of Technology, Minna
- Professor Grace C. Nzelihbe
University of Abuja, Abuja
- Dr. Abdu Sani
UTM-Malaysia
- Dr. Abdallah Sandero
Tanzania
- Dr. Eugene Okyere
kwakye kofiridua Technical University, Ghana.
- Dr. Kayode Adenuga
Cameroon Uni Duala



EDITOR'S NOTE

The Mautech international Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship (MIJME) is an online peer reviewed Journal published by the Department of Management Technology, Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola.

The Journal aims to provide a platform for the dissemination of research ideas and finding among expert researchers, young academics as well as practitioners in Management, Entrepreneurship, and related fields.

The Journal welcomes contributions in the form of original research findings, conceptual papers, case studies, and short communications, specific areas of interest include, but not limited to: Business Administration, Human Resource Management, Marketing Management and Consumer Behavior, Entrepreneurship, Accounting and Finance, Information and Technology Management, Corporate Governance, Organization Behavior, etc.

Frequency of publication: Biannual (June and December).

Review policy: All submissions will be subjected to an initial screening by the editors to ensure that the papers meet up to basic publishing standards. Papers that scaled through the initial screening will be sent to two experts for review, and final decision on publishability.

We hope you will learn from this publication.

Thank you.

The Editor



GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS

AS A RULE, ALL PAPERS MUST INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- Authors name, institutional affiliations correspondence address, e-mail and phone number.
- A title of not more than 15 words; centered, and in 14-point size
- An abstract of between 200-300 word
- Introduction, literature review, methodology, discussion of findings, conclusion and reference.

ALL PAPERS MUST CONFORM TO THE FOLLOWING FORMAT:

- All texts in times new roman, 12-point font size
- 1.5-line spacing throughout the paper
- As much as possible, tables and figures should not break across pages
- Reference should be APA style.



CONTENTS

Page

**FOREIGN OWNERSHIP AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF LISTED
FINANCIAL SERVICE COMPANIES IN NIGERIA**

Hauwa Modu Kumshe1, Mohammed Abba 2, Salihu Aliyu Modibbo 3 1-19

FINANCE-GROWTH NEXUS IN NIGERIA: NEW EVIDENCE

Nuruddeen Mahmud Bunu 1, Hassan Ibrahim Bakari 2, Sule Ya'u Hayewa 3 20-35

IMPACT OF ORGANISATIONAL CAPABILITY ON BUSINESS PERFORMANCE

OLOTA, Oluwayomi Omotayo 1, AUN, Isaac Iortimbir (Ph.D) 2,
AYOOLA, Olorunfemi Joseph 3 36-51

**CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND FIRMS' SURVIVAL IN NIGERIA: COX
PROPORTIONAL HAZARD MODEL APPROACH**

Olushola J. Omolekan, Ph.D 52-68

CORPORATE RESTRUCTURING AND EMPLOYEE EFFICIENCY

Salmanulfarisi Abdulrahman PhD 69-85

**IMPACT OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ON THE GROWTH AND
DEVELOPMENT OF GUARANTY TRUST BANK PLC, YOLA**

Dr Deva Vincent Bello 86-112



IMPACT OF ORGANISATIONAL CAPABILITY ON BUSINESS PERFORMANCE

***OLOTA, Oluwayomi Omotayo**

Department of Business Administration,

Faculty of Management Sciences,

University of Ilorin

Olota.oo@unilorin.edu.ng

08037225831,

AUN, Isaac Iortimbir (Ph.D)

Department of Business Administration,

Faculty of Management Sciences,

University of Ilorin

isaacaun@gmail.com

08030795599

and

AYOOLA, Olorunfemi Joseph

Department of Business Administration,

Faculty of Management Sciences,

University of Ilorin

aolorunfemi@yahoo.com

** Correspondence author*

ABSTRACT

The business environment is dynamic and rapidly evolving. Various techniques used in achieving organizational success applicable years ago are now being modified to meet the demands of changing times. For any organization that does not want to be destroyed by giant firms in its industry, its organizational capabilities must be identified and favourably developed. Therefore, this study was designed to evaluate the impact of organisational capability on business performance in Dangote Flour Mills, Ilorin. Primary data was used in



his study. Data was collected using questionnaires, and a simple random probability sampling was used. A total of 147 questionnaires administered to the staff of company were completed and were returned. And the techniques employed for data analysis include the Regression Analysis and Correlation Analysis. The findings of the study were that; Technological Capability has a positive significant impact on Organisational Performance; there's a positive relationship between human resources capability and employee productivity; there is a positive relationship between marketing capability and customer satisfaction. The study concluded that the business performance of any organization dependent on its organizational capabilities. It is recommended organisation should ensure synergetic relationship among these elements in order to have competitive advantage in their industry.

Keywords: Organisational capability, Business performance, technological capability, marketing capability, human resource capability, customer satisfaction

Introduction

The concept of Organisational capability is fast becoming recognised as a vital, if not the most vital, key to organisational success. The rate of change in the past decades has led to significant restructuring by organisations as they undergo constant innovation in their culture, strive for competitive advantage and transform their organisational character. Changes in work environment and the structuring of work have shifted the emphasis from individual competence to organisational capability, or at least, for the individual competence to be subsumed within organisational capability.

The concept of organizational capabilities has been created with a resource-based view of the firm (namely Barney 1991; Hunt & Morgan 1996). Organizational capability is

the ability of an organization to deploy and organise assets (tangible and intangible) and execute a task or activity in order to improve the performance (Maritan 2001). Barney (2002) defined organizational capabilities as the attributes of the firm that permits organizations to coordinate the use of their resources. The difference between resources and capabilities is the root of the uniqueness of firms across the market. Despite the fact that organizations have access to the same resources, their capabilities to configure and deploy these resources and obtain distinct services from these resources, which leads to a differentiated offering, a genuine source of heterogeneity (Penrose 1997)

In addition, strategic management literature addresses the key role that resources play in organisational life. In fact, some scholars



have defined organisation as simply “unique bundle of resources” (Wernerfelt, 1984). Others see resources as inputs into an organisation’s production process. (Ingraham, Joyce & Donahue 2003; Helfat, Finkelstein, Mitchell, Peteraf, Singh, Teece, & Winter, 2007). Organisational performance comprises the actual outputs or results of an organisation as measured against its intended outputs (or goals and objectives) It can also mean Organisational effectiveness which is the concept of how effective an organisation is achieving the outcomes the organisation intends to achieve. According to Richard, Devinney, Yip and Johnson (2009), organisational performance encompasses three specific areas of firm outcomes: product market performance (sales, market share etc.); financial performance (profits, returns on investments etc.) and shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.)

Capabilities are the combination of organisational routines, resources and interactions through which the firm’s resources are coordinated (Grant, 1991). A basic assumption of the ‘capability view’ is that companies have ways of doing things and dealing with organizational problems that show strong elements of continuity (Dosi, Faillo & Marengo, 2003). But firms are heterogeneous, they develop different

organizational routines even if they belong to the same industry and produce similar outputs. Firm-specific ways of acting are based on organizational capabilities that have been gradually accumulated and shaped within firms.

The main objective of this research is to assess the impact of organisational capability on organisational performance in Dangote Flour Mills, Ilorin.

Statement of problem

In the bid for organisations to achieve their objectives, they are faced with certain problems; It is evident that some organisations have the resources they need to achieve their stated objectives but they do not know how to harness them. Another problem that organisations face is that some organisations have found it difficult come up with organisational recipes they can put together in their own unique way (abilities that cannot be found elsewhere) in order for them to stay ahead in the fierce competitive environment i.e. they cannot define their organisational capabilities.

The overall performance or success of any organisation depends a lot on the efficient and effective utilization of available resources and central to an organisation’s capability is the combination of



technological capability, human resource capability and marketing capability. However, these resources are not productive in themselves. Most organisations failure to achieved synergy among these capabilities, which make it difficult for them to have competitive advantage in their industry.

The lack of synergy among organisational capabilities elements is the reason for the difference in business performance, while some achieve great performance, others are managing to survival and some have already go into extinction. So, for any organisation to create and sustain their competitive advantage, such organisation must know how to blend and coordinate these elements in a proper manner, which is the focus of this research paper.

Research Objectives

- i. To assess the impacts of technological capability on business performance
- ii. To evaluate the relationship between human resource capability and employee productivity;
- iii. To evaluate the relationship between organisational marketing capability and customer satisfaction.

The concept of Organisational Capability

Organisational capability is the capacity to mobilise and deploy resources in competitively useful ways (Winter, 2000). Capabilities have most frequently been defined in relation to the outcomes or performance that they enable (Dosi, Nelson & Winter, 2000). Organizational capabilities are anything a company does well that improves business and differentiates the business in the market. In the context of dynamics and change, the concept of organizational capability has generated much interest in the field of strategic management. Organizational capability has been considered as a major source of generation and development of sustainable competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). This view suggests that companies capable of developing and deploying unique, inimitable and valuable capabilities will gain a sustained competitive advantage (Barney, 2002).

It has a huge variety of names in the literature: core competence, collective skills, complex routines, best practices, or organizational capabilities. There has been a great debate in the literature on capability and its importance in acquiring competitive advantage since the issues of volatile markets; environmental uncertainty and change have come to the fore. In this



context, the focus has shifted to the ability to change and then to develop new organizational capabilities as a critical prerequisite in order to develop sustainable competitive advantages (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997).

Capabilities enable the firm to deploy resources, usually in combination, using organizational processes to obtain the expected results. They evolve and are developed, in time, by complex interactions between the firm's tangible and intangible resources. They are based in the development of human capital, by use and change of information.

Organisational Capability Elements

The following are the elements of organisational capabilities:

A. Financial capability

The availability, usage and management of funds have a bearing on the financial capability of an organization and ability to implement its strategies. A financial manager has to pool, deploy and allocate financial resources taking into consideration the capital or long term investments, working capital or short-term liabilities and repayment capacities.

B. Marketing Capability

Many organizations start to focus on how the organization has the competitive

advantage and sustainability. In the past, many organizations had an impact on the environment both inside and outside the organization at all times. Thus, the market environment changes rapidly, it leads to the complexity of the global market. Specifically, in turn, the economy has changed dramatically in the innovation and manufacturing capabilities (Teece, 2007).

C. Technological Capability

Teece, Pisano and Shuen, (1997) describe a "technological capability" as "the ability to perform any relevant technical function or volume activity within the organization including the ability to develop new products and processes and to operate facilities effectively". Technological capability have been an integral strategic resources used by organizations to achieve competitive advantage in the industry over the past era (Duysters & Hagedoorn, 2000).

D. Information Technology Capability

The concept of IT capability was introduced by Ross, Beath, and Goodhue, (1996) and defined IT capability as the firm's ability to assemble, integrate and deploy IT based resources. Heijden (2000) pointed out that the measurement of IT capability covers relationships in IT department with the rest



for the business. It also broadens the explanation of accepted views of organizational IT capabilities on an organization's information technology function.

E. Human Resource capability

In recent years, much concern has been shown for the strategic involvement of the Human Resource (HR) and its effect on firm's performance. The debate has led to the creation of a resource-based model of HRM (Boxall, 1996), identifying HR as being responsible for increasing organisational success (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2000) and a realistic indicator for the improved organisational effectiveness (Analoui, 1999a Analoui, 2002).

Organisational Capability and Business Performance

Organizational capabilities have been recognized as the highest order factor contributing to organizational performance (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997). Makadok (2001) has described organizational capabilities as the firm's ability to deploy resources, usually in combination by using organizational processes, to affect a desired end that has the potential to improve organizational performance. However, previous studies have examined the role of organizational capabilities on performance

which tended to focus on a single capability and its effect on a single measure of organizational performance. Studies which have examined the simultaneous effects of multiple types of organizational capabilities on organizational performance have so far not been given enough attention. Hadjimanolis (2000) has argued that a single resource has rarely been the main success factor for an organization. It is usually a combination of resources and capabilities that can lead to a sustainable competitive advantage. Hence, examine the simultaneous effect of several organizational capabilities on organizational performance in a single study is believed to provide a more holistic view on the effects of capabilities on organizational performance.

Subsequently, several studies have examined the interaction effects of resources and capabilities on organizational performance (such as Singgelkow, 2002; O'Regan & Ghobadian, 2004). These studies have shown that the interaction of organizational capabilities could lead to a better organizational performance. However, these studies were focusing on private firms. One study that has examined the link between organizational capabilities and their interaction on the performance of public sector organization is that by Carmeli and Tishler (2004a). They have examined the interaction effect of six types of



organizational capabilities on the performance of local authorities in Israel. They have found that the interaction among the capabilities has contributed significantly to the organizational performance. In both private and public firms, the resulting effect of several combinations of Organisational capabilities on Organisational performance has shown to be positive.

The Resource Based View

The resource based view of strategy has a long antecedent, with links stretching back to Edith Penrose (1959). However, it is more commonly associated with the work of Prahalad and Hamel (1994), Barney (1991), Grant (1991) and Peteraf (1993). For the proponents of the Resource Based School, the answer to why firms in the same industry experience different level of performance is to be found by looking into the organisation.

The RBV suggests that the resources possessed by a firm are the primary determinants of its performance, and these may contribute to a sustainable competitive advantage of the firm (e.g. Wernerfelt, 1984). According to Barney (1991), the concept of resources includes all assets, capabilities, organizational processes, firm attributes, information, knowledge, etc. controlled by a firm that enable the firm to conceive of and implement strategies that improve its efficiency and effectiveness

(Barney, 1991). In the early stage of the RBV, the main concern was to identify the characteristics of resources that are not subject to imitation by competitors. If the resources possessed by a firm can easily be replicated by competitors, even though the resources are the source of competitive advantage of the firm, then the advantage will not last long.

Empirical Review

Tsai (2004) *The Impact of Technological Capability on Firm Performance in Taiwan's Electronics Industry*. The research make use of secondary data where the empirical analysis is based upon a panel dataset which includes 47 large manufacturing firms quoted on the Taiwan stock market, but the sample is reduced to 45 firms as a result of missing observations on R&D expenditure and questionable data on other variables the data is between 1994-2000. The study concluded that firm technological capability has a significant effect on productivity growth and that technological capability is an important determinant in the promotion of competitive advantage for Taiwan's electronics firms.

Karami (2004) "How Human Resource Capabilities Affect the Organisations' Performance? The Case of Electronic Industry in the United Kingdom." They tested the hypothesised relationships among



variables using non-parametric statistical techniques namely spearman rank order correlation and non-parametric ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test). The important conclusion reached is that increasing the core competencies of the firm, in particular Human Resources, is the key element to the success of the firm.

Santos-Vijande, Sanzo-Pérez, Gutiérrez & Rodríguez (2012) Marketing Capabilities Development in Small and Medium Enterprises: Implications for Performance. The study makes use of primary data through the use of questionnaires that was mailed to the CEO of the small scale business. The sectors selected for analysis were chemicals, machinery and electrical equipment, optical and surgical equipment, electronics, motor vehicles and other transport elements, and metallurgy. The analysis is based on 163 respondents and Structural equation model was used for the analysis. Marketing capabilities exert a significant and positive effect on clients' satisfaction and loyalty, which ultimately

lead to better organizational performance in terms of sales, profit, and market share.

Methodology

The study employed the descriptive survey design and thus made use of primary Data. This method was considered best and enabled the research to obtain the opinion of the representative sample of the target population. The population of the study comprises of all the staff members of Dangote Flour mill in Ilorin which is 232 as 2019. Taro Yamane sampling size formula was adopted to ascertain the sample size from the population which 147. Simple random sampling technique was further used to distribute the questionnaires among staff. Hypotheses testing and analysis were carried out with linear regressions analysis and Pearson Correlation analysis.

Model Specification for Hypothesis 1

$$OP = f(TC)$$

$$OP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TC$$

Where OP= Organisational Performance

TC= Technological Capability



Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

H₀₁: Technological capability does not have a significant impact on business performance

Table 1 **Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.846 ^a	.716	.712	.86871

a. Predictors: (Constant), Technological, Capability

Source: researcher's computation (2020)

Table 1 above presented the impact of technological capability on business performance. From the table above, the coefficient of R-square (R^2) is 0.712 which shows that the independent variable has a significant influence on the dependent variable. That is technological capability accounted for 71.2% variation on the business performance of Dangote Flour Mills while the remaining 28.8% were exogenous variables that are not explained by the model.

Table 2 ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	274.446	2	137.223	181.836	.000 ^b
	Residual	108.670	144	.755		
	Total	383.116	146			

a. Dependent Variable: business performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Technological capability

Source: Researcher's computation (2020)

The F-statistic as shown from the ANOVA table above is significant since the ANOVA significance of .000 is less than the alpha level of .05, thus the overall model is significant. The analysis in the table 2 above showed regression sum of square value (274.446) which is higher than the residual sum of square value of (180.670). This implies that the model accounted for most variations in the dependent variables. Furthermore, the calculated value of (181.836) indicating a significant relationship. In addition, the significant value of P (0.000) is smaller than (0.05)



which means that the independent variable (technological capability) to a large extent accounted for the variation in the dependent

variable (business performance) of Dangote Flour Mills.

Table 3 Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.376	.199		1.893	.060
1 Technological	.576	.057	.633	10.125	.000
Capability	.265	.061	.271	4.333	.000

a. Dependent Variable: business performance

Source: Researcher's computation (2020)

The coefficients of individual independent variable indicated that technological advancement (.576) has a greater effect on business performance. In addition, the p-value and t-statistics value of (.000) and 10.125 further suggest that the relationship between business performance and technological capabilities is significant since alpha level of .05 is greater than the p-value. The conclusion therefore is that technological advancement in term of

capabilities has impact on business performance of Dangote flour Mills Plc.

It can be concluded that since R^2 of 71% is positive and the ANOVA significance of .000 is less than the p-value of .05, then the null hypothesis is **REJECTED**. Hence, technological capability has an impact on business performance. In agreement with this, Tsai (2004) in his research work indicated that technological capability is an important determinant of a firm's performance.



Hypothesis Two

H₀₂: There is no relationship between human resources capability and employee productivity.

Table 4Correlations

		Employee turnover	Employee Productivity
Human Resource Capability	Pearson Correlation	1	-.436**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	147	147
Employee Productivity	Pearson Correlation	-.436**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	147	147

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

Source: Researcher's computation (2020)

The table above presents the result of correlation analysis for hypothesis two (2) which shows the relationship between human resource capability and employee productivity. As shown in the above table, the correlation significance of .000 is less than the alpha level of .01, hence the null hypothesis which states that "there is no significant relationship between human resource capability and employee productivity in an organization" is REJECTED and alternate hypothesis is therefore accepted.

This signifies that there is a positive relationship between the two variables. The

correlation coefficient gives $r = 0.436$, meaning that there is a perfect positive relationship between human resource capability and employee productivity. This implies that the rate of employee productivity in an organization will increase with increase in the rate of human resource capability. This is in agreement with Karami (2004) that increasing the core competencies of the firm, in particular Human Resources, is the key element to the success of the firm in term of performance. This shows the level of the relationship between performance and human resource capabilities.



Hypothesis Three

H₀₃: There is no relationship between marketing capability and customer satisfaction

Table 5 Correlations

		Pricing Strategy	Promotional tools	Customer Loyalty	Customers Patronage
Pricing Strategy	Pearson Correlation	1	.641**	.847**	.733**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	147	147	147	147
Promotional tools	Pearson Correlation	.641**	1	.482**	.554**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.001	.000
	N	147	147	147	147
Customer Loyalty	Pearson Correlation	.847**	.482**	1	.570**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001		.000
	N	147	147	147	147
Customers Patronage	Pearson Correlation	.733**	.554**	.570**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	147	147	147	147

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

Source: Researcher's computation (2020)

From the table 5 above, two variables were examined as proxies for both marketing capability (pricing strategy and promotional tools) and customer satisfaction (Customer loyalty and customer patronage) and these variables were correlated against each other to examine the relationship among these variables. The relationship between marketing capability and customer satisfaction examined is statistically significant (at 0.05 level of significance).

This means that marketing capability and customer satisfaction are significantly related. The null hypothesis was rejected while alternative hypothesis should be accepted which implies that there is positive relationship between marketing capability and customer satisfaction. In agreement with this, Santos-Vijande, Sanzo-Pérez, Gutiérrez & Rodríguez (2012) agreed that Marketing capabilities exert a significant and positive effect on clients' satisfaction



and loyalty, which ultimately lead to better organizational performance in terms of sales, profit, and market share.

Conclusion and Recommendation

After analyzing various variables and testing the hypotheses, the following conclusions were made:

Technological capability has a significant impact on business performance. One point that could not be disregarded in the business environment is the impact of technological change. Potential thoughts about a firm's technological strategies should be performed by the combination of core capabilities of a firm with adequate corporate strategies by upper management team.

It was concluded that there is a positive relationship between human resources capability and employee productivity. An organization's human resources are regarded as the organization's intellectual assets. They are the ones who help in actualizing an organization's objectives and so identifying human resources as being responsible for increasing organizational success is crucial.

Finally, it was concluded that there is a positive relationship between marketing capability and customer satisfaction. In this global and highly intensive competitive business environment, market place is getting complicated day by day. Therefore,

firms have growing need to strengthen their marketing and sales forces in order to enhance their performance.

From the above findings, it is therefore recommended that

- i. Organisation should provide an enable environment for all the staff to have technological know-how, modern production technology and skills. This will give the firm competitive advantage through new product development and product innovation processes. Thus, technological capability is one of the main capabilities of a firm, to achieve business performance.
- ii. Employees should be trained and developed to meet their organization's needs in term of human resource capabilities and also be well compensated for their intellectual contribution towards organisational productivity. This will serve a motivational tool to enhance performance.
- iii. Marketing and sales forces of the firm should evaluate their market environment frequently and gather valuable information that can help the organisation



increase their marketing capabilities because of the rapid changes in customer needs and taste.

- iv. Finally, organisation should ensure synergetic relationship among these elements in order to create and sustain competitive advantage in their industry and overall business performance

REFERENCES

- Analoui, F. (1999a). Effective Human Resource Development: a Challenge for Developing (F., 1998b) Countries (Eds). *Aldershot: Ashgate*.
- Analoui, F. (2002). The Changing Patterns of Human Resource Management (eds). *Aldershot: Ashgate*.
- Barney J. (1991): Looking inside for Competitive Advantage. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9: 49–51.
- Barney J. (2002): Gaining and Sustaining competitive Advantage. *Prentice-hall, Englewood cliffs, NJ*.
- Boxall, P.(1996). The strategic HRM debate and the resource-based view of the firm. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 6, 59-75. Christensen, R. K. and B. Gazley (2008). "Capacity For Public Administration: Analysis Of Meaning And Measurement." *Public Administration and Development*
- Carmeli A, and Tishler A (2004) The relationships between intangible organizational elements and organizational performance. *Strategy Manage Journal* 25(13):1257–1278
- Dosi, G., Nelson, R. and Winter, S. (eds) (2000) The nature and dynamics of organizational capabilities, *Oxford University Press*
- Dosi, L., Faillo M., and Marengo, L.; (2003) Organizational Capabilities, Patterns of Knowledge Accumulation and Governance Structures in Business Firms. An Introduction
- Duysters G, and Hagedoorn J. (2000). Core competencies and company performance in the worldwide computer industry. *Journal of High Technology Management Research*: 11(1):75–91
- Grant R. (1991): The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: implications for strategy formulation. *California Management review*, 33: 114–135.
- Hadjimanolis, A. (2000). A resource-based view of innovativeness in small firms.



Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, 12(2), 263–281

- Heijden, H. V. D. (2000), "Measuring IT core capabilities for electronic commerce results from a confirmatory factor analysis", *Paper presented at the 21st. International Conference of Information Systems*, Australia
- Helfat, C.E., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M.A., Singh, H., Teece, D.J., & Winter, S.G. (2007). Dynamic capabilities: Understanding strategic change in organizations. London: Blackwell
- Hilda, Hope & Ijeamaka (2016) Dynamic Capabilities and Performance of Selected Commercial Banks in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.
- Hunt S.D., & Morgan R.M. (1996): The resource advantage theory of competition: dynamics, path dependencies, and evolutionary dimensions. *Journal of Marketing*.
- Ingraham, P. W., P. G. Joyce & Donahue. (2003). Governance Performance: Why Management Matters. Baltimore, MD, The John Hopkins University
- Kakabadse A. & Kakabadse, N. (2000). Leading the pack: future role of IS/IT professionals. *The Journal of Management Development*. 19, 97-155.
- Karami, A. (2004). *How Human Resource Capabilities affect the Organisations' Performance ? The Case of Electronic Industry in The UK.*
- Makadok, R. (2001). Toward a synthesis of the resource-based view and dynamic capability views of rent creation. *Strategic Management Journal*
- Maritan C.A. (2001): Capital investment as investing in organizational capabilities: an empirically grounded process model. *Academy of Management Journal*
- O'Regan, N. & Ghobadian, A. (2004) 'The importance of capabilities for strategic direction and performance', *Management Decision*
- Penrose E. (1997): The theory of the growth of the firm. in: Foss n.J. (ed.): resources, Firms and Strategies. *Oxford University Press, oxford*
- Penrose, E.T. 1959. The theory of the growth of the firm. New York: Wiley & Sons



- Peteraf, M.A., (1993) 'The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view', *Strategic Management Journal* 14
- Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35(3): 718-804.
- Ross, J., Beath, C. and Goodhue, D. (1996), "Develop long-term competitiveness through information technology assets", *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 38
- Santos-Vijande, L., Sanzo-Pérez, M., Trespalacios Gutiérrez, J. & Rodríguez, N. (2012). Marketing capabilities development in small and medium enterprises: implications for performance. *Journal of Centrum Cathedra*, 5(1), 24-42.
- Teece, D. (2007) Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and micro-foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance *Strategic Management Journal*
- Teece, D. and G. Pisano (1994) The Dynamic Capabilities of Firms: An introduction Industrial and Corporate Change 3(3): 537-556
- Teece, D., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A., (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal* (1986-1998) 18 (7), 509
- Tsai K.H. (2004). The impact of technological capability on firm performance in Taiwan's electronics industry. *Journal of High Technological Management Research*
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984): A resource-based view of the firm, *Strategic Management Journal*
- Winter, S.G. (2000): The satisficing principle in capability learning. *Strategic Management Journal* 21: 981-996.
- (www.managementguru.net/tag/risk-management)