

Evaluating Marketing Performance Metrics from the Point of View of Telecom Operators Managers in Algeria: Comparative Study

BOUDIAF Ilyes¹*, CHORFI Moncef²

¹ Abdelhamid Mehri Constantine 2 University (Algeria),
ilyes.boudiaf@univ-constantine2.dz

² Abdelhamid Mehri Constantine 2 University (Algeria),
moncef.chorfi@univ-constantine2.dz

Received: 04/05/2022

Accepted: 24/05/2022

Published:15/07/2022

Abstract:

This study aims to measure the differences in marketing performance indicators between telecom operators in Algeria. On the basis of three approaches; the descriptive, inductive and comparative approach, we tried to answer the main question and carry out the empirical study. For data collection, we use a questionnaire of sample of 67 agencies and some short interviews with managers, as well as some reports about telecoms market published by ARPCE. To test the hypothesis, we use the one-way ANOVA test. Finally, we have found that there are no significant differences between telecom operators in developing the marketing performance indicators except the difference between OTA and WTA in Market share and innovation.

Keywords: Marketing Performance, Financial Returns, Market Share, Customer, Innovation.

* Corresponding author.

INTRODUCTION

In order to develop and maintain marketing performance, the business organization works to bring about continuous innovations and improvements in its products and services and to better manage its relationship with customers and maintain them. This is one of the latest, most prominent and successful means of creating marketing performance furthermore to invention and technology.

In order for a business organization to achieve its objectives, it must take into consideration its competitors in the market with the same importance and attention to the values that gives to its current and potential customers. And since competition consists in satisfying the needs of customers of the same need and through the same products for the same market, the thing that requires the business organization to monitor and compare its marketing mix with closest competitors. In order to achieve this position, it is necessary to understand the marketing performance and how to achieve and maintain it.

Adopting modern marketing trends means starting to excel, as this researches the customer's needs and desires and works to meet them in an easy way and on the simplest path and with the least efforts and costs. In addition to that, it seeks to discover and meet other new needs through innovation and creativity

The resources are classified within financial resources such as the size of the cash flow that allows the financing of self-projects and covering current expenses, human resources such as the number of workers and technical qualifications in which the business organization operates, material resources such as production sites, machines, inventory ... and others, organizational resources that reflect the ability to control the information system, control system, and procedures followed, technological resources, especially those related to knowledge control, where the resources are divided into three groups: resources with physical assets, and resources with human assets and organizational resources.

From the previous we can present the main questions of our study as follows:

- Are there marketing performance indicators for telecom operators in Algeria?
- Are there significant differences between telecom operators in Algeria related to marketing performance indicators from the point of view of the managers?

1- THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

1.1- Organizational Performance

Practitioners in the Marketing are under pressure that increasing over the days to illustrate their contribution to the organizational performance (Rust, Tim, & Gregory , 2004, p. 77). It has been largely discuss that an inability to marketing's contribution has sapped its standing within the organization (Don & Andrew , 2007, p. 80).

1.2- Business Performance Measurement

Orderly for organization to be successful and to benefit competitive and sustainable features, it is important to make plans and carry out performance measurement systems and structures. Therefore, it is necessary to measure and estimate each business function with

the goals to improve efficiency and profitability at the end and business success (Taticchi, 2010) (Eusibio , Andreu, & Belbeze , 2006). State that, with high hand the necessary of business performance and the pressure on organization to measure the inputs, there has been some research done on the procedure implemented to emphasize marketing effectiveness.

1.3- Marketing Performance Measurement

Marketing is the actions when the organization is a holistic in binding with the intention to present stakeholder's value (Ambler & Roberts , Assessing marketing performance: dont settle for the silver metric, 2008). Thus, it is not the department performance or a unique marketing activity but organizations inclusive performance and fulfillment with observance to marketing that creates the organization successful. In order to estimate the marketing performance, it is important to cling to three criteria especially a difference to internal, external benchmarks and regulate for all the variations in brand equity (Ambler, Kokkinaki, Puntoni , & Riley, 2001) (Mills , 2010).

The measurement research of Marketing performance can divide into several research streams: Marketing productivity measurement (Morgan, Bruce, & Rich , 2002, p. 365) (Roland, Katherine, & Valarie, 2004, p. 111) metrics identification in usage (Winer, 2000) (Barwise & John, 2003) and measurement of brand equity (Aaker & Robert , 2001, p. 487) (Ailawadi, Donald , & Scott , 2002). The measurement of Marketing performance is the appreciation of "the correlation among marketing activities and business performance" (Clark and Ambler 2002) (Morgan, Bruce , & Rich , Marketing Productivity, Marketing Audits, and Systems for Marketing Performance Assessment: Integrating Multiple Perspectives, 2002, p. 365). Because the question is the inability to measure the marketing activities

1.4- Marketing Capabilities and Performance

Capabilities in the Marketing field play a crucial role in achieving success in business. Many studies have examined the impact of marketing capabilities of an organization on its performance in comparison to the effects of other functional capabilities (Krasnikov & Jayachandran, 2008, p. 3) (Acar & Zehir, 2010, p. 691). In its study the meta-analysis of Krasnikov and Jayachandran (2008) focused that marketing capabilities have a bigger positive effect on performance compared to R&D and production capabilities (Gungor & Osman , 2013, p. 416) .

1.5- Marketing Performance Metrics

The metrics of Marketing are external and internal indicators of quantitative performance that can be financial or non-financial, and that are topic to monitoring by high management (Ambler, 2003). Non-financial metrics, like quality, satisfaction of customers and innovation are usually right predictors of the future performance of organization and their development potential, comparison to accounting reports (Eccles, 1991, p. 134). It is evident that metrics facilitate the marketing analysis cycle, help evaluate past performance, planning and control, and make it possible to compare the organization success within the sector to the success of competitors (Bennett, 2007, p. 962). The metrics of performance can be divided into financial and non-financial. Financial metrics usually come first among

the metrics used to assess marketing performance (Clark, 1999, p. 713). Profitability, sales and cash flow have, for a long time, been among the financial metrics frequently used for the evaluation of marketing performance. Market share, considered to be a former of cash flow and profitability, is another metric often used both by scholars and practitioners (Ambler, Kokkinaki, F, & Puntoni, Assessing marketing performance: the current state of metrics, 2001).

1.6- Marketing and Financial Performance

Financial analysis helps in measure and identifies the business strengths and weaknesses and finally the organization sustainability over time. The financial analysis is financial ratios that shown and specify the relationship among the organization's activities like modern resources related to sales (Kretlow , McGuigan , & Moyer).

Financial analysis helps in measuring and specifies the business strengths and weaknesses and finally the sustainability of the organization during the time. The financial analysis make up of financial ratios that refer and define the correlation between the organization's activities like existing resources in relevance to sales (Kretlow , McGuigan, & Moyer , 2006). The basic reasons (Sexton , 2009) has found for the tardy development made with the marketing return measurement

The marketing function measurement going to to become more challenging on account of many factors, like the highly competitiveness of competitors and markets, qualifier and informed customers, fast technologies advancement, progression of new industries and industry leaders (Chris & Gerhard , 2016).

2- METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1- Hypotheses:

The main and sub-hypotheses of the study are presented as follows:

- **H₁: There are marketing performance indicators in telecom operators in Algeria**
 - H_{1a}: There are financial returns indicators in telecom operators in Algeria
 - H_{1b}: There are market share indicators in telecom operators in Algeria
 - H_{1c}: There are customer indicators in telecom operators in Algeria
 - H_{1d}: There are innovation indicators in telecom operators in Algeria
 - H_{1e}: There are adaptability indicators in telecom operators in Algeria
- **H₂: There are differences in marketing performance indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.**
 - There are differences in financial returns indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.
 - There are differences in market share indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.
 - There are differences in customer indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.
 - There are differences in innovation indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.
 - There are differences in adaptability indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.

2.2- Objectives:

Our purpose through this study is to know the individual features of each operator in the telecoms sector in Algeria, about the indicators of financial returns, Adaptability, Customer, Innovation and Market share. Through the following sub-objectives

- Determining marketing performance indicators in the telecom sector
- Knowing the availability of marketing performance indicators in the telecom operators
- Detecting the differences in the marketing performance indicators of telecom operators

2.3- Population and sample:

The telecommunications market in Algeria is a dynamic market, thus understanding its structure helps identify the appropriate strategy in order to confront the challenges it faces. Given that the telecom sector in Algeria is one of the important fields, as it is one of the most successful Economic sectors due to its rapid development and growth, especially after reforms, which had a significant impact on competitiveness, quality and prices of services.

The population of this study is represented by the Manager's opinion of telecom operators in Algeria within their agencies and commercial spaces, which are estimated 338 units, and the sample represents 67 Manager from about 20% (338 Agencies in globally), i.e. 67 agencies and commercial spaces.

2.4- Approaches:

In this study we adopted three approaches, which are the descriptive, inductive and comparative approaches. By using one way ANOVA test.

3- RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1- Reliability:

The Reliability of the tool is intended to give this tool (questionnaire) the same result if it was redistributed more than once under the same conditions and in different context, or in other words, the Reliability of the tool means Reliability in its results and not to change it significantly if it is redistributed among the sample members several times during certain periods of time, the researchers test the reliability of the questionnaire using the Cronbach alpha method, as follows:

3.1.1. Cronbach's Alpha:

The researchers used the Cronbach alpha to measure the reliability of the questionnaire, and the results were as shown in the table below

Table (1) : Results of the Cronbach alpha test

Code	Field		Cronbach's Alpha			
	Dimensions	N of Items	AT N=28	WTA N=17	OTA N=22	N=67
D ₁	Financial returns	5	.848	,901	,909	,900
D ₂	Market share	4	,851	,911	,909	,891
D ₃	Customer	3	.876	,903	,895	,912
D ₄	Innovation	3	.893	,891	,904	,902
D ₅	Adaptability	3	.899	,889	,902	,905
D	Marketing performance	18	.876	,906	,901	,902

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

It is clear from the results shown in the above table that the value of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient is high for each dimension of the questionnaire. Also, the value of the alpha coefficient for all dimensions of the questionnaire was .902, which means that the reliability coefficient is high. Thus, the researcher has emphasized on the reliability of the questionnaire, which makes them confident of its reliability to achieve the results, analyze the data and test the hypotheses.

3.1.2. Guttman Split-Half Coefficient

The researcher used the Guttman Split-Half Coefficient to measure the reliability of the questionnaire as a second indicator, and the results were as shown in the following table:

Table (2) : Results of the Guttman Split-Half test

Code	Field		Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			
	Dimensions	N of Items	AT N=28	WTA N=17	OTA N=22	N=67
D ₁	Financial returns	5	,879	,888	,905	,805
D ₂	Market share	4	,904	,869	,904	,881
D ₃	Customer	3	,891	,900	,884	,869
D ₄	Innovation	3	,900	,845	,845	,905
D ₅	Adaptability	3	,891	,849	,847	,903
D	Marketing performance	18	,884	,861	,877	,886

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

It is clear from the results of above table that the value of Guttman Split-Half is good for all questionnaire parts. Also, the value of the Guttman Split-Half coefficient for all survey parts was ,886, which means that the reliability coefficient is high. Thus, the researchers have confirmed the reliability of the questionnaire, which makes them confident of its validity to analyze the results, answer the questions and test its hypotheses.

3.1.3. Structural validity

Structural Validity is one of the tool's validity measures, which measures the extent to which the goals are achieved by the research tool. It shows the extent to which each questionnaire part is related to the overall indicators score. The following table shows the correlation coefficient between the marketing performance and its dimensions.

Table (3) : The correlation coefficient between the marketing performance and its dimensions

Code	Dimensions	Pearson Correlation			Sig. (2-tailed)		
		AT N=28	WTA N=17	OTA N=22	AT N=28	WTA N=17	OTA N=22
D ₁	Financial returns	,911**	,903**	,912**	,000	,000	,000
D ₂	Market share	,922**	,904**	,912**	,000	,000	,000
D ₃	Customer	,904**	,898**	,801**	,000	,000	,000
D ₄	Innovation	,901**	,904**	,922**	,000	,000	,000
D ₅	Adaptability	,912**	,903**	,902**	,000	,000	,000
D	Marketing performance	1,000	1,000	1,000	-	-	-

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

It can be seen through the indicators in the table above that the correlation coefficients indicated are significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ levels and this is valid to measure.,

3.1.4. The appropriate tests:

We're going to determine the appropriate tests according to the hypotheses below:

- The variables nature is quantitative, for that the researchers purpose the evaluation method, not the Ordinal which is qualitative on Likert scales.
- The sample type is random: We relied on a multi-stage random sample that the society is quite homogeneous from managerial point of view. This facilitated the task and shortened the time of work.
- Observations follow the normal distribution, at least at 0.05 error level, and this is what the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test proves, according to the bellow hypotheses:

We'll test the hypotheses based on the Parametric Tests because the data are available of Parametric Tests hypotheses

3.2- Descriptive statistics

Based on the descriptive of indicators in the following table, we try to describe and prioritize the dimensions of the marketing performance achieved by telecom operators. The following is a description and ranking of the main dimensions of marketing performance.

Table (4) : Descriptive statistics of marketing performance dimensions

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
					Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
D ₁	Financial returns	67	4.3011	.70077	.323	.409	-2.021-	.798
D ₂	Market share	67	4.2883	.57794	-.556-	.409	-.732-	.798
D ₃	Customer	67	4.1213	.61007	-.367-	.409	-1.037-	.798
D ₄	Innovation	67	4.1131	.57342	-.128-	.409	-.501-	.798
D ₅	Adaptability	67	4.0611	.57222	.323	.409	-1.037-	.798
D	Marketing performance	67	4.2011	.61884	-.042-	.409	-1.183-	.798

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

Through the above table that related to the description of marketing performance dimensions, we can observe the relative importance of the indicators that make up marketing performance and their statistical measures.

3.3- Normality distribution

We try to test the distribution of the marketing performance dimensions if it follows the normal distribution by using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Table (5) : One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for marketing performance

		Financial Prf	Market share	Custo mer	Innov ation	Adapta bility
N		67	67	67	67	67
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	4.3011	4.2883	4.1213	4.1131	4.0611
	Std. Deviation	.70077	.57794	.61007	.57342	.57222
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.168	.145	.177	.178	.170

	Positive	.155	.118	.186	.138	.143
	Negative	-.190-	-.155-	-.179-	-.195-	-.190-
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.991	.882	1.044	1.112	1.084
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.209	.307	.199	.149	.179

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

The table shows the results of the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test as the level of significance (Sig) for the dimensions of the marketing performance is greater than α (0.05) for all the dimensions, that meaning the distribution is not significant, this proves the H0, so the marketing performance observations follow the normal distribution.

3.4- Hypothesis testing

After testing the reliability and validity, as well as describing the indicators, in this part we try to test the hypotheses through a set of tests to reach the empirical answer to the problematic as follow:

3.4.1. First hypothesis

We try, through the sub-hypotheses below, to find out whether telecommunications dealers possess indicators that constitute the marketing performance

H₁: There are marketing performance indicators in telecom operators in Algeria

This main hypothesis is divided into sub-hypotheses according to the dimensions as follows H_{1a}: There are financial returns indicators in telecom operators in Algeria

A. Financial returns:

The following is the indicators that make up the financial returns dimension and an attempt to evaluate them at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%.

Table (6) : One-sample T-test for financial returns indicators

Code	Financial returns, Test Value = 3.5					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
i ₁₁	12.313	66	.000	1.07576	.8978	1.2537
i ₁₂	11.147	66	.000	.98485	.8049	1.1648
i ₁₃	8.887	66	.000	.95455	.7358	1.1733
i ₁₄	10.844	66	.000	.95455	.7752	1.1338
i ₁₅	15.588	66	.000	1.22727	1.0669	1.3876
D ₁	13.149	66	.000	1.03939	.8784	1.2004

Source: By the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

Through the indicators that express the availability of the financial returns, we find that all the indicators that make up this dimension are significant (Sig is less than α), which indicates that telecom operators have acquired the financial returns in a result of marketing activities with all indicators at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and with a confidence level It is estimated at 95%.

H_{1b}: There are market share indicators in telecom operators in Algeria.

B. Market share

The following is the indicators that make up the Market share dimension and an attempt to evaluate them at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%.

Table (7) : One-sample T-test for Market share indicators

Code	Market share, Test Value = 3.5					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
i ₂₁	6.584	66	.000	.77273	.5337	1.0118
i ₂₂	13.363	66	.000	1.13636	.9631	1.3096
i ₂₃	10.844	66	.000	.95455	.7752	1.1338
i ₂₄	6.295	66	.000	.71212	.4817	.9426
D ₂	10.037	66	.000	.89636	.7196	1.0132

Source: By the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

Through the indicators that express the availability of the market share resulting from the marketing activities, we find that all the indicators constituting this dimension are significant (Sig is less than α), which indicates that telecom operators have acquired considered market share through their marketing activities efforts with all the indicators at hypothesized mean of 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%.

H_{1c}: There are customer indicators in telecom operators in Algeria

C. The customer:

The following is the indicators that make up the Market share dimension and an attempt to evaluate them at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%.

Table (8) : One-sample T-test for customer indicators

code	Customer, Test Value = 3.5					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
i ₃₁	8.648	66	.000	.92424	.7066	1.1419
i ₃₂	6.745	66	.000	.80303	.5605	1.0456
i ₃₃	6.295	66	.000	.71212	.4817	.9426
D ₃	7.854	66	.000	.81313	.6022	1.0240

Source: By the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

Through the indicators that express the availability of the customer dimension within the organization's marketing strategy, we find that all the indicators constituting this dimension are significant (Sig is less than α), which indicates the orientation and focus of telecoms operators on the customer in their marketing and management strategies and activities, with all indicators at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and confidence level of 95%.

H_{1d}: There are innovation indicators in telecom operators in Algeria.

D. Innovation:

The following is the indicators that make up the innovation dimension and an attempt to evaluate them at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%.

Table (9) : One-sample T-test for innovation indicators

code	Innovation, Test Value = 3.5					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
i ₄₁	4.845	66	.000	.68182	.3952	.9684
i ₄₂	6.020	66	.000	.74242	.4912	.9936
i ₄₃	12.313	66	.000	1.07576	.8978	1.2537
D ₄	7.817	66	.000	.83333	.6162	1.0505

Source: By the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

Through the indicators that express the availability of the innovation dimension enjoyed by telecom operators, we find that all the indicators that make up this dimension are significant (Sig is less than α), which indicates that telecom operators have an advantage that enables them to increase efficiency and effectiveness in innovation in terms of productivity, Marketing and organizational, with all indicators at hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and confidence level of 95%..

H_{1c}: There are adaptability indicators in telecom operators in Algeria.

E. Adaptability:

The following is the indicators that make up the innovation dimension and an attempt to evaluate them at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%.

Table (10) : One-sample T-test for Adaptability indicators

Code	Adaptability, Test Value = 3.5					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
i ₅₁	8.429	66	.000	.89394	.6779	1.1100
i ₅₂	7.879	66	.000	.80303	.5954	1.0106
i ₅₃	7.711	66	.000	.95455	.7024	1.2067
D ₅	8.783	66	.000	.88384	.6789	1.0888

Source: By the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

Through the indicators that express the availability of the Adaptability dimension possessed by telecom operators, we find that all the indicators of this dimension are significant (Sig is less than α), which indicates that telecom operators have the ability to control the work process, improve outputs, ability to Facing updates and emergencies also speed in reactions at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%.

3.4.2. Second hypothesis

In this part, we try to diagnose the differences in marketing performance dimensions between the Telecom operators (AT, OTA, WTA) through their dimensions, by displaying and analyzing their indicators.

H₂: There are differences in marketing performance indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.

This main hypothesis is divided into sub-hypotheses according to the dimensions as follows

H_{2a}: There are differences in financial returns indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.

A. Financial returns:

The following is a presentation of the indicators that make up the financial returns and attempt to diagnose differences in their application between the Telecom operators (AT, OTA, WTA) with an estimated confidence level of 95%.

Table (11) : One-way ANOVA for the financial returns

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1,820	2	,910	1,846	,169
Within Groups	22,677	64	,493		
Total	24,496	66			

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

In this table, the result of the one-way ANOVA, as the test value (F=1.846) is not significant (P= .169) at 0.05 error level. This means that the three operators do not differ in their financial returns.

Table (12) : Multiple comparisons for the financial returns

(I) GM	(J) GM	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AT	WTA	-,25152	,25197	,970	-,8776	,3746
	OTA	,26848	,23510	,778	-,3157	,8526
WTA	AT	,25152	,25197	,970	-,3746	,8776
	OTA	,52000	,27193	,186	-,1557	1,1957
OTA	AT	-,26848	,23510	,778	-,8526	,3157
	WTA	-,52000	,27193	,186	-1,1957	,1557

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

This table shows the binary comparisons between the three operators, as the differences between them statistically are not significant, meaning that the three groups do not differ significantly in their applications for financial returns at the 95% level.

H_{2b}: There are differences in Market share indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.

B. Market share:

The following is a presentation of the indicators of the Market share and attempt to diagnose differences in their application between the telecom operators (AT, OTA, WTA) with an estimated confidence level of 95%.

Table (13) : One-way ANOVA for the Market share

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2,806	2	1,403	3,373	,043
Within Groups	19,134	64	,416		
Total	21,940	66			

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

In this table, the result of the one-way ANOVA test appears, as the test value (F=3.373) is statistically significant (P= .043) at 0.05 error level. This means that the three operators are differ in getting the Market share.

Table (14) : Multiple comparisons for the Market share

(I) GM	(J) GM	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AT	WTA	-,29545	,23145	,625	-,8705	,2796
	OTA	,34788	,21596	,342	-,1887	,8845
WTA	AT	,29545	,23145	,625	-,2796	,8705
	OTA	,64333*	,24979	,040	,0227	1,2640
OTA	AT	-,34788	,21596	,342	-,8845	,1887
	WTA	-,64333*	,24979	,040	-1,2640	-,0227

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

This table shows the binary comparisons between the three operators, as the differences between them are not statistically significant, meaning that the three groups do not differ significantly in their applications for Market share at the 95% level. Except for the difference between OTA and WTA, this has a significant difference in Market share.

H_{2c}: There are differences in customer indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.

C. Customer:

The following is a presentation of the indicators of customer and attempt to diagnose differences in their application between the telecom operators (AT, OTA, WTA) with an estimated confidence level of 95%.

Table (15) : One-way ANOVA of customer

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1,163	2	,582	1,015	,370
Within Groups	26,362	64	,573		
Total	27,525	66			

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

In this table, the result of the one-way ANOVA test appears, as the test value ($F=1.015$) is not statistically significant ($P= .370$) at 0.05 error level. This means that the three operators do not differ in their customer.

Table (16) : Multiple comparisons for the customer

(I) GM	(J) GM	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AT	WTA	-,30455	,27167	,804	-,9796	,3705
	OTA	,09879	,25349	1,000	-,5310	,7286
WTA	AT	,30455	,27167	,804	-,3705	,9796
	OTA	,40333	,29319	,527	-,3252	1,1318
OTA	AT	-,09879	,25349	1,000	-,7286	,5310
	WTA	-,40333	,29319	,527	-1,1318	,3252

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

This table shows the binary comparisons between the three operators, as the differences between them are not statistically significant, meaning that the three groups do not differ significantly in their applications for customer at the 95% level.

H_{2d} : There are differences in Innovation indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.

D. Innovation:

The following is a presentation of the indicators of Innovation and attempt to diagnose differences in their application between the telecom operators (AT, OTA, WTA) with an estimated confidence level of 95%.

Table (17) : One-way ANOVA of customer Innovation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2,806	2	1,403	3,373	,043
Within Groups	19,134	64	,416		
Total	21,940	66			

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

In this table, the result of the one-way ANOVA test appears, as the test value ($F=3,373$) is statistically significant ($P=, 043$) at 0.05 error level. This means that the operators are differ significantly in their achievement of Innovation.

Table (18) : Multiple comparisons of Innovation

(I) GM	(J) GM	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AT	WTA	-,29545	,23145	,625	-,8705	,2796
	OTA	,34788	,21596	,342	-,1887	,8845
WTA	AT	,29545	,23145	,625	-,2796	,8705
	OTA	,64333*	,24979	,040	,0227	1,2640
OTA	AT	-,34788	,21596	,342	-,8845	,1887
	WTA	-,64333*	,24979	,040	-1,2640	-,0227

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

This table shows the binary comparisons between the three operators, as the differences between them are not statistically significant, meaning that the three groups do not differ significantly in their applications for Innovation at the 95% level. Except for the difference between OTA and WTA, this has a significant difference in Innovation.

H_{2c}: There are differences in adaptability indicators between telecom operators in Algeria.

E. Adaptability:

The following is a presentation of the indicators of Adaptability and attempt to diagnose differences in their application between the telecom operators (AT, OTA, WTA) with an estimated confidence level of 95%.

Table (19) : One-way ANOVA of Adaptability

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1,698	2	,849	1,786	,179
Within Groups	21,872	64	,475		
Total	23,571	66			

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

In this table, the result of the one-way ANOVA test appears, as the test value (F=1.786) is not statistically significant (P = .179) at 0.05 error level. This means that the three operators do not differ in their Adaptability.

Table (20) : Multiple comparisons for the Adaptability

(I) GM	(J) GM	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AT	WTA	-,30758	,24746	,661	-,9224	,3073
	OTA	,19576	,23089	1,000	-,3779	,7695
WTA	AT	,30758	,24746	,661	-,3073	,9224
	OTA	,50333	,26706	,197	-,1602	1,1669
OTA	AT	-,19576	,23089	1,000	-,7695	,3779
	WTA	-,50333	,26706	,197	-1,1669	,1602

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of SPSS.V25

This table shows the binary comparisons between the three operators, as the differences between them are not statistically significant, meaning that the three groups do not differ significantly in their applications for Adaptability at the 95% level.

CONCLUSION

Through the results obtained from the study and analysis of the indicators that make up the dimensions of marketing performance, we note that all indicators are statistically significant at a hypothesized mean equal to 3.5 and a confidence level of 95%. This rejects the null hypothesis H₀, which says that there are no indicators of the availability of marketing performance in the organizations under study, thus proving the alternative hypothesis H₁ which says that there are indicators of the availability of marketing performance in the studied organizations.

Through the results and analysis of the indicators of the marketing performance, we note that the indicators are not significant at 95% confidence level. This proves the null hypothesis H0 that there are no differences in the marketing performance indicators between the telecom operators (AT, OTA, WTA) through its dimensions, except the differences between OTA and WTA in both market share and innovation.

It should be noted that it is supposed to provide simple performance metrics that are qualified to be comprehensive and measurable, and give a correct assessment of performance. The organization must plan and determine the approach it is going before and during the evaluation, as the organization may not wait and move only when facing crises and problems, and it is also impossible to take all decisions in advance, because many changes are difficult to anticipate, as the successful marketing manager is the one who sets the work steps from the first moment of work and implementation.

The current trend in measuring marketing performance is the necessity of using non-financial with financial output measures because they focus on past performance on the one hand and not address some indicators such as customer satisfaction and loyalty, and the role of the brand on the other hand. In addition to the fact that relying on financial outputs only provides a non-integrated view of the organization, it is necessary to adopt non-financial outputs as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

1. Aaker, D. A., & Robert, J. (2001, November). The Value Relevance of Brand Attitude in High-Technology Markets. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38, 485–493.
2. Acar, A. Z., & Zehir, C. (2010). The harmonized effects of generic strategies and business capabilities on business performance. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 11(4), 689–711.
3. Ailawadi, K. L., Donald, R. L., & Scott, A. (2002). A Product-Market-Based Measure of Brand Equity. Marketing Science Institute.
4. Ambler, T., & Roberts, J. (2008). Assessing marketing performance: don't settle for the silver metric. *J. Mark. Manage*, 24((7-8)), 733-750.
5. Ambler, T. (2003). the marketing metrics to pump up cash flow. *Marketing and the bottom line*. 2. London: Financial Times / Prentice Hall.
6. Ambler, T., Kokkinaki, F. F., & Puntoni, S. (2001). Assessing marketing performance: the current state of metrics. *Centre for Marketing*.
7. Ambler, T., Kokkinaki, F., Puntoni, S., & Riley, D. (2001). Assessing market Performance: The Current State of Metrics. London Business School.
8. Barwise, P., & John, U. F. (2003). *Which Marketing Metrics Are Used and Where?* Marketing Science Institute.
9. Bennett, R. (2007). The use of marketing metrics by British fundraising charities: a survey of current practice. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(9), 959–989.
10. Chris, B., & Gerhard, v. W. (2016, March 28). An investigation of the marketing performance measurement practices in Hatfield Volkswagen group. *African Journal of Business Management*, 10(6), 131-139.

11. Clark, B. (1999). Marketing performance measures: history and interrelationships. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(8), 711–732.
12. Don , O., & Andrew , V. A. (2007, April). Marketing Performance Measurement Ability and Firm Performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 71, 79–93.
13. Eccles, R. G. (1991, Jan/ Feb). The performance measurement manifesto. *Harvard Business Review*, 131–137.
14. Eusibio , R., Andreu, J., & Belbeze , M. (2006). Measures of marketing performance: a comparative study from Spain. *Int. J. Contemporary Hospitality Manage*, 18(2), 145-155.
15. Gungor , H., & Osman , G. (2013, Supplement). Marketing performance measurement: marketing metrics in Turkish firms. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 14(1), 413–432.
16. Krasnikov, A., & Jayachandran, S. (2008). The relative impact of marketing, research and development, and operations capabilities on firm performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 22(4), 1–11.
17. Kretlow , W. J., McGuigan , J. R., & Moyer , R. C. (s.d.). *Contemporary Financial Management*. 10, p. 2006. Ohio: South-Western: part of the Thomson Corporation.
18. Kretlow , W., McGuigan, J., & Moyer , R. (2006). *Contemporary Financial Management*. (O. South-Western, Éd.) *part of the Thomson Corporation*, 10.
19. Mills , H. (2010). *An investigation of the marketing performance measurement practises of South African organisations*. University of Stellenbosch, South Africa.
20. Morgan, N. A., Bruce, H. C., & Rich , G. (2002, May). Marketing Productivity, Marketing Audits, and Systems for Marketing Performance Assessment: Integrating Multiple Perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 363–375.
21. Morgan, N. A., Bruce , H. C., & Rich , G. (2002, May). Marketing Productivity, Marketing Audits, and Systems for Marketing Performance Assessment: Integrating Multiple Perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 363–375.
22. Roland, T. R., Katherine, N. L., & Valarie, A. Z. (2004, January). Return on Marketing: Using Customer Equity to Focus Marketing Strategy. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 109–127.
23. Rust, R. T., Tim, A., & Gregory , S. C. (2004, October). Measuring Marketing Productivity: Current Knowledge and Future Directions. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 76–90.
24. Sexton , D. (2009). Value above cost: Driving superior financial performance with CVA, the most important metric you’ve never used. (N. J. Press., Éd.) 1.
25. Taticchi, P. (2010). *Business performance measurement and management*. 1. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

26. Winer, R. S. (2000). *What Marketing Metrics Are Used by MSI Members?*
Marketing Science Institute.

Annexe

D ₁	Financial returns (return on investment, sales growth)	Measuring Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
i ₁₁	High return on investment					
i ₁₂	Control costs efficiently					
i ₁₃	Make high profits					
i ₁₄	Business growth					
i ₁₅	High level of sales					
D ₂	Market share					
i ₂₁	Increase new customers					
i ₂₂	Providing new services					
i ₂₃	Maintain existing customers					
i ₂₄	Gain the customer trust					
D ₃	Customer (satisfaction and loyalty)					
i ₃₁	Understand and meet the customers' needs and wants					
i ₃₂	Owning an effective mechanism for dealing the customers' complaints and suggestions					
i ₃₃	Striving for and retaining strong relationships with key customers					
D ₄	Innovation					
i ₄₁	Creating new products that meet the customers' expectations					
i ₄₂	Creating modern marketing methods					
i ₄₃	Innovating modern management methods					
D ₅	Adaptability					
i ₅₁	Providing services in an appropriate manner					
i ₅₂	Planning and foresight to face challenges and emergencies					
i ₅₃	Responding to all changes in the surrounding environment					