International Review of Management and Marketing

ISSN: 2146-4405

available at http: www.econjournals.com

International Review of Management and Marketing, 2026, 16(4), 1-8.

# Strategic Alliances and Organizational Performance of Selected Manufacturing Firms in Ogun State, Nigeria

**Linus I. Okafor[1], Bashiru A. Bello[1], Temitayo A. Onifade[1], Margaret E. Ogunbiyi[2], Adedayo M. Opele[3], Olaronke O. Elufisan[4], Bolaji S. Hamzat[1], Alabi E. Olusanmi[1], Ikenna T. Nnoli[4]*, Oloyede Abiodun[1]**

[1]Department of Business Administration, Bells University of Technology, Ota, Nigeria, [2]Department of Management Technology, Bells University of Technology, Ota, Nigeria, [3]Department of Marketing, Lagos State University, Ojo, Nigeria, [4]Department of Economics, Accounting and Finance, Bells University of Technology, Ota, Nigeria. *Email: nnolis22@yahoo.com

**Received:** 08 December 2025 **Accepted:** 27 March 2026 **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.22949

**ABSTRACT**

The study examined the impact of Strategic Alliances on the Performance of Manufacturing Firms in Ogun State, Nigeria. Data from a questionnaire survey conducted among 375 employees of seven manufacturing firms were analysed using statistical methods. The Pearson correlation coefficient revealed a significant relationship between technological strategic alliance and firm performance (0.745 and $P < 0.01$), as well as between marketing strategic alliance and firm performance (0.878 and $P < 0.01$). Multiple regression analysis further confirmed that both technology ($\delta_1 = 0.239$) and marketing ($\delta_2 = 0.752$) strategic alliances had a positive and significant impact on firm performance. Based on these findings, the study recommends that policymakers should promote and support manufacturing firms in forming strategic alliances, particularly in technology and marketing sectors, to enhance their performance.

**Keywords:** Strategic Alliance, Technology Alliance, Marketing Alliance, Performance
**JEL Classifications:** L22, L25, O32, M31

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Strategic alliances have become an essential mechanism for firms to enhance competitiveness, improve performance, and secure long-term survival in a dynamic business environment (Zahoor et al., 2024; Okafor et al., 2024b). As Talebi et al. (2017) argue, strategic partnerships allow firms to access strategic and network resources, ultimately generating sustained benefits for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Strategic alliances are becoming more prevalent in the modern business world as firms combine their resources in an effort to obtain a competitive advantage (Musili and Deya, 2023). These alliances create value in several ways, including market access facilitation, technology collaboration, knowledge transfer, cost reduction, risk-sharing, and the strengthening of competitive advantage (Thendu et al., 2020). By partnering with larger corporations, SMEs can identify new customers, expand into novel markets, and capture emerging opportunities (Talebi et al., 2017). In this way, strategic alliances function as pathways for both growth and innovation.

The digital revolution of the twenty-first century has further transformed how firms approach alliances (Okafor et al., 2023). As technological changes reshape corporate strategies, firms increasingly turn to partnerships as mutually beneficial contractual arrangements through which they share resources, knowledge, and strengths to accomplish collective objectives (Cobeña et al., 2017; Serrat, 2017; Attah et al., 2024). Such collaborations not only extend firm capabilities but also reduce risks and operational costs while securing a competitive edge (Dodgson,

2018). Scholars contend that in the future, partnerships will play an even greater role than ownership in driving corporate growth and survival (Wei and Duan, 2024). In this context, organizational performance which is essential for survival and sustainability, can be strengthened by alliances that facilitate synergy, cooperation, innovation, knowledge development, and customer acquisition (Holotiuk et al., 2018; Kyrylenko et al., 2019; Oira et al., 2023).

Nevertheless, despite these advantages, strategic alliances remain vulnerable to several challenges. Barriers such as trust deficiencies, misalignment of goals, cultural differences, intellectual property concerns, and regulatory variations frequently undermine their success (Masoud et al., 2020). In particular, strategic technology alliances which is focused on joint innovation and technology transfer, often face high risks, with research showing that more than 50% of alliances fail within five years (Linwei et al., 2017; Masoud et al., 2020). Yet, firms continue to rely heavily on such partnerships as vehicles for market expansion, innovation, and global competitiveness (Ekpudu et al., 2013).

Despite their global adoption, the success rate of alliances remains low within the Nigerian manufacturing sector. In Ogun State, which hosts one of Nigeria's largest manufacturing clusters, firms often struggle with failed partnerships due to mismatches between alliance strategies and operational needs, ineffective relationship management, or weak execution (Zamir et al., 2014; Okafor et al., 2024a,b). Other challenges such as misperception of partner contributions, lack of resources, unequal commitment, and inefficiencies in complementary assets further weaken alliances. Moreover, power struggles, divergent goals, cultural dissimilarities, and the absence of managerial trust exacerbate these challenges (Dadfar et al., 2014; Masoud et al., 2020). These persistent issues have resulted in low success rates for strategic alliances in the region, despite their critical importance for firm survival.

A review of the extant literature reveals that strategic alliances have been widely examined across industries and sectors. Previous studies have explored their impact on performance and productivity (Akewushola et al., 2018; Muteshi and Awino, 2018; Salisu and Abu Bakar, 2018; Yu et al., 2019; Junaidu et al., 2019; Nwokocha and Madu, 2020), market share (Enyinnah et al., 2020), and the growth of startups and small businesses (Obioma, 2017; Salisu and Abu Bakar, 2018; Cacciolatti et al., 2020; Nwokocha and Madu, 2020). Research has also focused on large corporations (Junaidu et al., 2019) and has been conducted in multiple industries, including manufacturing (Akewushola et al., 2018; Muteshi and Awino, 2018; Junaidu et al., 2019; Mathuki et al., 2019; Ejekwu et al., 2020; Okafor et al., 2024a), commerce (Butigan and Benid, 2017; Yacob et al., 2016), and services (Akpotu and Jasmine, 2016; Salisu and Abu Bakar, 2018; Enyinnah et al., 2020; Okafor et al., 2024b). However, despite the breadth of this research, the consistently high rate of alliance failure suggests that many unanswered questions remain, particularly in developing economies. For instance, Madhok et al. (2015) reported that many alliances underperform because of managerial inefficiencies and the inability of firms to integrate complementary resources effectively. Also, Okafor et al. (2024a) highlighted that in Nigerian manufacturing, strategic alliances frequently fail because firms enter partnerships without clear execution strategies, leading to mismatches between alliance goals and operational realities.

This study contributes to the strategic management literature by focusing on the role of technological and marketing strategic alliances in shaping the performance of manufacturing firms in Ogun State, Nigeria. Its uniqueness lies in three key areas. First, it provides a sector-specific focus on manufacturing, a critical sector for Nigeria's industrial growth, where alliances are particularly vital but often underperform. Second, it adopts a dual-lens approach, examining both technological and marketing alliances simultaneously, two dimensions that are often studied separately in prior research. Third, it provides context-specific insights from a developing economy, addressing structural, cultural, and institutional dynamics that differ from those in developed countries By bridging these gaps, this research not only enriches theoretical understanding of strategic alliances in emerging economies but also offers practical guidance for managers and policymakers on how to structure, manage, and sustain alliances that deliver improved performance for manufacturing firms in Ogun State and beyond.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Empirical Literature Reviews

Over the years, several studies have explored the influence of strategic alliances on firm performance across industries, firm sizes, and national contexts. Findings consistently suggest that alliances, whether technological, marketing, financial, or distribution-based, play a crucial role in shaping organizational outcomes. However, differences in industry focus, methodology, and contextual factors indicate that the impact of these alliances can vary.

For instance, Okafor et al. (2024a) examined ten manufacturing companies in Ogun State and reported that both horizontal and vertical integration strategies significantly boosted competitive advantage, with horizontal integration ($\beta = 0.843$) exerting a stronger effect than vertical integration ($\beta = 0.556$). They recommended fostering government-supported industry forums to deepen collaboration and strengthen integration. Similarly, Nwokocha and Madu (2020), using multiple regression on 137 SMEs in Enugu State, found that strategic alliances greatly enhanced productivity. These Nigerian-based studies demonstrate the positive potential of alliances but emphasize the need for effective coordination and proper implementation.

In Lagos State, Ekon and Isayas (2022) revealed that although strategic management practices significantly influenced SME performance, many firms failed to implement them correctly, reducing their competitiveness internationally. This highlights the risk that poorly designed or misaligned alliances may hinder rather than improve performance. Likewise, Salisu and Abu Bakar (2018) stressed that while SMEs have access to vast resources and techniques, strategic alliances are crucial for unlocking innovation and overcoming barriers to performance in developing economies.

Evidence from outside Nigeria also reinforces the role of alliances. Ongongo and Mang'ana (2022) reported that strategy review techniques, particularly those enabled by information technology, significantly improved the performance of Kenyan commercial banks. In the same country, Mathuki et al. (2019), using RTD, RBV Integration, and Open System theories, showed a positive relationship between strategic alliances and performance among 160 manufacturing firms. Further, Muteshi and Awino (2018) established a modest but significant correlation between alliances and the performance of Kenya's food and beverage manufacturing enterprises. Mong'are (2016) similarly found that alliances significantly influenced organizational performance in 120 ICT firms in Kenya.

In Nigeria's textile industry, Junaidu et al. (2019) applied PLS-SEM to 328 firms and discovered that strategic alliances had a strong positive effect on both financial and non-financial performance. Aun (2014), studying Nigerian indigenous multinational manufacturing firms, confirmed through ANOVA and regression that alliances significantly enhance firm performance. Akewushola et al. (2018) also demonstrated in their analysis of four Nigerian companies; including Mobile Oil Nigeria Plc and GT Express, those alliances positively and significantly influenced firm outcomes.

Scholars have also examined the moderating and contextual factors shaping alliance outcomes. Adil et al. (2019) found that ethos strengthened the relationship between alliances and performance, while organizational culture was also highlighted as a positive moderator. Yang et al. (2014), studying Chinese manufacturing firms, concluded that relational stability and effective communication are critical antecedents of successful alliances, which in turn improve innovation and performance. Similarly, Talebi et al. (2017) emphasized that in Iran's automobile industry, alliances significantly enhanced SME performance through technological and resource-sharing synergies.

More recent studies continue to confirm these positive associations. Musili and Deya (2023) reported that technology, marketing, financial, and distribution alliances collectively explained 55.7% of performance variation in Nairobi's tourism sector, with technology alliances ($\beta = 0.486$) and marketing alliances ($\beta = 0.376$) standing out as significant drivers. Edewhor and Okoh (2024) also revealed that strategic alliances significantly improved revenue, cost efficiency, and profitability of commercial banks in Nigeria, recommending increased investment in modern technologies to enhance integration. Similarly, Almarri (2024) highlighted that in Saudi Arabia, strategic partnerships have become a key driver of digital transformation in manufacturing firms, enabling firms to acquire technological capabilities that fuel innovation and efficiency.

Beyond direct performance outcomes, strategic alliances are also linked to resilience and long-term sustainability. Philsoophian et al. (2021), through a bibliometric analysis, demonstrated that alliances strengthen supply chain resilience, helping firms withstand disruptions and sustain competitive advantage. This underscores the broader importance of alliances as mechanisms for not just performance enhancement but also organizational survival in turbulent environments.

Taken together, the empirical evidence paints a consistent picture: strategic alliances, whether technological or marketing-oriented, generally contribute positively to firm performance across different sectors and national contexts. However, the literature also shows that the strength of these effects depends on implementation quality, relational stability, cultural alignment, and the ability of firms to leverage complementary resources. Given the mixed experiences of Nigerian manufacturing firms and the importance of context-specific factors, it remains necessary to empirically test whether technological and marketing strategic alliances significantly influence the performance of manufacturing firms in Ogun State. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- $H_{o1}$: Technological strategic alliance does not have a significant impact on the performance of manufacturing firms in Ogun State, Nigeria
- $H_{o2}$: Marketing strategic alliance does not have a significant impact on the performance of manufacturing firms in Ogun State, Nigeria.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1. Area of Study

Seven manufacturing enterprises in Ogun State were used in this investigation. This study was conducted with the employees of a few chosen manufacturing companies in Ogun State. The study's site was chosen for its cosmopolitan character and ease of accessibility for potential respondents, which inevitably decreased the cost of conducting the study.

### 3.2. Research Design

A descriptive research methodology was employed in this study. Another term for descriptive research design is survey research design (Okafor et al., 2023). Research design offers a framework for gathering and interpreting study data (Walliman, 2017). This study looks at how strategic alliances affect manufacturing organisations' performance using a descriptive research methodology. To test hypotheses or discover the answers to research questions, researchers employ research design to collect data.

### 3.3. Population of the Study

In statistics, the population is the total set of people or things that the researcher is interested in and want to draw conclusions about (Avedian, 2014). All employees of the 7 selected manufacturing companies in Ogun State that were chosen for this study comprise the population. The seven manufacturing businesses and the total number of employees in the chosen manufacturing enterprises are displayed in the Table 1.

#### *3.3.1. Sample and sampling techniques*

Given that 5,964 people are the study's target group. The sample size was determined by the study using the Taro Yamane (1967) model, which results in a sample size of 375 (Table 2).

Sample size: $n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$. Where: n = anticipated total sample size; N = population size; e = acceptable error term (0.05).

$n = \frac{5,964}{1 + 5,964\,(0.05)^2} = 375$.

Employers of the seven manufacturing enterprises in Ogun State that were chosen for this study provided information on strategic alliances and the performance of manufacturing firms via the use of quota and stratified sampling approaches.

Using the proportional formular; $Y = \frac{n}{N} \times 100$ ; $b = \frac{Y}{100} \times B$ . The study's sample size is 375, and the following proportion of questionnaires will be given to workers at the seven manufacturing enterprises in Ogun State that were chosen:

### *3.3.2. Sources of data collection*

This study was conducted using primary data. The researcher employed a structured questionnaire to collect primary data, which she sent to all 375 staff members. The respondents were asked to read the questionnaire and provide feedback. Then, the questionnaire was set up such that the researcher could obtain and compile sufficient data from the participant. To get sufficient information for the research, a well-structured questionnaire was employed. A 5-point Likert type scale, which rates replies on a scale of 1-5, was used to rate the measuring items.

### *3.3.3. Reliability of research instrument*

Precision and reliability are related; to put it another way, reliability is used to assess the questionnaire's stability and consistency. When measurements are repeated under the same conditions, a test instrument is deemed reliable if it produces results that are comparable (Okafor et al., 2024a). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to gauge the instrument's dependability. According to some academics, all indicators' or dimensional scales' values ought to be higher than the 0.60 minimum advised value (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). Prior to the main study, a pilot test was conducted to assess the validity of the research tool and minimise any potential issues or inaccuracies that the questionnaires could have. To conduct a pilot test, 25 questionnaires were given to SONA Agro-Allied Foods Limited personnel in Ota, Ogun State. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to run the reliability test of the 25 set of questionnaires. The result of reliability test is shown below;

From the result presented in Table 3, it can be concluded that all variables (Independents and Dependent) fall within the range of 0.6-0.95; hence the research questionnaire is considered to have a good reliability.

### *3.3.4. Method of data analysis*

The inferential study employed regression and correlation analysis to investigate the impact of the predictor factors on the explained variables.

### *3.3.5. Model specification*

To investigate the combined effect of technology and marketing strategic alliances on manufacturing businesses' performance, the following is the specification of the Linear Regression model used in this study:

$$Y = \delta_0 + \delta_i x + \mu \quad (1)$$

Where: Y= Regressand = Performance of Manufacturing Firms (PMF); X= Regressor; $\delta_0$ = constant.

From equation 1,

$$x = f(TSA, MSA) \quad (2)$$

Combibing equations 1 and 2, we have;

$$PMF = \delta_0 + \delta_1 TSA + \delta_2 MSA + \mu \quad (3)$$

Where: TSA = Technological strategic alliance; MSA = Marketing strategic alliance; μ = Random variable; $\delta_1$ and $\delta_2$ = are the slope coefficients whose sign depicts the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. Equations 3 above was estimated in other to test the hypotheses of this research work.

**Table 1: Selected manufacturing companies in Ogun State**

| S. No. | Company | Employees |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Nestle | 1,311 |
| 2 | Intercontinental Distiller Limited | 932 |
| 3 | Nigeria Distilleries Limited | 786 |
| 4 | De United Foods Ind Ltd | 343 |
| 5 | Nigeria Brewery | 821 |
| 6 | HONDA Manufacturers Nigeria Limited | 864 |
| 7 | May And Baker Nigeria Public Limited Liability | 907 |
| | Total staff | 5,964 |

Source: Self-field survey

**Table 2: Sample distribution of questionnaires**

| S. No. | Company | Population (n) | Proportion In % $Y = \frac{n}{N} \times 100$ | Sample Size (B) $b = \frac{Y}{100} \times B$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Nestle | 1,311 | 22 | 82 |
| 2 | Intercontinental Distiller Limited | 932 | 15.6 | 58 |
| 3 | Nigeria Distilleries Limited | 786 | 13.2 | 49 |
| 4 | De United Foods Ind Ltd | 343 | 5.8 | 22 |
| 5 | Nigeria Brewery | 821 | 13.8 | 52 |
| 6 | HONDA Manufacturers Nigeria Limited | 864 | 14.5 | 55 |
| 7 | May And Baker Nigeria Public Limited Liability | 907 | 15.1 | 57 |
| | Total | 5,964 | 100 | 375 |

Source: Authors calculation

**Table 3: Reliability statistics**

| Variable | Dimensions | Sum of items | Cronbach alpha |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dependent | Performance of manufacturing firms | 5 | 0.917 |
| Independent | Technological strategic alliance | 5 | 0.693 |
| Independent | Marketing strategic alliance | 5 | 0.754 |

Source: Computation

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Following the Taro Ya-mane formula, a total of 375 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the chosen respondents. Of these, 375 respondents responded with a response rate of 94.4%, indicating that 354 questionnaires were successfully collected from the respondents and analysed. This part includes the results of the statistical analysis conducted on all the data collected throughout the survey, along with the testing of the hypotheses.

### 4.1. Demography Details of the Respondents

Table 4 displays the gender distribution of a sample comprising 354 respondents. The table consists of two categories: Female and Male. Among the respondents, 47.2% identified as female, with a total frequency of 167. In contrast, 52.8% of the respondents identified as male, totalling 187 individuals. The cumulative percent for each category represents the total percentage of respondents up to that point, with a cumulative percent of 47.2% for females and 100.0% for males, signifying the entirety of the sample. Overall, the table provides a clear overview of the gender distribution within the sample population.

Table 5 presents the age distribution of a sample consisting of 354 individuals. The data is categorized into four groups based on age ranges. The first category, "50 years and above," includes 47 respondents, accounting for 13.3% of the sample. The second category, "40-49 years," comprises 126 respondents, making up 35.6% of the total. The third category, "30-39 years," consists of 105 respondents, representing 29.7% of the sample. Finally, the fourth category, "Below 30 years," contains 76 respondents, contributing to 21.5% of the total.

Table 6 illustrates the marital status distribution of a sample containing 354 individuals. The data is categorized into three groups based on marital status. The first category, "Divorced," includes 27 respondents, constituting 7.6% of the sample. The second category, "Married," comprises 210 respondents, accounting for 59.3% of the total. The third and final category, "Single," consists of 117 respondents, making up 33.1% of the sample.

Table 7 displays the distribution of educational qualifications among a sample of 354 individuals. The data is categorized into five groups based on educational achievements. The first category, "PhD," includes 35 respondents, accounting for 9.9% of the sample. The second category, "M.Sc./MBA," comprises 100 respondents, making up 28.2% of the total. The third category, "B.Sc./HND," consists of 94 respondents, representing 26.6% of the sample. The fourth category, "OND/Diploma," contains 71 respondents, contributing to 20.1% of the total. Finally, the fifth category, "SSCE" (Secondary School Certificate Examination), includes 54 respondents, constituting 15.3% of the sample.

**Table 4: Gender**

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 167 | 47.2 | 47.2 |
| Male | 187 | 52.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 354 | 100.0 | |

Source: Self-field survey

**Table 5: Age group**

| Age | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| 50 years and above | 47 | 13.3 | 13.3 |
| 40-49 years | 126 | 35.6 | 48.9 |
| 30-39 years | 105 | 29.7 | 78.5 |
| Below 30 years | 76 | 21.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 354 | 100.0 | |

Source: Self-field survey

**Table 6: Marital status**

| Marital status | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Divorced | 27 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| Married | 210 | 59.3 | 66.9 |
| Single | 117 | 33.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 354 | 100.0 | |

Source: Self-field survey

**Table 7: Educational qualification**

| Educational qualification | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| PhD | 35 | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| M.Sc./MBA | 100 | 28.2 | 38.1 |
| B.Sc./HND | 94 | 26.6 | 64.7 |
| OND/Diploma | 71 | 20.1 | 84.7 |
| SSCE | 54 | 15.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 354 | 100.0 | |

Source: Self-field survey

Table 8 represents the distribution of the level of experience among a sample of 354 individuals. The data is categorized into three groups based on the number of years of experience. The first category, "21 years and above," includes 47 respondents, accounting for 13.3% of the sample. The second category, "11-20 years," comprises 114 respondents, making up 32.2% of the total. The third category, "Below 10 years," consists of 193 respondents, representing 54.5% of the sample. The cumulative percent is provided for each category, indicating the cumulative percentage of respondents up to that point. In this table, the cumulative percent reaches 100.0% when considering all levels of experience, providing a comprehensive overview of the distribution of experience levels within the sample population.

### 4.2. Testing of Hypotheses

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was employed in this study for testing hypotheses 1, and 2 while regression analysis was employed in testing the third hypothesis of the study.

**Table 8: Level of experience**

| Years of experience | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21 years and above | 47 | 13.3 | 13.3 |
| 11-20 years | 114 | 32.2 | 45.5 |
| Below 10 years | 193 | 54.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 354 | 100.0 | |

Source: Self-field survey

### *4.2.1. Hypothesis 1*

- $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between technological strategic alliance and the performance of manufacturing firms.

### *4.2.2. Hypothesis 2*

- $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between marketing strategic alliance and the performance of manufacturing firms.

From Table 9, for Technology strategic alliance and Performance of Manufacturing Firms: The Pearson correlation coefficient is approximately 0.745**. This indicates a strong positive correlation between the presence of technology strategic alliances and the performance of manufacturing firms. Marketing strategic alliance and Performance of Manufacturing Firms: The Pearson correlation coefficient is approximately 0.878**. This indicates a very strong positive correlation between the presence of marketing strategic alliances and the performance of manufacturing firms. All the correlation coefficients have a significant p-value (Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000), which means that the observed correlations are unlikely to occur by chance alone.

Based on the correlation matrix, it can be inferred that both technology strategic alliances and marketing strategic alliances have a positive association with the performance of manufacturing firms. This suggests that manufacturing firms that engage in strategic alliances, especially in the technology and marketing domains, tend to exhibit better performance outcomes compared to firms that do not have such alliances. From the result of the correlation analysis, the null hypotheses one and two are rejected and the alternative hypotheses one and two that states that there is a significant relationship between technological strategic alliance and the performance of manufacturing firms and there is a significant relationship between marketing strategic alliance and the performance of manufacturing firms respectively are accepted.

### *4.2.3. Hypothesis 3*

- $H_0$: Technological strategic alliance and marketing strategic alliance have no significant joint impact on performance of manufacturing firms.

The multiple regression analysis in Table 10 revealed that both "Technology strategic alliance" and "Marketing strategic alliance" have a significant positive impact on the performance of manufacturing firms. When using multiple regression analysis, significant positive relationship between strategic alliances and manufacturing firms performance was discovered. The findings also show that the coefficient estimate for technology strategic alliances is 0.239 with a T-statistic of 6.233 which is significant at 1% level, thus supporting hypothesis two by affirming that

**Table 9: Correlation analysis**

| Variable | Statistic | TSA | MSA | PMF |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TSA | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.731** | 0.745** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | n | 354 | 354 | 354 |
| MSA | Pearson Correlation | 0.731** | 1 | 0.878** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | | 0.000 |
| | n | 354 | 354 | 354 |
| PMF | Pearson Correlation | 0.745** | 0.878** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | |
| | n | 354 | 354 | 354 |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Source: Self-field survey

**Table 10: Multiple regression result**

| Dependent variable (PMF) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent Variable | Coefficient | Standard Error | T-statistics | Prob |
| (Constant) | 0.094 | 0.597 | 0.157 | 0.876 |
| TSA | 0.239* | 0.038 | 6.233 | 0.000 |
| MSA | 0.752* | 0.037 | 20.188 | 0.000 |
| Summary statistics | | | | |
| R-square | | 0.891 | | |
| Adjusted R-square | | 0.793 | | |
| F-statistics | | 676.246* | | |
| Sig F-statistics | | 0.000 | | |

* and ** significant at 1% and 5% respectively. Source: Authors computation,

technology partnerships affect the performance of the firms in a positive manner. Consequently, the coefficient of marketing strategic alliances stands at 0.752 and T-statistic of 20.188 both of which are significant at 1%. By the conventional method, the R-squared value of 0.891 means that 89.1% of the forces in firm performance are actually caused by these two strategic alliances, while adjustment R-squared equal to 0.793 and it proves that the model is well fitted. The obtained F-statistic is equal to 676.246, which is significant and indicates the overall reliability of the model. These findings are in tandem with previous research done in the field. For example, Okafor et al., (2024) identified that integration techniques enhance the competitive advantage of Ogun State manufacturing firms; this is in line with the results of this study that marketing alliances increase the firms' competitive advantage. Nwokocha and Madu (2020) and Akewushola et al. (2018) also affirm the contention that strategic alliance enhance firm productivity and performance as supported by both the technology and marketing alliance. This supports the assertion that the strategic alliances in marketing have a strong influence, consistent with the assertion made by Salisu and Abu Bakar (2018) that alliances are capable of using resources and innovation, something that Mong'are (2016) confirms in the case of ICT firms.

There are implications for the manufacturing firms in the Ogun State as it pulls an argument, indicating that strategic alliances, and particularly the marketing ones could be a major performance boost. This emphasises the fact that firms should take part in strategic strategic partnerships that improve their technological capacities and market access with a view of designing effective arrangement that would give them competitive edge.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study examined the effect of strategic alliances on the performance of manufacturing firms in Ogun State, Nigeria, and the evidence confirms that such collaborations significantly enhance competitiveness and productivity. The findings reveal that alliances allow firms to pool resources, share risks, and gain access to wider markets, thereby improving efficiency and technological capability. This outcome resonates with Greve and Zhang (2022), who found that strategic collaborations foster innovation and sustainable advantages, and with Syaifuddin (2025) , who emphasized that alliances enhance operational effectiveness in dynamic markets. Similarly, Rolland and Chauvel (2012), established that partnerships strengthen knowledge transfer and learning, while Child et al. (2019) demonstrated that firms embedded in alliances outperform rivals due to improved access to complementary resources. These insights validate the central argument that manufacturing firms in Ogun State need strategic alliances to navigate volatile business environments and achieve superior performance outcomes.

The findings further suggest that firms in Ogun State stand to benefit greatly from technology and marketing alliances, as these enable them to adopt superior production methods, enhance brand visibility, and expand market share. In line with Musili and Deya (2023), technology partnerships accelerate innovation and facilitate the adoption of advanced processes, while marketing alliances, as highlighted by Muthoka and Oduor (2014), strengthen firms' market penetration and customer loyalty. To maximize these benefits, there is a need for supportive policy frameworks that encourage collaboration through incentives such as tax credits, grants, and innovation-focused programs. Equally, the facilitation of knowledge and technology transfer through joint research and licensing arrangements would empower firms with the tools needed to drive competitiveness. Moreover, investing in managerial skills for alliance governance, especially in areas such as negotiation, trust-building, and conflict management, would ensure that partnerships deliver long-term value. Altogether, the study reinforces that harnessing technological and marketing alliances is a strategic pathway for manufacturing firms in Ogun State to achieve sustained growth and performance.

## REFERENCES


Adil, T.P., Soban, M., Malik, J.S., Summera, M. (2019), Evidence of moderating role of organizational culture among strategic alliances and organizational performance. Journal of Managerial Sciences, 14(4), 74-82.

Akewushola, R.O., Tijani, A.A., Adelekan, S.A. (2018), Strategic alliance and firm performance: A focus on service industry. Crawford Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 8(2), 84-91.

Akpotu, C., Jasmine, T.A. (2016), Strategic alliance and operational sustainability in the Nigerian banking sector. Review of Social Sciences, 1(8), 44-50.

Attah, R.U., Garba, B.M.P., Gil-Ozoudeh, I., Iwuanyanwu, O. (2024), Evaluating strategic technology partnerships: Providing conceptual insights into their role in corporate strategy and technological innovation. International Journal Frontiers Science Technology Research, 7(2), 77-89.

Aun, I.I. (2014), Effect of strategic alliance on the performance of manufacturing companies in Nigeria. Jorid Journals, 12(2), 99-111.

Avedian, A. (2014), Survey Design. Cambridge: Harvard Law School.

Butigan, N., Benid, D. (2017), The impact of membership in strategic alliances on the profitability of firms in the retail sector. Croatian Economic Survey, 19(2), 47-82.

Cacciolatti, L., Rosli, A., Ruiz-Alba, J.L., Chang, J. (2020), Strategic alliances and firm performance in startups with a social mission. Journal of Business Research, 106, 106-117.

Cobeña, M., Gallego, Á., Casanueva, C. (2017), Heterogeneity, diversity and complementarity in alliance portfolios. European Management Journal, 35(4), 464-476.

Child, J., Faulkner, D., Tallman, S., Hsieh, L. (2019), Cooperative Strategy: Managing Alliances and networks. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dadfar, H., Dahlgaard, J.J., Brege, S., Arzaghi, B.J. (2014), International strategic alliances in the Iranian pharmaceutical industry: An analysis of key success and failure factors. Total Quality Management and Business Excellence, 25(7-8), 812-826.

Dodgson, M. (2018), Technological Collaboration in Industry: Strategy, Policy and Internationalization in Innovation. Routledge. Available from: https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781351265607/technological-collaboration-industry-mark-dodgson

Edewhor, V., Okoh, L. (2024), Assessing the effect of strategic alliances on organizational performance of commercial banks in Nigeria. NG Journal of Social Development, 14(2), 129-153.

Ejekwu, K., Zeb-Obipi, I., Uhuru, G.P. (2020), Operations sensitivity and strategic alliance success in Nigerian manufacturing companies port harcourt. The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management, 7(1), 495-504.

Ekon, B., Isayas, B. (2022), Factors impacting strategic management practices among SMEs in Nigeria. African Economic and Management Review, 2(1), 40-49.

Ekpudu, J.E., Aigbepue, S., Olabisi, J.O. (2013), Appraisal of strategic alliances and corporate effectiveness. African Research Review, 7(1), 155-164.

Enyinnah, N.U., Adefulu, A.D., Asikhia, O.U., Onyia, V. (2020), Strategic alliance and market share of selected microfinance banks in Lagos Nigeria. International Journal of Research Science and Management, 7(2), 50-58.

Greve, H.R., Zhang, C.M. (2022), Is there a strategic organization in the behavioral theory of the firm? Looking back and looking forward. Strategic Organization, 20(4), 698-708.

Holotiuk, F., Klus, M.F., Lohwasser, T.S., Moormann, J. (2018), Motives to Form Alliances for Digital Innovation: The Case of Banks and Fintechs. 22. BLED 2018 Proceedings. Available from: https://aisel.aisnet.org/bled2018/22

Junaidu, A.S., Bature, G., Zuru, L.N. (2019), Strategic alliance and performance of textile industry: Empirical evidence from Kano, Nigeria. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 6(5), 238-245.

Kyrylenko, O., Riazanovska, V., Novak, V. (2019), Strategic airline alliances as a special form of company integration. Baltic Journal of Economic Studies, 5(1), 75-80.

Linwei, L., Feifei, J., Yunlong, P., Nengqian, J. (2017), Entrepreneurial orientation and strategic alliance success: The contingency role of relational factors. Journal of Business Research, 72, 46-56.

Madhok, A., Keyhani, M., Bossink, B. (2015), Understanding alliance evolution and termination: Adjustment costs and the economics of resource value. Strategic Organization, 13(2), 91-116.

Masoud, I.F., Buzovich, A.I., Vladimirova, I.G. (2020), Factors of Success and Failures of International Strategic Alliance. In: 1st International

Conference on Emerging Trends and Challenges in the Management Theory and Practice (ETCMTP 2019). Atlantis Press. p32-37.

Mathuki, P.M., Ogutu, M., Ndemo, B., Pokhariyal, G.P. (2019), The link between strategic alliances and performance of Kenyan manufacturing firms in the East African community market. International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches, 6(6), 67-91.

Mong'are, A. (2016), Strategic Alliances and Performance of Information Communication Technology Companies in Kenya. Nairobi: University of Nairobi, School of Business.

Musili, M.N., Deya, J. (2023), Influence of strategic alliances on performance of firms in the tourism sector in Nairobi County, Kenya. Journal of Business and Strategic Management, 8(5), 1-24.

Muteshi, D.C., Awino, Z.B. (2018), Strategic alliances and performance of food and beverage manufacturing companies in Kenya. DBA Africa Management Review, 8(1), 86-98.

Muthoka, M., Oduor, P.A. (2014), Effects of strategic alliances on organizational performance: Supermarkets and their alliances in Kenya. European Journal of Business and Management, 6(34), 75-89.

Nwokocha, V.C., Madu, I.A. (2020), Strategic alliance and its influence on the performance of small- and medium-scale enterprises in Enugu State, Nigeria. Global Journal of Emerging Market Economies, 12(2), 199-216.

Obioma, O. (2017), Aligning small and medium enterprises for competitiveness in Nigeria: The role of strategic alliance. Review of Public Administration and Management, 5(1), 1000215.

Oira, S.M., Omagwa, J., Abdul, F. (2023), The relationship between operational synergy and firm performance: A review of literature. Journal of Finance and Accounting, 7(5), 95-112.

Okafor, L.I., Ifekwem, N.E., Bello, B.A., Ajayi, M.A., Omotola, B.E., Adebiyi, O.O., Modibbo, U.A., Nnoli, I.T. (2024a), Integration strategies and competitive advantage in manufacturing sector: Evidence from Ogun state, Nigeria. International Review of Management and Marketing, 2024, 14(4), 103-112.

Okafor, L.I., Nnoli, I.T., Bello, B.A., Oke, B. (2023), Impact of digital management on organization productivity in Eti- Osa local government area of Lagos state. Innovations, 72, 521-529.

Okafor, L.I., Sokeye, A.O., Nnoli, I.T., Ajayi, M.A. (2024b), Strategic management and competitive advantage in the hospitality industry in Ogun State, Nigeria. African Journal of Business and Economic Research, 19(3), 435-456.

Ongongo, L.A., Mang'ana, R. (2022), Effect of strategic management practices on performance of commercial banks In Kenya. Journal of International Business, Innovation and Strategic Management, 6(1), 58-72.

Philsoophian, M., Akhavan, P., Abbasi, M. (2021), Strategic alliance for resilience in supply chain: A bibliometric analysis. Sustainability, 13(22), 12715.

Rolland, N., Chauvel, D. (2012), Knowledge transfer in strategic alliances. In: Knowledge Horizons. London: Routledge. p225-236.

Salisu, Y., Abu Bakar, L.J. (2018), Strategic alliance and the performance of SMEs in developing economies: The mediating role of innovation strategy. Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 6(2), 47-56.

Sekaran, U., Bougie, R. (2016), Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach. John Wiley and Sons. Available from: https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/bkkthon/article/download/33962/28587

Serrat, O. (2017), Knowledge Solutions: Tools, Methods, and Approaches to Drive Organizational Performance. Springer Nature. p1140. Available from: https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/28041/1001955.pdf

Syaifuddin, S. (2025), Understanding the dynamics of collaboration and partnerships: A qualitative inquiry into enhancing competitiveness through strategic alliances and business networks. Golden Ratio of Marketing and Applied Psychology of Business, 5(1), 110-120.

Talebi, K., Farsi, J.Y., Miriasl, H. (2017), Identifying the impact of strategic alliances on the performance of SMEs (Case study: The industry of automotive parts manufacturers in Iran), International Business Research, 10(6), 227-235.

Thendu, B., Kariuki, P., Muturi, W., Wanjohi, P. (2020), Influence of strategic alliances on the performance of airline carriers registered under IATA: A literature based review. African Journal of Emerging Issues, 2(2), 48-69.

Walliman, N. (2017), Qualitative data analysis. In: Research Methods: The Basics. Milton Park: Routledge. p148-166.

Wei, W., Duan, J. (2024), How do entrepreneurial activities at different levels promote business growth: A review and research agenda. Chinese Management Studies, 18(3), 755-784.

Yacob, S., Sucherly, P., Sari, D., Mulyana, A. (2016), Do really competitive strategy and strategic alliances affect retail business performance? Evidence from the mini market retail in Jakarta and Bandung city, Indonesia. International Journal of Economics and Management, 4(2), 783-796.

Yang, H., Zheng, Y., Zhao, X. (2014), Exploration or exploitation? Small firms' alliance strategies with large firms. Strategic Management Journal, 35(1), 146-157.

Yu, B., Xu, H., Dong, F. (2019), Vertical vs. Horizontal: How strategic alliance type influence firm performance? Sustainability, 11(23), 6594.

Zahoor, N., Khan, Z., Marinova, S., Cui, L. (2024), Ambidexterity in strategic alliances: An integrative review of the literature. International Journal of Management Reviews, 26(1), 82-109.

Zamir, Z., Sahar, A., Zafar, F. (2014), Strategic alliances; a comparative analysis of successful alliances in large and medium scale enterprises around the world. Education Research International Journal, 3(1), 25-39.