

# **BUILDING A MARKETING PERFORMANCE ALONG WITH CO-CREATION, REGIOSINTRIK CAPABILITIES IN SMES OF BATIK**

Naili Farida<sup>1\*</sup>

Titin Woro Murani<sup>1</sup>

Nanik Trihastuti<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

\*Correspondence email: [faridanaili@ymail.com](mailto:faridanaili@ymail.com)

## **Abstract**

The study examined about SMEs of Batik in Central Java Indonesia. The purpose of this study was to test the influence of the networking capabilities of imaging capabilities, product regiosentrik, and brand equity against the value of co-creation and performance marketing. The respondents in this research is the owner/manager of SMEs of Batik in Central Java, Indonesia. The analysis that is used in this research is the structural equation modeling (SEM), where the data obtained processed using Amos 21. The results of this research show that a major factor in increasing value co-creation is the networking capabilities and the capabilities of imaging products regiosentrik. In addition, this research found the driving factor of performance marketing of SMEs of Batik is value co-creation and brand equity.

**Keywords:** Networking Capability, Capability of Imaging Products Regiosentrik, Value Co-Creation, Brand Equity, And Performance Marketing

## **Intriduction**

In the marketing literature, there is a change of everything comes from the manufacturer of the switch into the cooperation between producers and consumers. Many companies with conventional approaches have problems with customer satisfaction (Zhang & Chen, 2008). Customer satisfaction is diminished due to the values obtained do not correspond to their expectations. In the process, Thomke and Hippel (2002) explains that some companies radically provide opportunity for its customers to design and develop products according to the desires. The consumer is the one party that was instrumental in the creation of value. Consumer donations at the production process becomes larger since creation occurs between the provider and the consumer. Consumers will tend to have the maximum satisfaction for being able to create value and generate a joint product or service provider.

In this study, co-creation will affect on marketing performance (Chakraborty et al., 2014; Chuang & Lin, 2015). Customers liked the involvement in making products (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Customer involvement in making the product will make the product has a unique value. By doing so, the company will tend to be able to keep customers from switching (Pine et al., 1995). Relationship will also be preserved properly between the customer and provider (Walter et al., 2001). In this study, the factors that affect value creation is the imaging capabilities and networking capabilities of the product regiosentrik, whereas co creation will impact positively on the performance marketing.

The purpose of this study was to test the influence of the networking capabilities of imaging capabilities, product regiosentrik, and brand equity against the value of co-creation and performance marketing.

### **Literature Review dan Hypothesized Network Capability and Value Co Creation**

Networking capability is defined as the ability of the company to initiate, develop and capitalize on relationships between internal and external organizations (Zacca et al., 2015). Kale et al. (2000) explained there are several components that must be considered in establishing the network, IE: internal communication, relationship skills, coordination and knowledge of its partner. SMES that have outstanding networking will surely have lots of benefits. (Mu, 2013). Capabilities that allow a company to be successful in the network is an important factor in the creation of knowledge and value creation (Dayan et al., 2013) and performance (Ardyan et al., 2016). The company will collaborate in business networking to create products together (Fileri et al., 2014). Reypens et al. (2016) explains that collaboration is done by multistakeholder in networking to generate value. This cooperation will be followed throughout the stakeholder within the network. The results show the value maximization of existing accepted by all stake holders (Reypens et al., 2016). The ability of a network, which includes the adoption of a long-term relationship, encourage collaborative communications, design and use of cross-functional teams, and the involvement of partners of the supply chain, also plays an important role in creating value along with customers (Kahn et al., 2006).

### **H1: Networking Capabilities has positive effect and significant on value co-creation**

#### **Capacity of Brand Image Regiocentrik and Value Co Creation**

Brand image can be seen from two points of view. From the point of view of the customer, brand image is everything thought and felt about the brand customers (Roy & Banerjee, 2007). Keller (1993) describes the brand image as a brand association in the minds of customers. Brand Image is one of distinguishing between one brand with the brand. The brand was able to put a value on the company (Srivastava et al., 2001). The brand is also able to provide efficiency and effectiveness in marketing activities, create loyalty, and create a high margin (Cretu & Brodie 2015). From the point of view of the company, the company must have the ability to create a certain image on the brand. In the research enterprise must have the capability of imaging products regiosentrik. Regiosentrik relating to certain segments. So the imaging capabilities of the product regiosentrik means the ability of a product to make the association with regard to certain areas. In this study, we hypothesised that the sensing capabilities to increase market value co-creation.

### **H2: Image Capabilities Of The Product Regiosentrik Has Positive And Significant Effect On Value Co Creation.**

#### **Brand Equity and Value Co creation**

In the marketing literature, brand equity is seen from a number of approaches, namely the financial approach (Anderson, 2011; Carol & Sullivan, 1993) and approach the consumer (Christodoulides & De Chernatony, 2010; Lassar et al., 1995; Mahon & Sequeira, 2016; Vazquez et al., 2002). From a financial point of view, brand equity is defined as the value of the acquired company's financial response from customers against marketing brands (Anderson, 2011). In the viewpoint of finance, Feldwick (1996) explains that creating financial value of brand equity is required to assess the brand will be sold or incorporated into the balance sheet. It is required at the time of the acquisition. Companies should assess not just the value of the assets but also the brand equity must also be assessed.

In this research we suspect that brand equity will have an impact on value-cocreation. Companies with strong brand equity will be easier to cooperate with customers to create products together. This cooperation will also create new values will be received directly by the customer.

### **H3: Brand Equity Has Positive Effect And Significant On Value Co creation**

#### **Brand Equity and Marketing Performance**

Brand equity is also seen from the consumer. In conceptualizing how customers evaluate the brand equity, it is deemed as consisting of two components – the power of brand and value brand (Srivastava & Shocker, 1991). Customer based brand equity has been defined as the differential effects of brand knowledge about consumer response against marketing brands (Kamakura & Russell, 1991). Vazquez et al. (2002) describes a customer based brand equity as a whole consumer associations at the time consuming and using the brand, including the functional and symbolic Association.

In general the performance defined as a performance results as either in quality or quantity. In the context of marketing, Kotler and Keller (2012) viewed as a measure of performance results have implications both financially or non financial. Some studies use the term organizational performance (Ledwith & O'Dwyer, 2009), the performance of the business (Jyoti & Sharma, 2012; Sin et al., 2005a; Sin et al., 2005b), the performance of the company (Beard & Dess, 1981; Hooley et al., 2001; Milfelner et al., 2008), the performance of SMEs (Ardayan, 2016; Ardayan et al., 2016) and marketing performance (Sugiyarti & Ardayan, 2017).

Some of researches describes a positive influence between brand equity and performance (Kim & Kim, 2005; Kim & Kim, 2004; Wang et al., 2015). Research conducted by Mahon and Sequeira (2016) found that the dimensions of brand equity effect on performance. Companies with a high brand equity means the company is rated by its customers. Preferred customers with high value business equity. They tend to purchase the product at the companies they trust. Therefore, a high equity will have an impact on the purchasing decisions and will ultimately have an impact on the company's performance.

### **H4: Brand Equity Has Positive Effect And Significant On Marketing Performance**

#### **Value Co-Creation and Marketing Performance**

Co-creation is very beneficial both for the company or for its customers. Co-creation with customers into a new source of competence for business strategy (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Co-creation makes the company interacts with its customers. Pine et al. (1995) said that through interaction with its customers so the company will really understand its customers would desire. The emphasis of co-creation with customers may not only impact positively on the ability of service, but also have a direct impact on the ability of promotion, which is significantly different from the ability of traditional (Zhang & Chen, 2008). Other benefits perform co-creation is gaining new competitive ability, which can precisely target customers and use the data to create a unique approach (Whiteley & Hessian, 1996). Some of the research makes it clear that value Co Creation impact on performance (Chakraborty et al., 2014; Chuang & Lin, 2015).

### **H5: Value Co-Creation Has Positive Effect And Significant On Marketing Performance**

## Research Method

### Sample

This research spread as many as 154 questionnaires which throughout the respondents want to fill out the questionnaire. The following characteristics of respondents in this research:

Table 1. The Characteristic of Respondents

NOTES	f	%
Gender		
Male	48	31,17%
Female	106	68,83%
Age		
25-35 years old	14	9,09%
36-46 years old	69	44,81%
>47 years old	81	52,60%
Business Period		
3 until 6 years	21	13,64%
7 until 10 years	101	65,58%
> 10 years	32	20,78%

### Measurement

Each question in this study made with 7 scale, where 1 indicates the strongly disagree perception while of 7 scale indicates strongly agree perception. Here's an explanation of variables, indicators and supporting literatur in the scale of measurement.

Table 2. The Definition of Operational

Variables	Indicators	References
Networking Capabilitites	Monitor the ups and downs of market demand	
	Always adjust to changing tastes	
	Always make use of customer information	
	Always observe the ever-changing market environment	
	Always share the experience with customers	
Regiosentrik Capabilities	Guarantee the quality of products of high quality	
	Always keep a good name or prestige products	
	Always enhance the attractiveness of the product by means of creating a unique design	
	Always increase the impression or positive image on products such as packing is interesting	
	Always promote products to customers through online media, offline, exhibitions	

Variables	Indicators	References
Value Co-Cration	Always engage the customer with active in new product development	
	Always engage the customer to deal with the problem together	
	Always be responsible if there is a problem with the customer	
	Always flexible in responding to the changing relationship with customers	
	Always cooperate in a variety of situations with the agreement	
	Always involve customers in planning new products	
Brand Equities	Have a product better known	
	Have a quality brand that is better than a competitor's product	
	Have a very good product quality continuously	
	The company has been rated high by the customer as compared to competitors	
	Have customers who are willing to buy at a price	
	Have the name of the company that has provided the profits than competitors	
	Have customers who would recommend to other customers to buy the product	
	Have customers that the majority intends to buy back products	
Has a relationship with customers in the long term		
Marketing Performance	The value of the sales of our products are experiencing an increase in 1 year	
	The number of sales of our products has increased within 1 year	
	Profitability has increased within 1 year	
	The sales volume in units has increased within the last 1 year	
	Sales in the unit area growth has increased within the last 1 year	

### Analysis

In this research analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). To process data used Amos 21.

The instruments are built tested in advance validity and reliability. In this research the validity of measured using the factor loading and AVE, while the test reliability using composite reliability. The value of the factor loading and AVE must be above 0.5 (Hair et al.,

2010), whereas composite reliability must be above 0.6 (Ghozali, 2013). Table 3 explains that the whole testing either the validity or reliability of the above already, the value of which is required.

**Table 3. Validity of the test results and Reliability**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Standardized Loading</b>	<b>CR</b>	<b>AVE</b>
Networking Capabilities	Monitoring the ups and downs of market demand	0,601	0,83	0,55
	Always adjust to changing tastes	0,625		
	Always utilizing of customer information	0,796		
	Always observe the ever-changing market environment	0,858		
	Always share the experience with customers	0,674		
Regiosentrik Capabilities	Guarantee the quality of products of high quality	0,845	0,88	0,76
	Always keep a good name or prestige products	0,904		
	Always enhance the attractiveness of the product by means of creating a unique design	0,907		
	Always increase the impression or positive image on products such as packing is interesting	0,927		
	Always promote products to customers through online media, offline, exhibitions	0,776		
Value Co-Crations	Always engage the customer with active in new product development	0,856	0,96	0,8
	Always engage the customer to deal with the problem together	0,895		
	Always be responsible if there is a problem with the customer	0,897		
	Always flexible in responding to the changing relationship with customers	0,926		
	Always cooperate in a variety of situations with the agreement	0,933		
	Always involve customers in planning new products	0,872		
Brand Equities	Have a product better known	0,775	0,96	0,74
	Have a quality brand that is better than a	0,752		

Variables	Indicators	Standardized Loading	CR	AVE
	competitor's product			
	Have a very good product quality continuously	0,856		
	The company has been rated high by the customer as compared to competitors	0,884		
	Have customers who are willing to buy at a price	0,896		
	Have the name of the company that has provided the profits than competitors	0,904		
	Have customers who would recommend to other customers to buy the product	0,898		
	Have customers that the majority intends to buy back products	0,91		
	Have a relationship with peanggan in the long run	0,87		
Marketing Performances	The value of the sales of our products are experiencing an increase in 1 year	0,665	0,75	0,5
	The number of sales of our products has increased within 1 year	0,619		
	Profitability has increased within 1 year	0,68		
	The sales volume in units has increased within the last 1 year	0,598		
	Sales in the unit area growth has increased within the last 1 year	0,67		

## Result

Before testing the hypothesis, this study did test the goodness of fit. Goodness of fit are used in this research include: chi-Square (221.938), probability (0.000), Cmin/DF (0.855), GFI (0.992), TLI (0.962), CFI (0.907), RMSEA (0.073). All indicators of goodness of fit can be said its value is in compliance with the conditions, so it can be inferred that the goodness of fit in this study is already good.

Table 4 describes the results of hypothesis testing. There are 5 a hypothesis proposed in this research. There are 4 accepted hypothesis (H1, H2, H4, H5) and 1 rejected hypothesis (H3). Following the results of hypothesis testing:

Hypotheses	$\beta$	P	Notes
<i>H1: Networking Capabilities has positive effect and significant on value co-creation</i>	2,294	*****	Hypotheses accepted

<i>H2: Image Capabilities of the product Regiosentrik has a positive effect and significant on Value Co Creation</i>	0,520	****	Hypotheses accepted
<i>H3: Brand Equity has a positive effect and significant on Value Co creation</i>	-1,130	****	Hypotheses rejected
<i>H4: Brand Equity has a positive effect and significant on Marketing Performance</i>	0,526	****	Hypotheses accepted
<i>H5: Value of co-creation has a positive effect and significant on Marketing Performance</i>	0,382	****	Hypotheses accepted

$\alpha < 0,001$

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

The results of this research show that Networking Capabilities has a positive impact and significantly in value co-creation. The results of this study indicated by the value of  $\beta = 2.294$  significantly less than 0.001. This same research results with the results of previous research (Filiari et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2015). Networking capabilities can help develop collaborative business relationships (Walter et al., 2001). The ability of a network encouraging collaborative communication, design, and the involvement of partners, also plays an important role in creating value together with customers (Kahn et al., 2006). The ability to collaborate is also very impact on the integration of the resource so that it enables the company to create value co-creation (Gummesson & Mele, 2010). SMEs of Batik that are able to maximize the network to collaborate, then SMEs will be able to increase value for its customers.

The results of this research show that the image capabilities of the product regiosentrik has positive effect and significant on value co creation. The results of this study indicated by the value of  $\beta = 0.520$  significantly less than 0.001. Image of the company will make customers fell satisfied to team up with the company. Customers will feel proud when, in cooperation with the high quality company.

The results of this research show that Brand Equity has a negative effect and significant on Value Co creation. The results of this study indicated by the value of  $\beta = -1.130$  significantly less than 0.001. These results indicate that the higher the brand equity then the lower the customer's opportunity to do co creation. In the batik industry, brand image is not an important thing in increasing cooperation between SMEs of Batik and its customers.

The results of this research explains that brand equity effect on performance marketing. The results of this study indicated by the value of  $\beta = 0.526$  significantly less than 0.001. Previous research also exist which found that brand equity is able to improve the performance of (Kim & Kim, 2005; Wang et al., 2015). Other research results show that the value of co creation was able to improve the performance of marketing. The results of this study indicated by the value of  $\beta = 0.382$  significantly less than 0.001. this same research results with previous studies (Chakraborty et al., 2014; Chuang & Lin, 2015). Co-creation as a joint action by customers and service providers through direct interaction (Gronroos, 2012). The impact of co-cration is service to satisfy customers (Zhang & Chen, 2008). Satisfied customers against the Ministry will have an impact on the purchasing behavior and customer loyalty. Customer satisfaction and loyalty is an indication of the performance of the company (Voola et al., 2012).

### **Limitation and Suggestion for the Next Research**

There is no perfect research. This research has some limitations and suggestions for research that will came. First, the respondents in this research is still in the area of Central



Java. For upcoming research suggested to expand not just the territory of Central Java. By expanding the area of the respondents then the chances of getting a more interesting results. Central Java, West Java, East Java, or have local wisdom. Second, the concept of the imaging capabilities of the product regiosentrik is a concept adopted from several approaches. Need for more research to prove this validity variables.

## References

- Anderson, J. (2011). Measuring the financial value of brand equity: The perpetuity perspective. *Journal of Business Administration Online*, 10(1), 1-11.
- Ardyan, E. (2016). Market sensing capability and SMEs performance: The mediating role of product innovativeness success. *Business & Economics Review*, 25(2), 1-18.
- Ardyan, E., Rahmawan, G., & Isstianto, S. (2016). Building entrepreneurial networking quality to improve the success of innovation and Batik SMEs performance. *International Journal of Sociotechnology and Knowledge Development*, 8(4), 37-54.
- Beard, D. W., & Dess, G. G. (1981). Corporate-Level Strategy, Business-Level Strategy, and Firm Performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 24(4), 663-688.
- Carol, J. S., & Sullivan, M. W. (1993). The Measurement and Determinants of Brand Equity: A Financial Approach. *Marketing science*, 12(1), 28-52.
- Chakraborty, S., Bhattacharya, S., & Dobrzykowski, D. D. (2014). Impact of Supply Chain Collaboration on Value Co-creation and Firm Performance: A Healthcare Service Sector Perspective *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 11, 676-694.
- Christodoulides, G., & De Chernatony, L. (2010). Consumer-Based Brand Equity Conceptualization and Measurement. *International Journal of Market Research*, 52(1), 43-66.
- Chuang, S.-H., & Lin, H.-N. (2015). Co-creating e-service innovations: Theory, practice, and impact on firm performance. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(3), 277-291.
- Cretu, A. E., & Brodie, R. J. (2015). Brand image, corporate reputation and customer value. In A. Woodside (Ed.), *Business to Business Brand Management: Theory, Research and Executive Case Study Exercise* (Vol. 15, pp. 263-387): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Dayan, M., Zacca, R., & Benedetto, C. A. (2013). An Explorative Study of Entrepreneurial Creativity: Its Antecedents and Mediators in the context of UAE Firms. *Creativity and Innovation Management Journal*, 22(3), 223-240.
- Feldwick, P. (1996). Do We Really Need Brand Equity. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 4(1), 9-28.
- Filieri, R., McNally, R. C., O'Dwyer, M., & O'Malley, L. (2014). Structural social capital evolution and knowledge transfer: Evidence from an Irish pharmaceutical network. *Industrial marketing Management*, 43(3), 429-440.
- Ghozali, I. (2013). *Model Persamaan Struktural: Konsep dan Aplikasi Dengan Program AMOS 21*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.
- Gronroos, C. (2012). Conceptualising value co-creation: a journey to the 1970 and back to the future. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28(13/14), 1520-1534.
- Gummesson, E., & Mele, C. (2010). Marketing value co-creation through network interaction and Resource integration. *Journal of Business Marketing Management*, 4, 181-198.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7 ed.). New York: A Global Perspective.

- Hooley, G., Greenley, G. E., Fahy, J., & Cadogan, J. (2001). Market-focused resources, competitive positioning and firm performance. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17(5-6), 503-520.
- Jyoti, J., & Sharma, J. (2012). Impact of Market Orientation on Business Performance: Role of Employee Satisfaction and Customer Satisfaction. *Vision : The Journal of Business Perspective*, 16(4), 297-313.
- Kahn, B. E., Maltz, E. N., & Mentzer, J. T. (2006). Demand collaboration: Effects on knowledge creation, relationships, and supply chain performance. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 27(2), 191-221.
- Kale, P., Singh, H., & Perlmutter, H. (2000). Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances: Building relational capital. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(3), 217-237.
- Kamakura, W. A., & Russell, G. J. (1991). Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Brand Quality with Scanner Data: Implications for Brand Equity. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer Based Brand Equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Kim, H.-B., & Kim, W. G. (2005). The Relationship Between Brand Equity and Firms' Performance in Luxury Hotels and Chain restaurants. *Tourism Management*, 26, 549-560.
- Kim, W. G., & Kim, H.-B. (2004). Measuring Customer-Based Restaurant Brand Equity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 115-131.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2012). *Marketing Management*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Lassar, W., Mittal, B., & Sharma, A. (1995). Measuring Customer-Based Brand Equity. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 12(4), 11-19.
- Ledwith, A., & O'Dwyer, M. (2009). Market Orientation, NPD Performance, and Organizational Performance in Small Firm. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 26, 652-661.
- Mahon, B. C., & Sequeira, A. H. (2016). The impact of customer-based brand equity on the operational performance of FMCG companies in India. *IIMB Management Review*, 28, 13-19.
- Milfelner, B., Gabrijan, V., & Snoj, B. (2008). Can Marketing Resources Contribute to Company Performance? *Organizacija*, 41(1), 3-13.
- Mu, J. (2013). Networking capability, new venture performance and entrepreneurial rent. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 15(2), 101-123.
- Pine, B. J., Peppers, D., & Rogers, M. (1995). Do you want to keep your customers forever? *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 103-114.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating unique value with customers. *Strategy & Leadership*, 32(3), 4-9.
- Reyens, C., Lievens, A., & Blazevic, V. (2016). Leveraging value in multi-stakeholder innovation networks: A process framework for value co-creation and capture. *Industrial marketing Management*, 56, 40-50.
- Roy, D., & Banerjee, S. (2007). Caring strategy for integration of brand identity with brand image. *17*, 1/2(140-148).
- Sin, L. Y. M., Tse, A. C. B., Heung, V. C. S., & Yim, F. H. K. (2005a). An Analysis of Relationship Between Market Orientation and Business Performance in The Hotel Industry. *Hospitality Management*, 24, 555-577.
- Sin, L. Y. M., Tse, A. C. B., Yau, O. C. B., Chow, R. P. M., & Lee, J. S. Y. (2005b). Market Orientation, Relationship Marketing Orientation, And Business Performance: The

- Mediating Effects of Economy Ideology and Industry Type. *Journal of International Marketing*, 13(1), 36-57.
- Srivastava, R. K., Fahey, L., & Christensen, H. K. (2001). The Resources Based View and Marketing: The Role of Market Based Assets in Gaining Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 27, 777-802.
- Srivastava, R. K., & Shocker, A. D. (1991). Brand Equity: A Perspective on Its Meaning and Measurement. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Sugiyarti, G., & Ardyan, E. (2017). Market sensing capability and product innovation advantages in emerging markets: The case of market entry quality and marketing performance of Batik Industry in Indonesia. *DLSU Business and Economics Review*, 27(1), 175-189.
- Thomke, S., & Hippel, E. V. (2002). Customers as Innovators: A New Way to Create Value. *Havard Business Review*(April), 5-11.
- Vazquez, R., del Rio, A. B., & Iglesias, V. (2002). Consumer-Based Brand Equity: Development and Validation of a Measurement Instrument. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 18, 27-48.
- Voola, R., Casimir, G., Carlson, J., & Agnihotri, M. A. (2012). The effects of market orientation, technological opportunism, and e-business adoption on performance: A moderated mediation analysis. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 20, 136-146.
- Walter, A., Ritter, T., & Gemunden, H. G. (2001). . Value-creation in buyer-seller relationships: Theoretical considerations and empirical results from a supplier's perspective. *Industrial marketing Management*, 30(4), 365-377.
- Wang, D. H.-M., Chen, P.-H., Yu, T. H.-K., & Hsiao, C.-Y. (2015). The effects of corporate social responsibility on brand equity and firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 68, 2232-2236.
- Whiteley, R., & Hessian, D. (1996). Customer-centered growth: Five strategies for building competitive advantage. *Managing Service Quality*, 6(5), 47-52.
- Zacca, R., Mumin, D., & Ahrens, T. (2015). Impact of network capability on small business performance. *Management Decision*, 51(1), 2-23.
- Zhang, J., Jiang, Y., Shabbir, R., & Du, M. (2015). Building industrial brand equity by leveraging firm capabilities and co-creating value with customers. *Industrial marketing Management*, 51, 47-58.
- Zhang, X., & Chen, R. (2008). Examining the mechanism of the value co-creation with customers. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 116(2), 242-250.