



Organizational Responsiveness and Marketing Resilience of Domestic Airlines in Nigeria

Ebenuwa, Augustina Osogom. Ph.D.

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management and Social Sciences
University of Delta, Delta State, Nigerian | Email: aebenuwa@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This study examined the nexus between organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria. The study treated organizational responsiveness as unidimensional construct; while marketing resilience was decomposed into situation awareness, coping-with-change, marketing adaptability and resilient marketing ethos. The study adopted a descriptive research design and collected primary data through cross-sectional survey; using a structured questionnaire. The Spearman's rank order correlation served as the test statistic, relying on the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 24.0. The study found that organizational responsiveness relates to marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria. Organizational responsiveness posted strong, positive and statistically significant association with all the measures of marketing resilience. The study concluded that organizational responsiveness contributes to the manifestation marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria or that marketing resilience of domestic Airlines depends on organizational responsiveness. The study thus recommends that domestic Airlines in Nigeria that desire improved marketing resilience should institutionalize structures and practices that advance or drive their responsiveness capacity.*

Keywords: *coping-with-change, marketing adaptability, organizational responsiveness, situation awareness, resilient marketing ethos*

Introduction

Change is the only certain and consistent phenomenon in the business-scape; and marketers plan and provide for change with a view to reducing its negative effect on their operations (Ebenuwa, 2021; Ateke & Nwulu, 2021). Aspects of change that marketers have increasingly come to terms with is increased enlightenment and sophistication of today's customers; highly disruptive transformation that characterize the business environment; globalization of markets that has weakened national boundaries and socio-economic and health concerns that ravage the world. Most therefore, institute deliberate programmes and practices that enhance their capacity to effectively and timeously respond to market-dynamics, by adapting their operations to emerging challenges or at least, rebound from setbacks (Ebenuwa, 2021). This is commonly expected of firms, given that they recognize the turbulence and volatility of the operating environment and the need to always be prepared for shocks.

However, it is not all firms that are able to effectively maintain their equipoise or successfully rebound from adverse effects inflicted by shocks and disruptions in the market, this is especially so in Nigeria's aviation sector where several domestic airlines have been observed to fold on account of debilitating effects of market dynamics (the likes of Okada Air, Albarka, Sosoliso among others easily come to mind). The Independent, a national daily reported in August 2019 that Nigerian Airlines are having a hard time remaining in business as they are fast losing seats, passengers and revenue to foreign Airlines even in the domestic market, where Nigerian Airlines hitherto dominated. Also, additions to the list of domestic Airlines in Nigerian that have ceased operations seem to be a regular feature in the aviation sector. These testify to the fact that domestic Airlines in Nigeria are not as resilient as they should be in their marketing operations in terms of awareness of their operating situation, coping with change, marketing adaptability and resilient marketing ethos to hiccups in the market. The chain effects of this phenomenon on industry structure, life, and society are manifold.

In the circumstance, this study is inclined to believe that domestic Airlines in Nigeria have not been quick to responding to real market changes as they should be; as it has been shown that responding appropriately to marketplace shifts, enhance the wellness of firms (Ateke & Didia, 2017). This study is of the view that domestic Airlines could be more resilient if they are responsive to changes in the market. That is, domestic Airlines in Nigeria can improve their marketing resilience by being more responsive to present and emerging market conditions. Previous studies report that marketing resilience may be orchestrated and nurtured through employees' competences (Ateke & Nwulu, 2018; Harcourt & Ateke, 2018; Eketu & Ogbu, 2017), process innovation (Ahiauzu & Jaja, 2015), marketing agility (Ateke & Nadube, 2017), knowledge management (Fani & Fard, 2015; Mafabi, Muene, & Ahiauzu, 2013) market-sensing (Ebenewa, 2021; Ateke & Didia, 2017) among others.

We therefore, examined the connection between organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria. The study is appropriate at this point in the annals of the aviation sector in Nigeria when domestic carriers are finding it increasingly more challenging to withstand competition from foreign carriers, global health challenges are crippling economies and running firms into bankruptcy, and when dwindling fortunes of domestic Airlines is raising concerns about job security. These factors, and more, have necessitated the need to further explore ways of achieving and maintaining marketing resilience for domestic Airlines.

Foundational Theory

This study is premised on the theory of distinctive competences (Selznick, 1957). Theory of distinctive competences is a benchmark theory of strategy and competitiveness which holds that firms own or have access to "a set of unique capabilities" which allows them to enter markets of interest and gain advantage over competitors. Distinctive competences evolve from "tangible and intangible resources which a firm owns or has access to" (Graig & Grant, 1993). A firm's strengths which cannot be easily matched or imitated by competitors, and which builds

competitive advantages are its distinctive competence. Abdullah, Sabah, and Shawqi (2017) therefore, views distinctive competences as the “aggregate of multiple activities that firms perform better than rivals in an industry. Mooney (2007) define it as “a unique firm-specific strength that allows a company to better differentiate its products and achieve competitive advantage.”

Hence, “distinctive competence must be sustainable and visible to consumers, and not restricted to the outcome of a firm’s special adaptation to its special purposes and programmes” (Abdullah *et al.*, 2017). A distinctive competence is usually a strategic strength, but a strategic strength may not always be a distinctive competence as rivals in a highly competitive industry are apt to imitate a firm’s competence, such that what was once a distinctive competence could become a minimum requirement to compete in the industry. The theory of distinctive competence thus presupposes that firms could develop competences in specific areas such as environmental scanning and cross-functional responsiveness or in general areas by developing expertise in such areas as marketing, procurement, production etc. which are noticeable by rivals and customer. This study therefore adopts the theory of distinctive competences as a baseline theory on the premise that it is a viable theory to explain how firms can develop expertise in responding swiftly to market shifts, thus enhance their resilient capacity in their operating environment.

Concept of Responsiveness

Harcourt and Ateke (2018) construe responsiveness as firm’s “ability to detect environmental changes and adapt to them by (1) making changes internally at individual action and learning level or at organizational structures and policies, and (2) developing active interfaces that alters the environment to increase the firms’ adaptability”. It represents the ability to employ aggressive marketing strategies in response to environmental disruptions. Responsiveness is thus not strictly determined by the nature of change, but also by other factors that foster or inhibit action.

Responsiveness is also the ability to configure or reconfigure resources and processes to respond promptly to environmental demands (Dove, 2001). It represents the ability to respond to market demands in terms of quality, speed and flexibility (Asree, Zain, & Razalli, 2010). The construct of responsiveness is viewed from service marketing and operations management perspectives (Palmer, 2001). From service-marketing perspective, responsiveness is related to the willingness to help customers and speed of service delivery; while from operations management perspective, it is related to the speed and variety of products offered (Nwulu & Ateke, 2018). This study however takes an integrated view of responsiveness and represents it as the ability to respond promptly to market shifts, as well as the willingness to (re)configure marketing programmes, practices and activities to deliver consistent value and maintain a consistent image.

Responsiveness is thus a cumulative capability in terms of multiple performance measures such as quality, speed and flexibility (Hoyt, Huq, & Kreiser, 2007). It is an aspect of the market orientation construct where it represents the swift and seamless response to market intelligence about current and future market situations; as well as threats and opportunities embedded in those situations. It entails the capacity to speedily summon individual and collective competencies to address issues relating to the firm itself, its customers, as well as all other factors in the environment (Hoyt *et al.*, 2007). The ability and capacity to respond to challenges posed by the environment is often a strategic one for most marketers.

The design school of strategy formation suggests that responsiveness consists in a strategy formation as entrepreneurial response to match internal abilities and opportunities in the environment ((Nwulu & Ateke, 2018; Hoyt *et al.*, 2007). Environmental scanning provides marketers with intelligence, which they respond to, in a manner that promotes marketing wellness. Marketers that react quickly and effectively so, survive better and are more resilient in the long haul. Marketers adapt to contextual vagaries by being responsive through fast decisions while simultaneously considering several possible alternatives (Ateke & Nadube, 2017). Responsive marketers undertake prompt and seamless transformations in their configuration, programmes and activities (Brannen & Doz, 2012), including “leadership, strategy, innovation, knowledge sharing and organization” (Brueller, Carmeli, & Drori, 2014). “Responsiveness thus relates to strategy and marketing that permeates the variables involved in marketing management actions that pique marketers to innovate, seize opportunities, adapt and act proactively” (Hult, Ketchen & Slater, 2005).

Marketing Resilience

The construct of resilience originated from physics where it was used to describe “the quality of materials to regain their original shape after being bent, compressed, or stretched” and in engineering where it was used to “determine the capacity of an entity or system to maintain and renew itself, particularly in the presence of stressors” (Smyntyna, 2016). The construct has however, gained transdisciplinary significance, and is emphasized in psychology, economics, emergency management and organizational studies (Ateke & Nwulu, 2018); as well as in cultural and social anthropology, psychiatry, behavioural studies, and healthcare systems (Mallak, 1998) cited in Ebebuwa (2021). In organizational studies, resilience is defined as the ability of a firm to reinvent itself when conditions change, and the capacity to respond to uncertain conditions (Ebebuwa, 2021; Akhigbe & Onuoha, 2019); and is exemplified in the ability to react to, and rebound from disruptions timeously. Resilient organizations have the ability to anticipate, prepare for, respond and adapt to gradual and abrupt disruptions in the operating environment without losing their functional capabilities (Ateke & Nadube, 2017).

The construct of resilience is herein extended and applied to marketing to represent the ability of marketing to cope with disruptions in the operating milieu, overcome adversity and function adaptively, as well as stage a comeback from shocks. It is the ability of marketing to recover rapidly, overcome, respond or otherwise adapt to disruptions in marketing operations caused

by environmental upheavals. This is in line with the conception of resilience as “a system’s ability to continue to perform and meet its objectives amidst adverse conditions” (Barasa *et al.*, 2018) cited in Ateke and Nwulu (2018). Marketing operations are conducted in plastic conditions that present both threats and opportunities; cultivating a resilient marketing culture therefore better positions a firm to prosper (Harcourt & Ateke, 2018).

Resilience is a multidimensional construct. In this study, we decompose marketing resilience into situation awareness (Lee *et al.*, 2013), coping with change (Zhang & Liu, 2012), marketing adaptability and resilient marketing ethos (Lee, Vargo, & Seville, 2013; Stephenson, Vargo, & Seville, 2010; McManus, Seville, Vargo, & Brunson, 2008). These measures were preferred because marketing must be conscious of its operating environment in order to adeptly tinker the variables with which it seeks to build and maintain profitable relationship with stakeholders. Also, marketing operations must be nimble enough to respond to market shifts seamlessly and timeously. In addition, marketing must have the ability to maintain its operational capabilities under different circumstances; it must be able to cope with change. Resilience requires marketing to function effectively, irrespective of disruptions in the operating context; and be able to create and deliver consistent value all the time and in all conditions. Finally, marketing must develop a culture of resilience if it must be able to cope with environmental shocks and rebound from setbacks better and stronger; the marketing function must have a resilient culture.

Situation awareness

Very costly marketing errors will be committed if the marketing function is not always conscious of its operating environment (Ateke & Nwulu, 2018). The concept of situation awareness thus describes the knowledge marketing has of its operating environment (McManus *et al.*, 2008); which includes the ability to anticipate opportunities, threats, disturbances and the ability to correctly identify potential crisis, their likely effects and what must be done to turn things around (Tamunomiebi, 2018). It involves understanding how events, trends, information, or own action affect goal realization (Gugerty, 1997). Marketing is the bridge between the firm and its market, and is therefore, required to always be alert to changes even before they become manifest and possibly take a toll on the firm’s health. Ahiauzu and Jaja (2015) observe that:

“The loss of situation awareness usually occurs over a period of time and leaves a trail of clues such as confusion, use of improper procedures; departure from regulations; failure to meet planned targets; unresolved discrepancies; ambiguity and fixation. Situation awareness is thus dynamic, hard to maintain, and easy to lose”.

Keeping in touch with the environment all the time is very difficult, especially during complex high stress operations (Tamunomiebi, 2018). Marketing thus requires resources to continually scan the environment to discern opportunities that could be exploited and threats that should be avoided. Therefore, "combining new information with existing knowledge in working memory and the development of a composite picture of the situation along with projections of

future status and subsequent decisions as to appropriate courses of action to take" is essential to marketing resilience.

Coping-with-change

Change represents a transformation of situations from established or expected trajectory to radically different courses, thus requiring (re)planning in order to remain focused on a preset course. The environment in which business is conducted is sophisticated, convoluted, intertwined and less predictable (Lelièvre, Radtke, Rohr, & Westinner, 2019). Environmental shocks emerge from several factors that herald change, and these must be subdued by maintaining or reconfiguring current templates or designing and integrating new ones (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). The ability to implement plans even when unexpected turns tend to upend the plans and dis-align functioning is enhanced by a capacity to cope with change. Coping with change involves accommodating unexpected vagaries in the environment and remaining the same in functions, structures, processes and programmes.

Environmental disruptions force marketers to reset and reinvent their operations by retreating to the core of their business that remains strong (vision, mission, values and the main products that the business is well known for); or by reducing expenses (staff, operating, marketing, etc.) in response to the situation (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Reinvention becomes adequate after resetting; as the business can "craft new plans, develop products and delivery methods, hire people and spend money on growth again" (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). The intent this strategic maneuver is to effectively cope with change. In coping with change, the ability to absorb and react to shock is crucial. Marketers must constantly roll with changing market requirements by creating new products and processes, as well as the accompanying levels of customer service and customer-firm interfaces. This without, marketers will awake to find that yesterday's customers are different than today's customers and that today's customers will not be available tomorrow; and therefore have "the wrong value directed at the wrong people at the wrong time". To forestall this, marketers must be equipped with the right information from the right sources and also be fitted to cope with change (Lelièvre *et al.*, 2019).

Marketing adaptability

McCann (2004) and Hamel and Välikangas (2003) view the capacity to adapt marketing activities to changing market conditions as "the ability or inclination of individual or teams within marketing to maintain an experimental attitude towards new situations as they occur and act in terms of changing circumstances". Marketing adaptability is a process that promotes the design and implementation of proactive insights about future possibilities that enables the creation of value that connects with stakeholders. It is linked to competitiveness as it is a resilient characteristic, and describes the ability to adapt operations to prevailing conditions with a view to gaining advantage over less adaptive competitors, and maintain a robust marketing profile (Akhigbe & Onuoha, 2019). Marketing adaptability implies "the aptitude to adapt swiftly to varying environmental conditions; and is essential to navigating firms in the contemporary business milieu where turbulent disruptions constitute the new norm; and

facilitates firms' ability to respond to threats and opportunities. Marketing is inherently adaptive, the practice of marketing today is markedly different than what obtained a decade ago, and it will appear even more different by the next decade (Ateke & Nadube, 2017).

Marketing adaptability may be orchestrated by changes in internal resources or external challenges; it is nonetheless, the natural outgrowth of a market orientation or the "customer first" mindset that adapts to changing customers' requirements and specificities of other environmental factors. It often involves reforming marketing programmes and operations to suit changing consumer preferences, geography or era in which the firm operates. Marketing adaptability is thus context-specific (McManus *et al.*, 2008); "it varies in terms of value and nature and may be analyzed through coping ranges, the conditions a system can deal with, accommodate, adapt to, and recover from" (Ateke & Nwulu, 2018). Marketing adaptability promotes consistent alignment of marketing objectives and customer desires, mostly, by creating "innovative customers" or marketing practices, programmes and operations to suit emerging market trends (Ateke & Nwulu, 2018).

Resilient Marketing Ethos:

Marketing ethos represents market-oriented values, norms and actions that inform and guide marketing actions. It is one that practically translates the marketing concept, which emphasizes the importance of customers not just within marketing, but throughout the firm; and anchored on identifying market demands and meeting them better than competitors. A market-oriented culture focuses on developing, communicating and delivering value; and thrives on learning about market developments, sharing this information with appropriate personnel, and adapting operations to changing conditions. Zostautiene, Zvireliene, and Susniene (2017) aver that marketing practices are encumbered by a "perfect storm" of adversities orchestrated by forces ranging from turmoil and instability of markets, economic downturns, changes in employees' values, resource shrinkages, technological advances, fragmented demographics, pandemics, etc.

The most suitable time since the invention of management for firms to prepare for adversity by building resilient marketing ethos is now. A resilient marketing culture is a climate within marketing that foster resilience in the wake of adversity; an environment that the majority of marketing personnel perceive as non-punitive, but motivating and supportive (Zostautiene *et al.*, 2017). One that encourage innovation, stimulate personal satisfaction and growth, as well as extraordinary success. A resilient marketing ethos is one equipped to face challenging market disruptions, and handle turbulence proactively; with skills, tools, and a mindset to cope with new realities; one designed to "perform in the storm" in times of disruptions. Resilient marketing ethos is a system-wide shared attitude, habits and beliefs that encourage resourcefulness, reflectiveness and responsiveness to environmental shifts (Stephenson *et al.*, 2010).

Organizational Responsiveness and Marketing Resilience

The statement of foremost English geologist, biologist and naturalist, Charles Darwin (1809-1882) that “it is not the strongest of species that survive, nor the most intelligent, but the one most responsive to change” aptly contextualizes the imperative of responsiveness to market dynamics. Marketing pundits have thus called attention to strategic actions - “a pattern of resource allocation and alteration of marketing practices that enable firms to improve marketing performance” (Ketchen, Hult, & Slater, 2007; Barney, 1996). Responsiveness is a market-driven firm-level strategic action that respond to external environmental factors while taking existing frameworks and constraints of the market structure and characteristics into account (Jaworki, Kohli, & Sahay, 2000) in Wei and Wang (2011). Highly responsive firms utilize various resources to meet market-dynamics. Homburg, Grozdanovic, and Klarmann (2007) argue that maintaining and enhancing a firm's responsiveness to environmental changes endow competitive advantage that enhance a firm's market position and fortunes; just as failure to respond appropriately to market-dynamics could waste a firm's scarce resources (Jayachandran & Varadarajan, 2006).

Responsiveness describes firms’ ability to respond to changing market conditions appropriately, so as to reduce threats or capitalize on opportunities (Collins & Hitt, 2006). For marketers that are faced with environmental challenges, “responsiveness also represents the ability to respond to emergent opportunities or concerns” (Lindblom, Olkkonen, Mitronen, & Kajalo, 2008). Responsiveness is a core competency that enhances the provision of superior customer value, strong differentiation and extendibility which are relied upon to achieve desired financial and market positions (Nwulu & Ateke, 2018). The potency of responsiveness to better the lot of firms was supported by Agha, Alrubaiee, and Jamhour (2012) who observed that core competences have strong positive impact on organizational performance.

The vagaries of the competitive environment have made responsiveness an imperative to survival and growth of firms (Luo, 2012). It helps maximize marketing’s initiatives and proactive pursuit of new opportunities that are consistent with company’s goals” (Birkinshaw, 1996). In addition, responsiveness motivates marketing to “establish sustained, solid relationships with publics, which in turn creates more opportunities or extenuates contextual hazards” (Luo, 2012). Responsiveness stimulates business success, and is required for competitiveness, since it serves as a foundation for bolstering the formulation and implementation of appropriate (Porter, 1990) in Luo (2012).

Previous studies have posted in varying degrees of coherence, the predictive power of responsiveness on company wellbeing. Wei and Wang (2011) report that organizational responsiveness and innovation enhances superior performance. Garrett, Covin and Slevin (2009) observe that responsiveness determines market pioneering; and that “responsiveness is a critical competency for market pioneers.” Responsive firms adapt quickly to changing market conditions (Randall, Morgan, & Morton, 2003), and this rapid adaptation is critical when conditions reflect ambiguity and uncertainty. The forgoing suggests that responsiveness will

relate to marketing resilience significantly. However, in order to allow for statistical testing and interpretation, the study formulates the following null hypotheses:

- Ho₁:** Organizational responsiveness does not relate significantly to situation awareness of domestic Airlines in Nigeria.
- Ho₂:** Organizational responsiveness does not relate significantly to coping with change of domestic Airlines in Nigeria.
- Ho₃:** Organizational responsiveness does not relate significantly to marketing adaptability of domestic Airlines in Nigeria.
- Ho₄:** Organizational responsiveness not relate significantly to resilient marketing ethos of domestic Airlines in Nigeria.

Methodology

The focus of this study is to examine the association between organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience. The study adopted a descriptive research design. The study was anchored on the realist ontology and positivist epistemology; it adopts a nomothetic methodology based on the conviction that man's interaction with the environment is deterministic. A questionnaire thus served as the instrument of primary data collection. The study was conducted in a natural setting; hence, the researcher did not exert any form of control over the research elements (the test units). The cross-sectional survey, which permits researchers to collect data from test units at a point in time, was adopted.

The population of the study comprised domestic airlines in Nigeria. Information from the Nigerian Civil Aviation Agency (NCAA) indicates that there are twenty-three (23) domestic Airlines in Nigeria. These twenty-three (23) domestic Airlines constitute the population of the study. The study took a census since the population of the study is not large. The study however surveyed one hundred and fifteen (115) management level staff of the twenty-three (23) airlines on a sample frame of five (5) respondents per airline. The study purposively surveyed marketing; operations; corporate communications; regional and general managers of the airlines. The choice of this category of staff is premised on the conviction that they are (1) better placed to understand the trajectory of the study, (2) privy to the core of airline operations and therefore possess the required information, and (3) in positions of authority to speak for their firms.

The instrument used in the study passed face and content. The face validity of the instrument was ascertained through the opinion of experts consisting members of the academia within marketing, organizational studies, and measurement and evaluation; and practitioners with adequate knowledge of the subject of the study; while content validity was predicated on the fact that it was derived from literature, and mostly from instruments used by other researchers, with minimal adaptation. The internal consistency of the instrument was determined through the Cronbach's Alpha test of reliability, with a threshold of 0.70 (Nunally, 1978). Table 1 presents a summary the results.

Table 1: Reliability result for the study

Variables	No. of items	Alpha coefficients
Organizational responsiveness	7	0.992
Situation awareness	8	0.820
Coping-with-change	6	0.967
Marketing adaptability	8	0.914
Resilient marketing Ethos	9	0.962

Source: Simulation from SPSS output of data analysis on organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience (2021).

The Spearman’s Rank order correlation served as test statistic, relying on the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24.0. The choice of the Spearman’s Rank order correlation is premised on its noted flexibility in assessing correlations for both ordinal and interval data (Neuman, 2006). The decision rule for accepting or rejecting the null hypotheses was premised on the adoption of the 0.05 level of significance as a criterion for assessing the Probability value (Pv). Hence where $Pv < 0.0$, the null hypothesis was rejected, and accepted where is $Pv > 0.05$.

Results and Interpretation

Table 2: Relationship between organizational responsiveness and metrics of marketing resilience

		Organizational Responsiveness	situation awareness	Coping-with-change	Marketing adaptability	Resilient marketing ethos	
Spearman's rho	Organizational Responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.801**	.695**	.725**	.663**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
		N	109	109	109	109	109
	Market situation awareness	Correlation Coefficient	.801**	1.000	.752**	.825**	.818**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
		N	109	109	109	109	109
	Coping-with-change	Correlation Coefficient	.695**	.752**	1.000	.790**	.806**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
		N	109	109	109	109	109
	Marketing adaptability	Correlation Coefficient	.725**	.825**	.790**	1.000	.767**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
		N	109	109	109	109	109
	Resilient marketing ethos	Correlation Coefficient	.663**	.818**	.806**	.767**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.
		N	109	109	109	109	109

Source: SPSS Output of Data analysis on organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience (2020).

Table 2 presents the results of the test of linear correlations between organizational responsiveness and measures of marketing resilience. A summary of the results is as follows:

- 1) Organizational responsiveness has a very strong, positive and statistically significant correlation with situation awareness of domestic Airlines in Nigeria is with $\rho = 0.801$ and $Pv = 0.000$. The null hypothesis is thus rejected.

- 2) There is a strong, positive and statistically significant relationship between organizational responsiveness and Nigeria's domestic Airlines' ability to cope with change, with $\rho = 0.695$ and $Pv = 0.000$. The null hypothesis is rejected based on this evidence.
- 3) The relationship between organizational responsiveness and marketing adaptability of domestic Airlines in Nigeria is strong, positive and statistically significant with $\rho = 0.725$ and $Pv = 0.000$. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.
- 4) Organizational responsiveness and resilient marketing ethos of domestic Airlines in Nigeria have strong, positive and statistically significant connection with $\rho = 0.663$ and $Pv = 0.000$. The null hypothesis is rejected based on these facts.

The result from the test demonstrates that the relationship between organizational responsiveness and market situation awareness appears to be the highest as it reflects a very strong relationship. This is as the relationship between organizational responsiveness and coping with change is revealed to be strong, that of organizational responsiveness and market adaptability is also strong and finally the relationship between organizational responsiveness and resilient marketing ethos is strong. These results demonstrate that organizational responsiveness play substantial role in the actualization of marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

This study concentrated on examining the nexus between organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria. The results generated from the empirical analysis point to a strong, positive and statistically significant relationship between organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience. The findings suggest that timely and evident addressing of market dynamics by domestic Airlines in Nigeria contributes substantially towards resilient marketing outcomes like situation awareness, coping with change, marketing adaptability and resilient marketing ethos. The observed relationship between the variable supports the view of previous scholars (Jung, 2007; Fani & Fard, 2015; Grinstein, 2008) who highlight the importance to marketing effectiveness, brand visibility and business success. Day (2011) argue that marketing actions should be reflexive and at the same time tailored to integrate the uniqueness of each market. According to Lin and Wang (2017), the adaptation and design of marketing strategies should not only focus on objective of the firm, but should also integrate the properties and characteristics of the groups, elements and units that make up its market.

Day (2011) revealed responsiveness as a key driver of firms' effectiveness in adapting products to suit the needs and expectations of the market. From this perspective, each context has or is marked by underlying attributes and gaps that differentiate it from other contexts. Such factors shape the behaviour, preferences and choices of customers and although may share in some of the general features of other markets, nonetheless, Day (2011) argued that other features may be tailored to reflect the dominant values inclinations of the context. From this perspective, organizational responsiveness inclines marketing actions and behaviour to align strategies and

programmes to customer preferences and choices as reflected in the values and other contextual features of the market. Day (2011) stated that such responsiveness also serves for effective service localization and improvement.

The current findings also align with the position that organizational responsiveness enhances the provision of superior customer value, strong differentiation and extendibility which enables the achievement of desired financial and market positions (Nwulu & Ateke, 2018); and that responsiveness better and strongly relates to organizational performance (Agha *et al.*, 2012). The findings further corroborate the stance that organizational responsiveness is imperative to survival and growth of firms in today's competitive environment (Luo, 2012); because it facilitates the maximization of marketing initiatives and proactive pursuit of new opportunities (Birkinshaw, 1996). Wei and Wang's (2011) report that organizational responsiveness enhance superior performance; Luo's (2012) position that responsiveness stimulates business success; and Randall *et al.* (2003) position that organizational responsiveness inform rapid adaptation in the face of ambiguity and uncertainty are supported by the findings of this study.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Domestic Airlines in Nigerian have a challenge to address market shakeups; and extenuate the effects of competitiveness deficiencies, dis-functionalities and pervasive change in the industry. This however, will require not only being alert to changing market conditions, but also, to be smart in appropriating responses to observed changes in market conditions. This study focused on assessing the link between organizational responsiveness and marketing resilience. The results from the empirical analyses demonstrate that a strong, positive and statistically significant correlation exists between the variables. This implies that organizational responsiveness contributes significantly towards enhanced marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria. This observation presents organizational responsiveness as an essential determinant of competitiveness and ability of domestic Airlines in Nigeria to sustain their relevance through increased levels of situation awareness, ability to cope with change, marketing adaptability and resilient marketing ethos.

In view of the findings of the study and the discussions that followed, the study concludes that organizational responsiveness leads to marketing resilience through heightened situation awareness, ability to cope-with-change, marketing adaptability and resilient marketing ethos. This is facilitated through adaptation, change forecasting and market opportunities exploitation that inform domestic Airlines' behaviours and actions. The study therefore recommends that domestic Airlines in Nigeria that desire to maintain or enhance their resilient capacity should institutionalize structures and practices that advance or drive their responsiveness. This may take the form of proactive market-sensing effort that facilitate timely gathering and sharing of market(ing) intelligence to direct appropriate organizational response.

References

- Abdullah, M. A., Sabah, H. A., & Shawqi, N. J. (2017). The impact of distinctive competence on competitive advantage: An empirical study on detergent manufacturing companies in Jordan. *Merit Research Journal of Business and Management*, 5(3), 52-62.
- Agha, S., Alrubaiee, L., & Jamhour, M. (2012). Effect of core competence on competitive advantage and organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 192-204.
- Ahiauzu, L. U., & Jaja, S. A. (2015). Process innovation and organizational resilience in public Universities in South-South Nigeria. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research*, 3(11), 102-111.
- Akhigbe, E. A., & Onuoha, B. C. (2019). Strategic agility and organizational resilience of food and beverage firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business Systems and Economics* 12(2), 80-93.
- Asree, S., Zain, M., & Razalli, M. R. (2010). Influence of leadership competency and organizational culture on responsiveness and performance of firms. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(4), 500-516.
- Ateke, B. W., & Nwulu, C. S. (2021). Dynamic marketing capabilities and adaptability of hospitality firms in Rivers State. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, 22(1), 165-189.
- Ateke, B. W., & Nwulu, C. S. (2018). Employee competency development and organisational resilience of deposit money banks. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 4(3), 31-44.
- Ateke, B. W., & Nadube, P. M. (2017). Agile marketing for organizational resilience in a dynamic business environment: A theoretical reflection. *Rhema University Journal of Management and Social Science*, 5(2), 133-143.
- Ateke, B. W., & Didia, J. U. D. (2017). Market sensitivity and business wellness of deposit money banks. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 4(8), 9-17.
- Barney, J. B. (1996). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage*. Addison-Wesley.
- Birkinshaw, J. (1996). How multinational subsidiary mandates are gained and lost. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27, 467-495.
- Brannen, M. Y., & Doz, Y. L. (2012). Corporate languages and strategic agility: Trapped in your jargon or lost in translation? *California Management Review*, 54, 77-97.
- Brueller, N. N., Carmeli, A., & Drori, I. (2014). How do different types of mergers and acquisitions facilitate strategic agility? *California Management Review*, 56, 39-57.
- Collins, J. D., & Hitt, M. A. (2006). Leveraging tacit knowledge in alliances: The importance of using relational capabilities to build and leverage relational capital. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 23(3), 147-167.
- Day, G. S. (2011). Closing the marketing capabilities gap. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 183-195.
- Dove, R. (2001). *Response ability: The language, structure and culture of the agile enterprise*. John-Wiley.
- Ebenuwa, A. (2021). Market sensitivity and marketing resilience of domestic Airlines in Nigeria. *Doctoral Thesis* submitted to the department of marketing, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education. Port Harcourt.

- Eketu, C. A., & Ogbu, E. F. (2017). Human resource planning and organizational sustainability: A study of selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 3(3), 37-46.
- Fani, A. S., & Fard, H. D. (2015). Knowledge management and organizational resilience in Iranian public organizations. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(7), 32-43.
- Garrett, R. P., Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (2009). Market responsiveness, top management risk taking, and the role of strategic learning as determinants of market pioneering. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 782-788.
- Grinstein, A. (2008). The effect of market orientation and its components on innovation consequences: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(2), 166-173.
- Gugerty, L. J. (1997). Situation awareness during driving: Explicit and implicit knowledge in dynamic spatial memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 3(1), 42-66.
- Hamel, G., & Välikangas, L. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(9), 52-63.
- Harcourt, H., & Ateke, B. W. (2018). Customer-contact employee empowerment and resilience of quick service restaurants. *European Journal of Human Resource Management Studies*, 1(2), 1-17.
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 474-487.
- Homburg, C., Grozdanovic, M., & Klarmann, M. (2007). Responsiveness to customers and competitors: The role of affective and cognitive organizational systems. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(3), 18-38.
- Hoyt, J., Huq, F., & Kreiser, P. (2007). Measuring organizational responsiveness: The development of a validated survey instrument. *Management Decisions*, 45(10), 1573-1594.
- Hult, G. T., Ketchen, D. J., & Slater, S. F. (2005). Marketing orientation and performance: An integration of disparate approaches. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 1173-1181.
- Jayachandran, S., & Varadarajan, R. (2006). Does success diminish competitive responsiveness? Reconciling conflicting perspectives. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(3), 284-294.
- Jung, K. (2017). Sources of organizational resilience for sustainable communities: An institutional collective action perspective. *Sustainability*, 9, 1141: doi:10.3390/su9071141.
- Ketchen, D. J., Hult, G. T. M., & Slater, S. F. (2007). Toward greater understanding of market orientation and the resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(9), 961-964.
- Lee, A. V., Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2013). Developing a tool to measure and compare organizations' resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 14, 29-41.
- Lelièvre, D., Radtke, P., Rohr, M., & Westin R. (2019). *Building resilient operations*. McKinsey Quarterly, May, 1-6.
- Lin, J. H., & Wang, M. Y. (2015). Complementary assets, appropriability, and patent commercialization: Market sensing capability as a moderator. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 20(3), 141-147.

- Lindblom, A., Olkkonen, R., Mitronen, L., & Kajalo, S. (2008). Market sensing capability and business performance of retail entrepreneurs. *Contemporary Management Research*, 4(3), 219-236.
- Luo, Y. (2012). Determinants of local responsiveness: perspectives from foreign subsidiaries in an emerging market. *Journal of Management*, 27, 451-477.
- Mafabi, S., Munene, J. C., & Ahiauzu, A. (2013). Organizational resilience: Testing the interaction effect of knowledge management and creative climate. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 13(1/2), 70-82.
- McCann, J. (2004). Organizational effectiveness: Changing concepts for changing environments. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(1), 42-50.
- McManus, S., Seville, E., Vargo, J., & Brunson, D. (2008). A facilitated process for improving organizational resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 9(2), 81-90.
- Mooney A (2007). Core competence, distinctive competence, and competitive advantage: What is the difference? *Journal of Education for Business*, 83(2), 110-115.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. 2nd Edition. McGraw-Hill.
- Nwulu, C. S., & Ateke, B. W. (2018). Frontline employee competence development and responsiveness of quick service restaurants. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, 2(10), 1-17.
- Randall, T. R., Morgan, R.M., & Morton, A. R. (2003). Efficient versus responsive supply chain choice: An empirical examination of influential factors. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 20(6), 430-443.
- Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). Perceptions of organizational change: A stress and coping perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1154-1162.
- Smyntyna, O. (2016). Cultural resilience theory as an instrument of modeling human response to global climate change. A case study in the North Western Black Sea region on the Pleistocene-Holocene boundary. *Riparia*, 2, 1-20.
- Stephenson, A., Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2010). Measuring and comparing organisational resilience in Auckland. *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 25(2), 2934.
- Tamunomiebi, M. D. (2018). Ethics training as predictor of organizational resilience in tertiary health institutions in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 4(2), 56-65.
- Wei, Y. S., & Wang, Q. (2011). Making sense of a market information system for superior performance: The roles of organizational responsiveness and innovation strategy. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40, 267-277.
- Zostautiene, D., Zvireliene, R. & Susniene, D. (2017). Changes of marketing culture expression: comparison analysis in times of economic recession and recovery. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 30(1), 302-317.