ADOPTION OF CO-BRANDING STRATEGIES IN THE EXPANSION OF HONEY MARKET IN TANZANIA

JOHAKIM KATEKELE JOHN

D65/89144/2016

A RESEARCH PROJECT REPORT SUBMITED IN PARTIAL FULFULMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MARKETING, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

2018

DECLARATION

I **Johakim Katekele John**; hereby declare that, this research project report is the outcome of my fieldwork. This original work has not been presented in any other high learning institution for academic or professional awards, or for any similar or related purposes.

Signature………………………….. **Date…**6/DECEMBER/2018**………………..………………**

This research project report has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor.

Signature……………………………….. **Date……………………………**

Dr. Victor Muya Ndambuki
University of Nairobi
Scholl of Business
Department of Business Administration

Signature……………………………….. **Date……………………………**

Prof. Mary Kinoti
University of Nairobi
Scholl of Business
Department of Business Administration

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to those whom supported and encouraged me to the accomplishment of this work. My sincere thanks to Vlir-ous Project specifically Project 4 and the Dean of Mzumbe University School of business Dr. Hawa Tundui for the support and encouragement that has made the accomplishment of this work possible. Also special thanks go to my family for their encouragement I received from them since the beginning up to the time of completion of this work.

My sincere thanks go to Dr. Victor Ndambuki for his professional advice and guidance during the undertaking of this work until the completion. I also recognize unexplainable support and encouragement I acquired from my friend Jerum Kilumile, therefore my heartfelt thanks go to him. Lastly, I appreciate the support and collaboration I received from the targeted respondents of this study.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my beloved family and friends; I am very appreciative for their encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABRIVIATIONS

AFWC	African Forestry and Wildlife Commission
AMA	American Marketing Association
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
Ed	Edition
EMC	European Marketing Confederation
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FMCG	Fast Moving Consumer Goods
MNRT	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Mt	Metric Ton
NBP	National Beekeeping Policy
TFS	Tanzania Forest Service Agency
USA	United State of America
Vol.	Volume

ABSTRACT

Branding strategies are inseparable from business performance. Proper utilization of these strategies guarantee firm's none doubtful competitive advantages. As one of branding strategies, co-branding strategies have been gaining popularity as unquestionable strategies that enable firms to expand their markets strategically. Given its importance in business performance such as market expansion, different or a combination of different co-branding strategies have been adopted by firms to ensure market expansion. In the context of Tanzania market, this study aimed at identifying the level of co-branding strategies adoption in honey market, and identifying the challenges associated with the adoption of these strategies among business partners. On top of this, this study intended to establish the relationship between co-branding strategies and market expansion. The study adopted a sample of 80 respondents, and employed judgmental sampling technique to collect data from information-rich respondents. This study based on primary data only, and the data were collected through observation, questionnaire and interview methods. Chi square test of independence were used to test the association between co-branding strategies and market expansion. From the findings, the adoption level was found to be high since all respondents reported to adopt at least one of the co-branding practices and the most responses have revealed that the reasons for the adoption were all aiming at market expansion. Also, even if the adoption level is high, findings show that there some challenges that are associated with the adoption as shown in chapter four. Co-branding adoption were found to have a relationship with market expansion since two indicators of market expansion (sales revenue, and customer base increase) among three indicators (sales revenue, and customer base increase) as used in this study were found to have a statistically significant association with co-branding adoption.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1.Background of the study

Business firms adopt different marketing strategies to secure competitive advantages for their brands. Market expansion is one of the steps that firms take to ensure large number of customers and variety of market segments for their brands. In today's business environment branding strategies have offered more opportunities for the firms to undertake businesses profitably while easily venturing in to new market segments. Grebosz (2012), and Grebosz & Otto (2014) confirm co-branding strategies as one and the best strategies mostly adopted by firms to expand their market bases; that is entering in to new segments and even new international markets while enjoying the other benefits. Washburn et al. (2002) point out that co-branding strategies are even the best strategies to expose to the market unfamiliar brands (brands in an introductory stage in the market) while Desai & Keller (2002) argue that co-branding strategies ensure quick acceptance of the brand in new market segment or new product in the same market segment.

Irrespective of other benefits, co-branding strategies soften the new market segment entry as we have realized the same from different Multinational Companies. Therefore, given the power of these strategies in market expansion firms fail to ignore the adaption of these strategies in conducting their business successfully. Boad and Blackett's (1999) developed the hierarchy of forms of co-branding as discussed in literature review, but not every form of co-branding necessarily guarantee success in market expansion. Grebosz, (2012) conducted a research investigating two forms of co-branding (ingredient and symbolic co-branding) and reported that symbolic co-branding guarantee market expansion in comparison with ingredient co-branding. This means that, it is very important to understand the nature of the market and select the valid guiding theory. This study intends to base on Ansoff model, Balance theory, and signaling theory to come up with the answer of the intended objective of this study in the context of Tanzanian markets.

Honey business in Tanzania has been improving due to the Government efforts in developing and growing the Beekeeping sector since the year 1998 when the National Beekeeping Policy was introduced (Mwakabete & Mligwa, 2006). Formulation of National Beekeeping Program of 2001, the Beekeeping Act No.15 (2002), and the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania of 1998 created conducive environment for the beekeepers and the Bee products traders to invest profitably in Beekeeping sector. Although there is friendly environment for the production and trade, only less than 5% of honey is exported while over 85% is consumed nationally with low profit to the traders and beekeepers. This situation requires the stakeholders to employ marketing strategies such as branding strategies that can help to reach a wider base of market profitably.

1.1.1. Concept of Branding

Branding involves all the creative means a company undertakes to position itself in the mind of the customers as the differential and superior product or service provider. Keller (2013) describes branding as an art of crafting a distinct image in the targeted customer's mind towards seller's products in relations to that of similar offerings. Aaker, (1991) defines branding as a creative way a producer or seller distinctively differentiates his or her product from that of other competitors. Brand is a name, term, sign or symbol or design or a combination of them created intentionally by the seller or group of sellers to enable product identification and differentiate their products from that of the competitors (AMA, 1960). Brands shape the mental perception of the consumer towards the product as Keller (2013) points out that, brands shapes the attitude and the general consumption behavior of the consumer. In this sense, organizations required to create a strong brand that can capture and shape the consumer perception and attitude towards their products.

Considering that brands are the most valuable assets in any organization, organizations are required to have a strong and strategic management that can strategically manage brands (Keller, 2013). An organization is required to be a brand driven organization so that can manage to build and sustain a strong brand (Keller, 2013, King & Grace, 2008). Branding as a strategy enhances both internal and external business opportunities of the product that the brand represents (Heding et al., 2008). To hit on this target, synergy between branding and business strategies, corporate value and culture is necessary (Aaker, 2008). Therefore, branding as a strategy should start with an in-depth awareness or understanding of the corporate business strategy to allow the strategic consistency to prevail (Van Gelder, 2003). Branding as a strategy should be carried in a creative and disciplinal manner as it helps the organization to build and maintain an organization sustainable competitive advantage as Arnold (1992) points out that, branding strategy gives the direction and scope of the brand over the long term.

1.1.2. Co- Branding Strategies

Back to early 1990's some literatures started to be published concerning co-branding and brand alliance. One of the first researchers to undertake a research in this discipline is Norris, 1992 who examined co-branding in form of ingredient branding. The term co-branding is used by most of Authors to mean a strategic relationship between brand partners. Terms such as brand alliance, brand bundling, symbiotic marketing, cross promotion, and joint branding are sometimes used to mean co-branding (Simonin and Ruth, 1998). Aaker (1991), Blackett &Russell (1999) and Kotler (1999) define co-branding as paring of two or more brands to form a new brand. Co-branding occurs when two or more than one existing brands called family brands join together to form a new brand called an offspring, or to be marketed together in a certain unique fashion (Keller, 2013).

Co-branding involves joining more than one brand in a market context such as Production, Promotion, Pricing and Product distribution (Grosmann, 1997, Dickson & Heath, 2008), also involves technical partnerships, and ingredient branding (Walchli, 2007) . According to Washburn et al., (2000) co-branding strategy benefits more low equity brands because brands with high or strong equity cannot be shaken even if are paired with brands with low equity. Also these authors points out that, co-branding strategies are the best strategy to expose to the market brand which are at the introductory stage (unfamiliar brands in the market). Co-branding strategies in Africa is a new discipline and its adoption has started to gain popularity early 2000's. The discipline has been highly witnessed in banking industry. Currently the discipline to some extent is highly gaining popularity even different Universities and Colleges have started to integrate the discipline in to their curriculums as a teaching subject in business courses Tanzania being one of the fastest adopting countries.

1.1.3. Market Expansion Strategies

The term growth/expansion is defined by Penrose (1959) to as an upturn in quality and size and any changes that observed in company's growth or expansion objectives. Kotler et al (1999), adopt Ansoff Matrix to explain how companies can expand or grow their markets. The framework shows the major four means to grow, which include; market development, product development, market penetration, and diversification. Depending on the nature of the company, the product and the market itself the company can select one or a combination of the mentioned strategies to expand or grow their markets (Kotler et al 1999). According to Ansoff (1957) the company can decide to do diversification through developing a new product for the new market, can opt market development by looking for new market for the current product, also can decide product development through modification of the current product or new product for the current market, and finally market penetration by looking to increase more market share from the existing market and existing product.

Absanto and Nnko (2013) confirm that, different growth/expansion strategies are appropriate to difference businesses. This means that, not all growth/expansion strategies are suitable to all businesses. Therefore, the company is required to find a perfect fit between the adopted strategy, the market place, the stage of the product in the product life cycle and the nature of the product offered by the company to that market place. The growth indicators are grouped by (Absanto & Nnko, 2013) in four categories as business outcomes, business outputs, capacity indicators and quality indicators. Also apart from Ansoff matrix, Absanto & Nnko (2013) discuss other growth strategies to include; General Electric Company Diversification Strategy (concentric diversification which involves adding new but related products to the business, and conglomerate diversification which involves adding new and none related product to the business). Another strategy is Mergers which occurs when more than one firm normally of equal size join to form and operate a single new company, also Acquisition growth strategy which occurs when a company buys the other one with the confidentiality agreements. Other growth strategies are joint venture, horizontal integration, and vertical integration.

1.1.4. Honey Market in Tanzania

The production potential of honey in Tanzania per annum is estimated to be 138,000mt (NBP, of 1998). According to MNRT (2014) report and AFWC (2016), there is a mismatch between the demand and supply of pure honey in the market; a situation which makes honey to be an organic gold at a global level hence creates business opportunities. European countries (German and Belgium being the key customers), China, Japan, Dubai, Oman, and USA are the major oversea Tanzanian honey markets. In Africa Tanzania sells honey in Kenya, Botswana, Uganda, Burundi, DRC, and Rwanda (AFWC, 2016). Tanzania have been experiencing a tremendous decline in exportation of honey a year after year, this is probably due to an increasing nationally consumption. For example, in the year 2015, 152.6mt was exported compared to 291.4 metric tons which was exported in 2010 (MNRT, 2014). It is also estimated that over 500 mt are exported within the region of East Africa while an estimate of over 85% is consumed nationally. The market is not yet saturated both internally and externally as MNRT (2014) report and AFWC (2016), reports that the demand exceeds the supply, therefore there is a need of proper marketing strategies that can help the business stakeholders to expand their markets.

1.2.Research Problem

Branding is argued to be correlated to performance of the firms (Jordaan, 2014). Now-days, branding is beheld as a cooperative and joint value creation activity of the firm with other stakeholders rather than being viewed as a firm-provided property (Merz et al., 2009). Co-branding has emerged as a key strategy to secure the competitive strength of the firm (Allan et al 1994). Allan et al (1994) argue that, to strengthen the firm's capability and acquire adequate resources firms are required to make a strategic brand alliance. Also Firms form brand alliances to enjoy brand partner favorable association and increase consumer response (Allan et al 1994).

Co-branding strategy is rapidly adopted by the firms who are in need to grow and expand their markets because the strategy increases a possibility of new market entry (Grebosz, 2012, Grebosz & Otto, 2014). However, Knape & Rodesledt (2013) argue that, Co-branding increases an opportunity of rate of acceptance for the new brands in the new market segments.

The honey business in Tanzania is speedily growing, local individual people and firms are seizing the opportunities form this sector. The international required quality and the production potential have motivated even international traders to invest their capital in this business. Traders have adopted branding as one of the honey value addition strategies, but they have not utilized this strategy to enhance their business growth and market expansion. Lack of knowledge on how branding strategies can help them to grow and expand their markets is one of the problems that the traders face. Thus, this study intends to address co-branding strategies as a means that can enable the traders to expand their markets profitably.

Researchers have conducted different studies concerning the reasons for the adoption of co-branding strategies among different firms. Grebosz, (2012) studied the outcomes of co-branding strategies in Poland and reported that symbolic co-branding guarantee a great possibility for market entry. Also the great possibility for diversification through co-branding was reported by (Bhat & Reddy, 2001). Grebosz and Otto (2014) studied consumer behavior toward co-branded products of textile industries and ended up reporting that co-branded products were given priorities compared to those which were none co-branded. Munyoki (2010) conducted a study on effectiveness of co-branding in credit cards in Kenya and reported that, co-branding contributes on market penetration. In his study on influence of co-branding on customer perception conducted in Kenya (Maina, 2011) reported that, co-branded products help to improve the value of existing product hence inviting more customers which in turn increases profits to the partners.

Unfortunately Tanzania is lacking literatures which address co-branding strategies adoption in Tanzanian market. Therefore, this study intends to establish literature on co-branding in Tanzanian market context using honey market as a case study by answering the following questions; what is the level of co-branding strategies adoption in Tanzania, what challenges associated with the adoption of these strategies, and is there any relationship between co-branding and market expansion?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study is to examine adoption of co-branding strategies in the expansion of honey market in Tanzania.

1.3.1 Specific Objectives

Specifically, this study intend to;

I. To identify the level of co-branding strategies adoption in Tanzania
II. To identify the challenges associated with co-branding strategies adoption in Tanzania
III. To establish the relationship between co-branding and market expansion

1.4. Value of the Study

The findings of this study are useful in determining the rate of co-branding strategies adoption among honey business partners in Tanzania. The study also uncovers the challenges associated with the adoption of co-branding strategies. Through this study beneficiaries will acquire knowledge on how can the strategies be useful to get exposure to both existing and new market hence expansion of the market base.

To the researchers, the study adds useful information which will be used for further investigation. The information will be used as secondary data for researchers who will be in need to bridge the gap of the related study. Therefore, the findings from the study help to add literature in the field of branding specifically co-branding.

Also to other local business firms operating in different industries other than beekeeping industry or honey firms wishing to grow their market bases will benefit from the findings of this study. The findings help to guide them in policy making when planning growing their businesses strategically.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Both theoretical framework, theoretical and empirical reviews as related to this study are discussed in this chapter.

2.2. Theoretical Framework

This study will be guided by Ansoff Model, Balance Theory, and Signaling Theory**.**

2.2.1 Ansoff Model

According to Ansoff (1957) continuous change and growth to any business firm is inevitable. Therefore, the firm must seek for the better strategies to grow profitably. The Ansoff matrix of 1957 shows market penetration, product development, market development and diversification to be the growth/expansion strategies mostly adopted by many business firms (Kotler et al. 1999, Hall and Lobina, 2007). Therefore, for any business to grow and seize the competitive advantages uses one or a combination of the mentioned strategies.

Market penetration strategy involves increasing the company sales or market share while offering the existing product in the existing targeted market segment (Ansoff, 1957). In this strategy products remain unchanged and offered in the current market segment in the manner that can increase the firm's performance. This can be done through intensive promotion to the existing customers or to the new customers in the same targeted market segment (Eagle & Brennan, 2007, Absanto and Nnko, 2013). In market development strategy firm markets its existing or unchanged products in a new market (Ansoff, 1957). In this strategy, new market is developed while the same product offered to that market, for example franchising, exporting, or even starting from the scratch in the other region. Johns and Pineb(2002) points that, new market can be outside the existing market segment or unmet needs and wants within the same targeted market segment.

According to Ansoff (1957) in product development strategy a firm struggles to boost its market share than the competitors by developing a new product that can replace the existing and sell it in the existing market segment. According to (Hussain et al, 2013), market share can be boosted through new product development only in the presence of decline in the demand of the existing product in that existing market segment. Therefore, firms are required to be updated about the current needs and wants of the customers so that they can grab an opportunities of offering the best solutions to the customer (2004, Johns and Pineb, 2002, Mishina et al, 2004), which in turn gives a growth opportunity to the firm. Diversification strategy involves venturing in to new different lines of business and developing and selling new product lines to different new markets (Ansoff 1957). This strategy is considered to be the risky one because it involves a lot of uncertainties entering in to a new unfamiliar market. Ansoff (1957) and Hussain et al (2013) propose that, this strategy should be the last option in case the first three strategies that is; market penetration, market development and product development fail to meet the intended growth objectives.

2.2.2 Balance Theory

The theory was presented by Heider (1946), by observing individual relationship. He proposed that, individuals always search for balance in their relationships. He state that, individual's attitude towards another individual or entity may influence another individual's attitude. He stated the balanced state as "in the case of two entities a balanced state exists if the relationship between entities is positive or negative in all respects. In the case of three entities a balanced state exists if all three relations are positive in all aspects if two are negative and one is positive" (Heider , 1946). He named sentiment relation to be a relationship between people, and unit relation as a relationship between existing between entities. Mowen (1980) adopted the same theory to describe consumer-endorsement relationship as sentiment relationship and consumer-firm relationship as unit relationship.

According to the theory, if person/entity C has a positive relationship with K¸ and K has a positive relationship with P then C will automatically be having a positive relationship with P (Cartwright & Harary, 1956). Therefore, in co-branding this means that, if a certain group of customers (say Z) have a positive relationship with one of the partner or a certain brand that endorses the other brand (say J) in the alliance (JM), automatically that group of customers (Z) will be having positive relationship with the other brand partner (M) in that alliance or the offspring brand/product (JM). This means that, the pre-existing consumers (Z) and brand (J) positive attitude affects positively the attitude of Z towards (JM).

2.2.3 Signaling Theory

This theory proposes that, to help the consumers to reduce costs of searching for the information regarding the products that can help to meet their needs and wants to the extent of their expectations and eliminating the state of customers' dissonance and uncertainties, companies should us brands as signals of the products (Bluemelhuber et al, 2007). These signals can include the brand names, brand characters, slogans and others. According to this theory, the preference and choice of a certain brand by a consumer, depends much on the nature of information available. Therefore, brand as a signal is used to help a consumer to reduce searching costs. This means that a created strong signal helps to increase brand equity and reduces searching costs of the customer (Erdem et al, 1998).

For the case of co-branding, the alliance between the brand partners can be a signal in itself but this will depend on the compatibility of the brands entering in to the alliance and the prior attitude or perception of the consumers towards one or both of the brand partners. Rao & Ruekert (1994) points out that, the alliance proves its advantage as a signal if at least brand partner is well-known and has a positive image among the targeted customers, hence that image helps them to reduce the state of uncertainty when deciding on a new product (offspring brand). Brand as a signal is required to be credible and trustworthy to the customers so that customers can believe it (Erdem et al, 1998). Therefore, different forms of co-branding can act as a signal to customers if the brand partner entering in to the alliance selected property (considering the compatibility and the purpose of the alliance) hence enjoying the co-branding benefits including expansion of customer base. Rao et al. (1999) argue that, the quality of the brand can be better evaluated by the consumers with no observable attribute only when that brand is joint branded with the other brand partner which is perceived positively by the customers. In that sense, double branded product provides and enhance quality signal compared to mono-branded product (Grebosz & Otto, 2014), hence easy acceptance in the new market segment.

2.3 Categories of Co-branding

Boad & Blackett's (1999) joint value creation model explains the categories of co-branding. The model insists that brand value creation between the brand partners in the alliance will depend on the type of co-branding the two or more partners are entering. The model presents the categories in form of hierarch and show that, the higher the brand partners go the more joint brand value created. The following are the categories;

The lowest form of co-brand at the hierarchy according to Boad & Blackett (1999) is Knowledge Co-branding. This form of co-branding normally calls for a short-term binding agreement. The aim of this agreement is to speedily and simply develop awareness and exposure level to the targeted group of customers using pre-existing equity of each brand partner. According to Boad & Blackett (1999), the partners enter in to the contract on their immediate needs. A good example is American Express and Delta Airline on sky mile program. This form is more applicable during sales and promotion. Boad & Blackett (1999) present Vale Endorsement Co-branding as another category of co-branding at the second stage in the hierarchy. In this form, one partner enjoys transfer of the brand value propositions from the other partner. If the consumer of one brand partner has a positive brand image of the values associated with the brand, that image can be easily transferred to another brand partner. Therefore, it can be concluded by saying that, that partner with a positive image easily does value endorsement to other partner. In other words, one partner gain confirmation of quality through the other partner. In most cases we see celebrities do this form of co-branding.

In the hierarchy presented by Boad & Blackett's (1999), the form of co-branding found in the third stage is named as Ingredient Co-branding. In this form of co-branding one of the brand partners with strong brand equity become an ingredient to another partner to create the final product/brand with mare additional value. This form gives the primary brand (PB) with more power to charge premium price due to the added value from the well-established and positively associated ingredient brand. Regardless of its benefits, Norris (1992) points out that, this form of co-branding cannot be necessarily a proper one due to its drawbacks. The final form in the hierarchy is Complementary Competence Co-branding. According to Boad & Blackett (1999), this form of co-branding is at peak of the hierarchy and it is in this form where brand partners invest a large package such as continuously providing knowledge, expertise, financial and other tangible and intangible investments to ensure an endless progress in the alliance. The main target in this alliance is to progress in synergism producing a superior product/brand more than an individual partner can do. Normally in this form of alliance both partners have a strong equity. A good example is Ferrari and Acer produced a personal computer and an exclusive smartphone.

2.4 Objectives of Co-branding

In this part, discussed are the marketing objectives that drive firms to adopt co-branding strategies.

2.4.1 Growth Objective

Market Growth/expansion is mentioned to be one of the major objectives of co-branding. Kapferer (1992) points out that, co-branding is the best strategy to attract customers and soften entry to the new market segment. As trying to relate co-branding/ brand alliance with other strategic alliances, Growth in any alliance is achieved due to Learning, Leaping and linking relationship or alliances between the partners. Growth is obtained when the company gets a chance to enter in to a new product category and add new customer segment to its portfolio. In most of times, companies fail to achieve this objective because they face with market entry barriers which are sometimes difficult to overcome. Therefore, using a brand alliance/ co-branding strategy can be a solution for this as (Preece, 1995) points out that, an alliance helps to overcome market entry barriers. Washburn (2000) argues that, co-branding is the best means of entering new segment of the market for new brands.

Also inertia for growth in any company is insufficient competence and Knowledge. This barrier for growth can be also removed through co-branding strategy, as Preece, (1995) points that, alliance helps to bridge the gap of the missing knowledge from the partner either in technology, marketing, production or process. Co-branding strategy can also facilitate the brand growth through getting access of suppliers by being linked by the brand partner. Linking alliance has been practiced by many companies as (De Wit & Meyer, 2004) point out linking alliance is a very common type of relationship.

2.4.2. Cost Reduction

Most of companies make an alliance for the purpose of creating a leaning relationship and this is one of the reasons for co-branding. Co-branding aims at cost reduction through leaning relationship. In co-branding one partner can outsource part of its activities which add value to its brand to the other partner so that remains with important activities and put more efforts on core business and core competencies. This actually enable both partners to specialize and efficiently and effectively allocate resources, competencies, skills and knowledge to the areas at which each partner fit better (Preece, 1995). On the other hand, the purpose of co-branding is to reduce costs through linking relationship/alliance, whereby one partner can link the other partner to the suppliers. This helps the partner to be effective in inventory management. Reduction of costs occur because partner's company become a Lean or/and JIT type of company. Linkage to the suppliers also helps to improve the quality of partner's products as (Preece, 1995) argues that, linking alliance helps to improve the quality. Co-branding also helps to reduce cost of research and innovation of new brand because the existing brands can be used for new product and hence reduce risk of failure (Ouruoff, 1993)

2.4.3. Sustainable Competitive Advantage

Co-branding is sometimes done to turn the competitors in to being partners rather than rivals. Co-branding can be aiming at creating a strong alliance that can help the partners to create strong market entry barriers to other players. Brand partners can decide to a locking out alliance to secure existing competitive advantages and creating more competitive advantages by creating environment that can be entrants' barriers to the other firms (Preece, 1995). Also linking alliance in co-branding enable the brand partners to saturate the supplier networks hence block the competitors from getting access to them. Co-branding aims at creating a Lobbying relationship that can helps to have more weight voicing when expressing their opinions to the regulatory authorities or political player (De Wit & Meyer, 2004). Co-branding reduce heavy competition and helps to make the brand more exposed to the marketplace (Spethmann & Benezra, 1994). Co-branding helps to enjoy the fruits of proper allocation of resources, and it reduces costs in terms of production process hence allow realization of more sales (Samu et al., 1999, and Kotler et al., 2006).

2.4.4. Profit making Objective

Washburn (2000) argues out that, co-branding is the best strategy to tap new market segments for the new brands in the market. Actually taping more new market segments widen a room for the brand to make more revenue from the new markets hence profits. Co-branding smoothen the adoption rate of the new brand in the market because customers use past experience of the other brand partner to make evaluation of the new product or to respond to the marketing of the joint brand. Profit making is the common goal to private companies and to realize the other objectives of the company sustainably this goal must first be achieved (Absanto and Nnko, 2013). Profit is an indicator of business growth since it signifies increase in efficiency and sales. Therefore, companies opt co-branding as a solution since it helps to share resources that can help to improve efficiency and reduces competition hence more sales and more revenue.

2.5 Empirical Review

Grebosz and Otto (2014) reported that, most companies in the textile sector adopt different new methods to ensure market expansion and increasing brand value. Among the methods adopted is co-branding and brand extension strategies. According to Grebosz and Otto (2014), market expansion through co-branding is easy because in the study they conducted on customer behavior towards co-branded products of the textile industry they observed that, customers give priority to co-branded textile products than others. They also reported that, co-branding helps to attract new customers, refreshing brand image, and reinforce the brand equity. In the study of the outcomes of the co-branding strategy Grebosz (2012) reported growth of the brand awareness and transfer of the brand association to be the outcomes of co-branding.

Also in the same study Grebosz (2012) found that there is high possibility for the companies to enter in to the new market segments and entering new foreign markets through co-branding strategies especially symbolic co-branding than ingredient co-branding. This means that not every form or type of co-branding gives an opportunity of market expansion. Bhat and Reddy, (2001) point out that, co-branding offers a great possibility for diversification. The adoption of co-branding gives room for product quality evaluation (Knape and Rodesledt, 2013; Rao et al., 1999), ensure quick acceptance of the product in the market (Desai & Keller, 2002), and finally increases market exposure while enjoying cost sharing (Spethmann & Benezra, 1994)

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.0 Introduction

This part presents the plan that systematically helped to meet the intended objective of the study. It includes the procedures that the researcher passed through in carrying out the study. The part gives a clear clarification about the adopted research design, the area of the study, the Population of the study, sample size and the sampling design, methods used in data collection and the data analysis and presentation.

3.1. Research Design

Cross-sectional survey design was adopted to meet the intended objective of this study. This study design was purposefully proposed due to time dimension of data collection from different respondents, and the nature of the study, that is descriptive in nature. Cross-sectional study is appropriate when collecting data from the population to understand a current situation on different variables (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Also this kind of design guarantees freedom and flexibility in the actual process of data collection (Ndunguru, 2007).

3.2 Area of the Study

The study was conducted in Morogoro Region Tanzania. The region is in the eastern part of Tanzania with more than 2.2 million population according to 2012 national census. The main economic activities in this region include Agriculture, Tourism, and Industrial activities (both manufacturing and processing). The region was purposely selected by the researcher because it is a potential area for beekeeping activities with more honey business practitioners who were the potential key respondents of this study. Therefore the region represented other potential areas that engage in beekeeping and honey business in Tanzania. Specifically this study was conducted in Morogoro Municipality district.

3.3. Population of the Study

Population means a list of individuals, items or objects having common characteristics from which the sample of measurement is selected. From the population the researcher select the representatives (sample) and draw the conclusion basing on findings obtained from the unit of analysis of that sample (Kothari, 2008). This study targeted the population of all honey business traders (both formal and informal) and specifically those who were at the managerial position and founders were targeted as the unit of analysis of the study. The exact number of the population of the firms is not clear, as Nchimbi (2002) cited by Isaga (2015) confirm that there is no accurate data on the population of SME's in Tanzania, hence this contributes to deficiency of appropriate sampling framework.

3.4. Sampling and Sample Size

Sample size means the number of unit of analysis selected properly to represent the entire study population. This study adopted a sample of 80 respondents to represent the population. The sample size was large because the researcher wanted to meet one of the required assumptions for chi square tests of independence as the model adopted in this study. Also to meet the intended objective of this study by considering the nature of the population of the respondents that is; absence of accurate number of the population, this study adopted non-probability sampling techniques as also recommended by Isaga (2015). The researcher used purposive sampling technique. The technique enabled the researcher easily to create an appropriate sample that enabled to come up with the correct information regarding the objective of the study because the researcher use his own judgments to select appropriate respondents with rich information as also recommended by Baker, (2003) and Saunders et al., (2003).

3.5. Data Collection

This study used primary data. These are data that are collected by the researcher himself and have never collected by others and disseminated elsewhere. Data collection methods included observation, questionnaire, and interview. The researcher employed his sensory organs to observe some matters during the study. The method allowed capturing more data that the respondents were not willing to express, and some which were not included in the questionnaire. Questionnaire was also used to collect large amount of information from a large number of people with less pressure to the respondent. To test the validity and reliability of the questionnaires, few questionnaires were distributed to few respondents where necessary adjustments were done as also Baker (2003) and Saunders et al., (2003) recommend. Also questionnaire was translated in to Kiswahili which is a common language of the respondents using the mixed techniques of translation where by back translations as also recommended by Isaga (2015) and Usunier (1998) were adopted. Interview was use and the respondents were free to give their opinions and the researcher was free to ask more questions which was not presented in the questionnaires. Also it allowed flexibility and the researcher made more clarifications on questions presented in a questionnaire.

3.6. Data Analysis and Presentation

Collected data were processed and analysed using descriptive statistics. The statistical package of social science was used as a tool to help in data analysis. Chi square test of independence were uses used to test the association between co-branding adoption and market expansion. Chi square was selected by the researcher due to nature of the variables (both independent and dependent variables) to be categorical variables. Findings were interpreted and tabulations were used to present the results.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents data analysis and interpretation of the findings basing on the questionnaire of this study.

4.2 General information

The researcher collected general information from the respondents for the purpose of identifying if the involved respondents were the right units of analysis and give more insights to the researcher for proper interpretation and discussion.

4.2.1 Nature of the Business

The researcher asked this question to determine either business were formal or informal and the responses were as presented in Table 4.2.1

Table 4.2.1 Nature of the business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Informal Business	66	82.5	82.5	82.5
	Formal Business	14	17.5	17.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2018

From Table 4.2.1, responses show that, 82.5% have responded that their businesses are informal, while 17.5% have responded to be formal. This response of formality (17.5%) may be attributed by the fact that this business in Tanzania is an emerging business in which people have started to currently invest seriously for commercial purpose.

4.2.2 Operation Period of the Business

The researcher grouped years of the business operation in to four categories and asked the respondent to give information about the operation period of their businesses and the responses were as presented in Table 4.2.2.

Table 4.2.2 Operation Period of an Organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less Than 3Years	35	43.8	43.8	43.8
3 to 5 Years	26	32.5	32.5	76.3
5 to 10 Years	18	22.5	22.5	98.8
More than 10 Years	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2018

Table 4.2.2 shows that, 43.8% of the respondents responded that their businesses have been in operation for less than 3 years, while 32.5% responded that have been in operation from 3 to 5 years. This means that, the cumulative of 76.3% of the respondents have been operating their businesses for not more than five years. This may also be the reason for the large number of informal businesses as indicated in Table 4.2.1. Also from Table 4.2.2, 22.5% of respondents fall under the category of 5 to 10 years while only 1.2% of respondents responded that they have been in operation for more than 10 years.

4.2.3 Nature of Ownership of the Business

Respondents were asked to indicate nature of ownership of their business as the researcher grouped the ownership into three categories that is, sole proprietorship, joint venture, and others. The responses were captured as presented in Table 4.2.3

Table 4.2.3 Nature of Ownership of the Business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sole proprietorship	53	66.25	66.25	66.25
	Joint Ownership	25	31.25	31.25	97.5
	Others	2	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2018

The responses from Table 4.2.3 show that, 66.25% of the businesses were individually owned, while 31.25 were jointly owned. The rest percentage which is 2.5% responded to fall in the category of others. The 2.5% responded that their businesses are under special Projects which mean that the businesses are owned by the project funders.

4.2.4 Position or Relationship of the Respondent with the Business

Respondents were asked to indicate their position or relationships with their businesses. The aim of the researcher was to identify if the respondent was the right unity of analysis. Table 4.2.4 presents the responses

Table 4.2.4 Position or Relationship of the Respondent with the Business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Founder	53	66.2	66.2	66.2
	Managerial Position	27	33.8	33.8	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2018

From Table 4.2.4, the responses shows that 66.2% of respondents were founders of the business while 33.8% were in the managerial positions. The researcher gave no room for other people who did not meet to fit with the intended unity of analysis of this research so that to allow rich data being collected from the right respondents. Given that, cumulative of 100% responses came from the intended unity of analysis (Founders 66.2% and Managerial Positions 33.8%) this means that the relevant unit of analysis were involved in the data collection process hence rich data were collected.

4.3 Co-branding Strategies Adoption – the most adopted strategies

To identify the most adopted co-branding strategies, the researcher prepared different statements/practices that represent different categories of co-branding strategies as indicated in Table 4.3. The statements aimed at capturing data for whether the respondents has adopted or not adopted either of the statements or practice. The response was as presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Co-branding Strategies Adoption – in count

Cobranding Strategies	Response	Count
Ingredient Co-Branding		
Product is used as an ingredient in other products/brands and become recognized by its name in promotion campaign	Not Adopted	77
	Adopted	3
Endorsement Co-Branding		
Business uses celebrities/popular people/popular entities/popular blogs to promote our brand/product	Not Adopted	60
	Adopted	20
Business cooperates with other brands in different events (e.g. CSR) so that our brand/products get well known	Not Adopted	62
	Adopted	18
Business uses our brand in publicity events as a means for the medias to endorse or indirectly advertise our brand	Not Adopted	62
	Adopted	18
Value Chain Co-Branding		
Business collaborates with service providers (e.g. hotels and herbal clinics) to sell our brand	Not Adopted	18
	Adopted	62
Product uses two brands (our brand and our distributor's brand)	Not Adopted	68
	Adopted	12
Business teams up with other online sellers to sell our brand	Not Adopted	7

	Adopted	73
Business collaborates with the other partner to use a single name to sell our final product	Not Adopted	66
	Adopted	14
Innovation Co-Branding		
Collaborates with the other firms to produce different final products (e.g. soaps, candles, cosmetics, medicine etc.) using our brand/product.	Not Adopted	46
	Adopted	34
Complementary Co-Branding		
Business collaborates with our suppliers to share competences and other resources to ensure production of superior product.	Not Adopted	11
	Adopted	69

Source: Research Data, 2018

From Table 4.3, the responses indicate that at least all practices were adopted; the difference was at to what extent. Also the response shows that different businesses adopt a combination of different strategies. Value chain co-branding, Innovation co-branding, and Complementary co-branding are the most adopted strategies as seen from Table 4.3. 69 respondents responded to adopt complementary co-branding, while 34 respondents have adopted Innovation co-branding. Four different practices were used to represent value chain co-branding but two of them (practices) were observed to be adopted by high number of respondents. As indicated in the table 62 respondents have responded to collaborate with other service providers to add value on their products, while 73 have responded that they were teaming up with other online sellers to sell their brands. Therefore this big response figures indicate values chain co-branding strategy to be adopted by many firms compared to others.

4.4 Co-branding Strategies Adoption level

To identify the co-branding strategies adoption level, the researcher had to prepare different statements/practices that represent different categories of co-branding strategies as indicated in Table 4.3. The adoption level was observed by grouping the extent of adoption in to two different groups, that is Low Level (Less than 5Practices) and High Level (5 Practices and Above). The results were as presented in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Co-branding Strategies Adoption level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low Level (Less than 5Practices)	44	55.0	55.0	55.0
	High Level (5 Practices and Above)	36	45.0	45.0	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2018

As seen in Table 4.4 the adoption level was observed form two different categories, that is Low Level (Less than 5Practices) and High Level (5 Practices and Above). The responses from the table show that, 55% of firms falling under low level (less than 5 practices) category have adopted co-branding practices, while 45% represents those in High Level (5 Practices and Above) category. Table 4.2.2 gives the reason for why high percentage of adoption falls in the category of low level (less than 5 practices) adoption that, 43.8% of firms have been in operation for less than 3 years while above 50% have been in business operation for not more than 5years a reason that can advocate for a less adoption of co-branding strategies.

4.5 Reasons for the Adoption of Co-branding Strategies – in Percentage

This question aimed at capturing data relating to the driving forces for the respondents to adopt co-branding strategies. The researcher developed a set of statements that show the reasons for the adoption of the strategies and asked the respondents to rate the reasons using a scale of 1 to 5 as indicated in the table. The responses were as presented in table 4.5

Table4.5: Reasons for the Adoption of Co-branding Strategies - in Percentage

	Very important	Important	To some extent important	Not important	Not sure
Sharing resources	8.8	52.5	35.0	2.5	1.2
Leveraging the secondary association of the partner brand	1.2	36.3	55.0	5	2.5
Easily increasing an efficiency	46.3	46.3	5.0	1.2	1.2
Enhancing easy access to the customers	36.2	53.8	6.2	3.8	0
To share risks	2.5	17.5	60	15	5
To increase sales and profit	40	56.2	1.3	1.2	1.3
To advance the quality of your product	36.2	50.0	8.8	3.8	1.2
Influence from the other partner	7.5	18.8	22.5	36.2	15.0
To eliminate competitors in the market	2.5	30.0	35.0	22.5	10.0
To control the market demand and supply	3.8	26.3	37.5	21.2	11.2

Source: Research Data, 2018

From table 4.6, the responses show that, only five reasons at a high extent have been influencing businesses to adopt co-branding strategies. The two column (Very important, and Important) were used by the researcher to make an inference on the strongest reasons for the adoption of co-branding strategies. Reasons with above 40% were considered for the inference. 52.5% of respondents responded that sharing resources was a major reason, while 46.3% responded that easily increasing efficiency was the big reason. Also 53.8% responded that enhancing easy access to the customers was the driving force for them. Increase sales and profit, and advancing the quality of product were also observed to be mentioned by 56.3% and 50% of respondents respectively. These reasons are aligning with market expansion intension, as they are in line with the market expansion indicators as used in this study.

4.6 Relationship between Co-branding Adoption and Market Expansion

Three variables were used as the indicators of market expansion that is, sales revenue, Profit and customer base. The relationship between co-branding adoption and market expansion was tested using chi square tests of independence assuming α=0.05. Each market expansion variable was tested against the adoption levels to establish the relationship and the results were as presented in Table 4.6.1, Table 4.6.2, Table 4.6.3, Table 4.6.4, Table 4.6.5, and Table 4.6.6.

Table 4.6.1: Chi-Square Tests - Adoption Level and Sales Revenue

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.393[a]	1	.036		
Continuity Correction[b]	3.499	1	.061		
Likelihood Ratio	4.448	1	.035		
Fisher's Exact Test				.044	.030
N of Valid Cases	80				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.65.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Source: Research Data, 2018

Table 4.6.2 Symmetric Measures output

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.234	.036
	Cramer's V	.234	.036
N of Valid Cases		80	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Source: Research Data, 2018

Table 4.6.3: Chi-Square Tests - Adoption Level and Customer base increase

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.051[a]	1	.025		
Continuity Correction[b]	4.091	1	.043		
Likelihood Ratio	5.107	1	.024		
Fisher's Exact Test				.042	.021
N of Valid Cases	80				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Source: Research Data, 2018

Table 4.6.4: Symmetric Measures Output

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.251	.025
	Cramer's V	.251	.025
N of Valid Cases		80	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Source: Research Data, 2018

Table 4.6.5: Chi-Square Tests - Adoption Level and Profit

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.693[a]	1	.193		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.151	1	.283		
Likelihood Ratio	1.706	1	.192		
Fisher's Exact Test				.255	.142
N of Valid Cases	80				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.85.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Source: Research Data, 2018

Table 4.6.6: Symmetric Measures Output

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.145	.193
	Cramer's V	.145	.193
N of Valid Cases		80	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Source: Research Data, 2018

From Table 4.6.1, Table 4.6.3, Table 4.6.5 the expected count was above 5, hence the assumption met. In Table 4.6.1 the results show that, ($X^{(2)}$ = 4.393[a], p= .036). This implies that there is a statistically significant association between co-branding adoption level and sales revenue and Phi= 0.234 as presented in Table 4.6.2, which implies that there is a small strength of association between co-branding adoption level and sales revenue. Also, from Table 4.6.3, ($X^{(2)}$ = 5.051[a], p= 0.025) which means that there is a statistically significant association between co-branding adoption level and Customer base increase, Phi= 0.251, which also implies that the strength of association between co-branding adoption level and Customer base increase is small as indicated in Table 4.6.4. Lastly, Table 4.6.5 shows that, there is no a statistically significant association between co-branding adoption level and profit ($X^{(2)}$ = 1.693[a], p= 0.193).

4.7 Challenges for the Adoption of Co-branding Strategies - in Percentage

Respondents were required to give the challenges associated with the adoption of co-branding strategies. The researcher prepared 10 statements/practices to that show the challenges and asked the respondents to rate the challenges using a scale of 1 to 5 to show the extent of their response. The responses in percentage are presented in Table 4.7

Table 4.7: Challenges for the Adoption of Co-branding Strategies - in Percentage

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Readiness of the partners to partner	27.5	71.3	1.2	0	0
Fear of negative consequences of co- branding strategies	21.2	52.5	23.8	2.5	0
Lack of expertise to facilitate the adoption of the strategies	20.0	75.0	5.0	0	0
Lack Management/Owner-manager support on adoption	8.8	41.2	50.0	0	0
Desire of full autonomy to control the product/production	6.3	37.5	32.5	23.7	0
Customers do not prioritize co-branded products	8.8	21.3	37.5	31.2	1.2
Complexity of the strategies	10.0	28.8	43.8	16.2	1.2
Lack of trust among other partners	25.0	73.8	1	0	0
Lack of commitment of other partners	20	71.3	6.3	2.4	0
Lack of expertise of other partners	22.5	65	8.8	3.7	0

Source: Research Data, 2018

From table 4.7, the responses show that, only five challenges have been experienced as the major challenges associated with the adoption of co-branding strategies. The researcher used two columns in table 4.7, (strongly agree, and agree column) to make an inference of the findings. Challenges with 50% and above were considered for the inference. 71.3% of respondents responded that readiness of other partners to partner was the major challenge, while 52.5% mentioned fear of negative consequences of co- branding strategies. Also Lack of expertise to facilitate the adoption of the strategies were reported by 75.0% of the respondents while Lack of trust among other partners, and Lack of expertise of other partners were mentioned by 73.8% and 71.3% respondents respectively.

HAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of summary, discussion of the findings basing on the objectives both main and specific objectives of the study as interpreted in chapter four, conclusion, and the recommendation.

5.2 Summary

The main objective of this study was to examine co-branding strategies adoption in the expansion of honey market in Tanzania. Specifically the study intended to establish the relationship between co-branding adoption and market expansion, to identify the level of co-branding adoption in the honey market in Tanzania, and identifying the challenges associated with the adoption of these strategies. In testing the relationship, co-branding adoption was used as independent variable while market expansion was considered to be dependent variable (customer base increase, sales revenue, and profit were used as indicators of market expansion).

From the findings, the adoption level was identified to be high since all respondents reported to adopt at least one of the co-branding practices and the most responses have revealed that the reasons for the adoption were all aiming at market expansion. Also, even if the adoption level is high, findings show that there some challenges that are associated with the adoption as shown in chapter four. Co-branding adoption were found to have a relationship with market expansion since two indicators of market expansion (sales revenue, and customer base increase) among three indicators (sales revenue, and customer base increase) as used in this study were found to have a statistically significant association with co-branding adoption.

5.3 Discussion

The findings in Table 4.4 depicts that firms with low level adoption (less than 5 practices) are many compared to firms with high level adoption (5 practices and above), that is 55% and 45% respectively. Table 4.2.2 shows that, 43.8% of firms have been in operation for less than 3 years while above 50% have been in business operation for not more than 5years a reason that may advocate for the firms falling under 55% category. Also the major challenges as interpreted from table 4.7 may be the reason for this number to be high.

Also chi square tests of independence were used to test the association between co-branding adoption and market expansion. The findings show that, co-branding adoption significantly affects sales revenue. This is supported by Samu et al., (1999), and Kotler et al., (2006) who reported that Co-branding helps to enjoy the fruits of proper allocation of resources, reduces costs while allows realization of more sales. Also it has been observed that, there is an association between co-branding adoption and customer base increase. The observation is supported by Washburn (2000) who reported co-branding to be a best means of entering new market segment which automatically lead to increase in customer base. The findings also are in consistency with Grebosz (2012) who reported that, there is a high possibility for the companies to enter in to new market segment through co-branding, in which new market segments increases customer base of the firm.

Co-branding adoption was found to be not associated with profit, which means that the two variables are independent to each other. From the findings, above 50% of firms responded to have been in business operation for not more than five years which may be considered to be a major reason for why most firms have not started to realize profit because they have been in the market for a short period of time. Also for most Micro and small businesses in Tanzania, information related to profit is considered to be very confidential, therefore difficult to divulging them to the business outsiders. This may also be another reason for the results as seen in table 4.6.5. Since co-branding adoption is significantly associated with two indicators of market expansion (sales revenue, and customer base increase) among three as used in this study (sales revenue, and customer base increase, and profit) it means that there is a significant relationship between co-branding adoption and market expansion. This means that, the findings are in consistency with Grebosz and Otto (2014) who also confirmed that, market expansion through co-branding is easy because customers prioritize co-branded products and it is a good means to attract new customers. Above 50% of respondents responded to have been adopted a combination of co-branding strategies especially complementary co-branding, innovation co-branding, and value chain co-branding strategies in order to improve the quality of their products, diversification as also supported by Bhat and Reddy, (2001) who point out that, co-branding offers a great possibility for diversification, and increase efficiency hence attracting more customers and generating more sales revenue.

As this business sector is an emerging one in Tanzania, encountering challenges is inevitable as also seen in the interpretation of table 4.7. Also, considering that 43.8% of respondents responded to be in the market for less than three years the probability of experiencing a number of challenges must be anticipated to be high. In addition to this, these challenges may be associated with the reason that co-branding discipline is a new marketing strategy in Tanzania therefore its adoption process may involve a number of challenges.

5.4 Conclusion

In Tanzania, Micro, Small and Medium enterprises are looking for the best marketing strategies that can help them easily and successfully expand their markets. From the findings, the use of co-branding is seen to be among of the strategies which have been adopted by many individual business people and firms engaging in honey businesses. The findings show that, lager percentage of firms and individual business people have been in operation for a short period of time but have adopted a combination of co-branding strategies. This can help to concluded that, the adoption rate is positive and there is a possibility of increase in adoption as number of business operation period increases, and awareness of the benefits associated with co-branding increases. The potentials of co-branding strategies in market expansion that have been realized by firms with a high level co-branding adoption (5 and above practices), will keep on attracting more firms especially the new entrants which are in business operation for less than 5 years. Therefore, the findings revealed that, business firms which are dreaming to expand their markets successfully while enjoying other benefits, co-branding strategies adoption is the right way to go.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

This study focused on honey industry only; hence limits generalization of the findings to other industries. Therefore, generalization of the findings should base only on honey industry in Tanzania.

Also, the study involved asking some questions such as performance in terms of profitability, and sales performance, which actually respondents treated it as confidential information to give the actual figures, therefore the researcher gave room to them to answer in terms of increased, stayed the same, or decreased.

Lastly, absence of accurate data base for Micro, Small and Medium enterprises specifically dealing with honey businesses, has forced the researcher to spend much time and financial resources searching for the true representatives of the population of this study.

5.6 Managerial Recommendations

In the observation of the study findings, it can be recommended that, honey business actors (both firms and individual people) in Tanzania should increase more efforts in adopting co-branding strategies for the market expansion purpose. Both new entrants, and existing firms and individual people, in collaboration with other honey business actors, should work together in consistency to improve the quality of honey, add value on honey in different ways, and increase efficiency which in turn will make them to realize the fruits of their collaboration in terms of sales revenue, customer increases and retention, and profit generation. In view of this, this study recommends much adoption of complementary co-branding strategies for quality and quantity improvement, value chain co-branding strategies for value adding purpose, efficiency and capturing a wide customer base, while innovation co-branding strategies be adopted for diversification purposes and capturing new market segments.

Also, the study recommend that, to increase awareness level of co-branding strategies and its associated benefits, and reducing the challenges associated with its adoption, training institutions should intervene by providing desirable knowledge to the business actors through special programs such as incubation centers and short course trainings. This will improve the general and specific understanding among the honey business firms and individual business people hence increase the rate of adoption.

5.7 Recommendation for Further Studies

This study was restricted to one place (Morogoro Municipality), therefore, the study recommends other studies to be conducted in other areas within Tanzania so that a proper generalization is made.

Also the study recommends similar studies or even with different methodologies to be conducted to other business sectors in Tanzania other than honey sector so that many literatures that will help to create awareness of the power of co-branding strategies in operating business successfully are established.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A. (1991).*Managing Brand Equity*. New York, Free Press

Aaker, D. A. (1996). *Measuring Brand Equity across Products and Markets. California Management Review*. Vol. 38(3). PP 102-120

Aaker, D. A. (2008). *Strategic Market Management*. New Jersey. Wiley

Absanto, G & Nnko, E (2013). *Analysis of Business Growth Strategies and their Contribution to Business Growth: A Tanzania Case Study*. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management. Vol. 1(1)

AFWC, (2016). *Beekeeping Value Chain Development in Tanzania: Invited Paper*. FAO

Allan, D et al., (1994). *Challenges and Opportunities Facing Brand Management: An Introduction to the Special Issue*. Journal of Marketing Research. Vol. 31(2) 149-158

American Marketing Association (AMA). (1960*). Marketing Definitions: A Glossary of Marketing Terms*. AMA, Chicago, IL.

Ansoff, I. (1957). *Strategies for Diversification*. Harvard Business Review

Arnold, D (1992). *The Handbook of Brand Management, Century Business*. London. The Economist Book

Baker, M (2003). *Business and Management Research, How to Complete your Research Project Successfully*. Scotland: Westburn

Berenschot (2008). *Window of Opportunity: Income from Honey*. Market Research for SNV East and South Africa

Bhat, S & Reddy, S.K (2001). *The Impact of Partner Brand Attribute Associations and Affect on Brand Extension Evaluation. Journal of Business Research*. Vol. 53(3) 111-122

Blackett, T. & Boad, B. (1999). *Co-branding: The Science of Alliance*. 1st ed. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd

Blackett, T and Russell, N. (1999. *Co-branding : The Science of Alliance*. Macmillan Business

Bluemelhuber, C. et al., (2007). *Extending the View of Brand Alliance effects*. International Marketing Review. Vol. 24(4) 427-443

Cartwright, D & Harary, F. (1956). *Structural Balance: A Generalization of Heider's Theory*. Psychological Review. Vol. 63(5) 277-293

Desai, K. K & Keller, K.L (2002). The *Effect of Ingredient Branding strategies on Host Brand Extendibility*. Journal of marketing. Vol. 66(1) 73-93

Dickison, S.J & Heath, T. (2008). *Cooperative Brand Alliance: How to Generate Positive Evaluation*. Australasian Marketing Journal. Vol. 16(2) 22-38

Eagle, L & Brennan, R. (2007). *Beyond Advertising: In-home Promotion of Fast Food.* Young Consumers. Vol. 8(4) 278-2888

Erdem, T. & Swait, J. (1998). *Brand Equity as a Signaling Phenomenon*. Journal of Consumer Psychology. Vol. 7(2). 131-157

Erdem, T et al., (2006). *Brands as Signals: A Cross-country Validation Study*. Journal of Marketing. Vol. 70(1) 34-49

Esch, F & Longner, T (2006). *Are Brands Forever?: How Brand Knowledge and Relationships Affect Current and Future Purchases*. Journal of Product and Brand Management. Vol.15(2) 98-105

FaoStat (2005). Faostat *Database on Agriculture and Malnutrition*

Grebosz, M. (2012). *The Outcomes of Co-branding Strategy*. Chines Business Review. Vol. 11(9) 823-829

Grebosz, M & Otto, J. (2014). *Customer Behavior Towards Co-branded Products of Textile Industry*. FIBRES & TEXTILE in Eastern Europe. Vol. 22, 2(104) 13-18

Grossman, R.P. (1997). *Co-branding in Advertising*. Journal of Product and Brand Management vol. 6(3).

Heding, T et al., (2008). *Using the Dynamic Paradigm Funnel to Analyze Brand Management. Strategic Market Creation: A New Perspective on Marketing and Innovation Management*. 1st ed. Chichester: Wiley.

Heding, T et al., (2009). *Brand Management: Research Theory and Practice*. 1st ed. New York, USA. Routledge

Heider, F., (1946). *Attitudes and Cognitive Organization*. The Journal of Psychology. Vol. 21(1) 107-112

Helmig. B. et al., (2008). *Co-branding: The State of the Art*. Schmalenbach Business Review (SBR). Vol. 60(4) 359-377

Hall, D & Lobina, E (2007). *Profitability and the Poor: Coorporate Strategies, Innovation and Sustainability*. Geoforum. Vol. 38, 772-785

Hussain, S et al., (2013). *ANSOFF Matrix, Environment, and Growth – An Interactive Triangle*. Management and Administrative Science Review. Vol. 2(2) 196-506

Isaga, N (2015). *Owner-Manager's Demographic Characteristics and Growth of Tanzania Small and Medium Enterprises*. International Journal of Business and Management. Vol. 10(5) 168-181

James, D.O. (2006). *Extension to Alliance: Aaker and Keller's Model Revisited*. Journal of Product and Brand Management. Vol. 15(1), 15-22

Johns, A.N & Pineb, R (2002). Consumer Behavior in the Food Service Industry: A Review. Journal of Hospitality Management. Vol. 21. 119-134

Jordaan, Y (2014). *Do Brands Actually Contribute to Firms Performance*? Academic Group of European Marketing Confederation (EMC)

Keller K.L et al., *(2008). Strategic Brand Management. A European Perspective. Harlow, England and Newyork*. Prentice Hall Financial Time

Keller, K.L. (2013). *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing brand Equity*. 4th ed. Pearson Education Limited. England

King. C & Grace. D (2008). *Internal Branding: Exploring the Employees Perspective*. Journal of Brand management. Vol. 15(5) 358-372

Knape, E & Rodesledt, P (2013). *Co-branding in the FMCG Sector: Investigating the Relationship Between Brand Association Transfer and Perceptual Fit in Co-branding*. Masthers Thesis

Kotler, P et al., (1999). Principles of Marketing. 2nd ed. Europe. Prentice Hall Inc

Maina, A.M (2011). *Influence of Co-branding on Customer Perception: A Case of M-kesho Customers in Kariobangi Area*. University of Nairobi. Kenya

Merz, M.A et al., (2009). *The Evolving Brand Logic: A Service Dominant Logic Perspective*. Journal of Academy of Market Science.vol. 37(3) 328-344

Mishina, Y et al., (2004). *Are More Resources Always Better for Growth? Resource Stickiness in Market and Product Expansion. Journal Strategic Management*. Vol. 25- 1179-1197

MNRT, (2014). *TFS Three Years Implementation Report for the Financial Year 2011/2012-2013/2014*

Mowen, J.C. (1980). *On Product Endorsement Effectiveness: A Balanced Model Approach*. Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising. Vol. 3(1) 41-57

Munyoki, P.K. (2010). *Effectiveness of Co-branding as a Brand Strategy in the Credit Card Sector in Kenya*. University of Nairobi. Kenya

Mwakatobe, A & Mlingwa, C. (2005). Bees for Development. Honey Trade Workshop

Mwakatobe, A & Mlingwa, C. (2006). *The Stauts of Tanzanian Honey Trade- domestic and International Markets*. Tanzania Wild research Institute. Arusha Tanzania.

NBP, (1998) *National Beekeeping Policy of Tanzania*

Nchimbi, M.I (2002). *Gender and Entrepreneurship in Tanzania, a Comparative Analysis of Male-Female's Start up Motivation, Individual Characteristics and Perception Business Success*. A Dissertation for Award of PhD Degree at the University of Dar es salaam, Dar es salaam. Tanzania

Rao, A.R & Ruekert, R (1994). *Brand Alliance as Signals of Product Quality*. Sloan Management Review. Vol. 36(1) 87-97

Rao A.R et al., (1999). Signaling Unobservable Product Quality Through a Brand Ally. Journal of Marketing Research. Vol. 36(2) 258-268

Saunders, M et al., (2003). *Research Methods for Business Students*. 3rd ed. Harlow. Prentice Hall

Simon, C.J & Sullivan, M.W. (1993). *The Measurement and Determinants of Brand Equity: A Financial Approach*. Journal of Marketing Science. Vol. 12(1) 28-52

Simonin, B.L, & Ruth, J.A (1998). *Is a Company Known by the Company it Keeps? Assessing the Spillover Effects of Brand Alliance on Consumer Brand Attitudes*. Journal of Marketing Research. Vol. 35(1) 30-42

Solomon,M.R et al., (2009). *Consumer Behavior: Buying, Having and Being*. Upper Saddle River, NJ. Prentice Hall

URT (1998). National Beekeeping Policy. MNRT. Government Printer. Dar es salaam

Van Gelder, s. (2003). *Global Brand Strategy: Unlocking Brand Potential Across Countries, Cultures and Markets*. London. Kogan page

Walker, B.J et al., (2007). *Marketing*. 14th ed. McGraw-Hill & Irwin. New York.

Washburn, J.H et al., (2000). *Co-branding: Brand Equity and Trial Effects*. Journal of Consumer Marketing. Vol. 17(7) 591-604

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

PART A: General Information

1. Name of your firm/organization/company…………………………………………..

   Use (✓) to indicate whether your firm/organization/company is formal or informal

   a) Formal ☐
   b) Informal ☐

2. Please use (✓) to indicate the period of time your organization has been operating in the market

   c) Less than 3 years ☐
   d) 3 years – 5 years ☐
   e) 5 years – 10 years ☐
   f) More than 10 years ☐

3. Please use (✓) to indicate the nature of ownership of your firm/organization/company/Business

   a) Sole proprietorship ☐
   b) Joint ownership ☐
   c) Others ☐

   If others, please specify……………………………………………………………………

4. Please use (✓) to indicate your position/relationship with/in your firm/organization/company/Business

   a) Founder ☐
   b) High managerial position ☐

PART B: Adoption of Co-Branding Strategies

5. The statements bellow is used to represent different types/forms of co-branding strategies; please use 1 to indicate the practices that your business has adopted and 2 to indicate the practices (statements) that your business has not adopted (1-Yes, 2-No).

No	**Statement that describe forms of co-branding strategies**	YES	NO
		1	2
1	Our brand/product is used as an ingredient in other products/brands and become recognized by its name in promotion campaign		
2.	Our business uses celebrities/popular people/popular entities/popular blogs to promote our brand/product		
3	Our business cooperates with other brands in different events (e.g. CSR) so that our brand/products get well known		
4	Our business uses our brand in publicity events as a means for the medias to endorse or indirectly advertise our brand		
5	Our business collaborates with service providers (e.g. hotels and herbal clinics) to sell our brand.		
6	Our product uses two brands (our brand and our distributor's brand)		
7	Our business teams up with other online sellers to sell our brand		
8	Our business collaborates with the other partner to use a single name to sell our final product		
9	Our business collaborates with the other firms to produce different final products (e.g. soaps, candles, cosmetics, medicine etc.) using our brand/product.		
10	Our business collaborates with our suppliers to share competences and other resources to ensure production of superior product.		

6. Please use a scale of (1-5) to indicate the strongest reasons for the adoption of co-branding strategies (1-Very important, 2-Important, 3-To some extent important, 4-Not important, 5-Not sure)

No	**Reasons for the adoption of co-branding strategies**	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Sharing resources					
2.	Leveraging the secondary association of the partner brand					
3.	Easily increasing an efficiency					
4.	To enhance easy access to the customers					
5.	To share risks					
6	To increase sales and profit					
7	To advance the quality of your product					
8	Influence from the other partner					
9	To eliminate competitors in the market					
10	To control the market demand and supply					

7. Please use 1, 2 and 3 to indicate whether there is an increase, decrease, or stay the same of the bellow indicators of performance as the result of co-branding strategies adoption in your business (1-Decreased, 2-Stay the same, 3-Increased)

No	Indicator	Response
1.	Sales revenue	
2.	Profit	
3	Number of customers	

PART C: Challenges in the Adoption of Co-Branding Strategies

8. Please use a scale of 1-5 to indicate the strongest challenges in the adoption of the statements that represent co-branding strategies (1-Strongly Agree, 2-Agree, 3-Neutral, 4-Disagree, 5- Strongly Disagree)

No	**Challenges for adoption of co-branding strategies**	**Scale**				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Readiness of the partners to partner					
2.	Fear of negative consequences of co-branding strategies					
3.	Lack of expertise to facilitate the adoption of the strategies					
4.	Lack Management/Owner-manager support on adoption					
5.	Desire of full autonomy to control the product/production					
6	Customers do not prioritize co-branded products					
7	Complexity of the strategies					
8	Lack of trust among other partner					
9	Lack of commitment of other partner					
10	Lack of expertise of other partner					