EPRA International Journal of Socio-Economic and Environmental Outlook (SEEO) ISSN: 2348-4101
Volume: 9 | Issue: 11 | November 2022 | SJIF Impact Factor: 7.426 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0314 | Peer-Reviewed Journal

ENHANCING ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS OF NIGERIA'S CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES THROUGH BETTER COST LEADERSHIP

Clement, M. Clement[1], Dr. C. Amah[2], Prof. C.O. Ofurum

[1]*DBA Student University of Port Harcourt Business School, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria*
[2]*Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria*
[3]*Department of Accounting, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria*

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between cost leadership and the organizational success of construction companies in Nigeria. Organizational success was measured using market share, and competitiveness. The cross-sectional form of the quasi-experimental research design was adopted for this work. A population of 1851 (one thousand eight hundred and fifty-one) was obtained. The Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table was used to arrive at a sample size of 331 (three hundred and thirty-one). The questionnaire was the main instrument for data collection. Construct and convergent validity were carried out and reliability was tested using the Cronbach Alpha test. Hypotheses were tested using Pearson Moment Correlation. Findings revealed a significant relationship between cost leadership and organizational success. The study concluded that cost leadership is key to the success of construction firms given their peculiarities. The study recommended the management of the construction firms in Nigeria should advance policies and functional frameworks that serve to regulate and prioritize their values when it comes to survival and the success of the organization. It also affirms that cost leadership has positive effects on the behavior of the organization and as such contributes substantially to its success. This adds to the body of literature, enriching content on the role of survival strategies and clarifying its implications for organizational outcomes.

KEYWORDS: ***Cost Leadership, Market Share, Organizational Success, Competitiveness.***

1. INTRODUCTION

The business environment is at its all-time volatility level, characterized by a high degree of uncertainty, an unpredictable business environment, and a cloud of complexity hanging over it Awa, Ojiabo, and Best (2017). The Nigerian economy makes business operations even more difficult, especially for construction firms in Nigeria. The sky-reaching inflation rate, a volatile foreign exchange market, and low government revenue have made the construction industry a less attractive one. The government's lack of revenue has affected their investment in construction and construction companies are now faced with a battle for survival as competition is now at a bottleneck Gabriel (2015). The construction industry in Nigeria has been at the receiving end of economic hardship as workers are continuously cut down to keep the organization afloat, one challenge before the organization today is a strategy to survive and navigate this reality.

Organizational success is a central issue in organizational studies, and growth is often believed to be an adequate indicator of such. As Ahmed and Elhag (2017) remarked, in general, organizational growth is an implicit assumption in research studies because it is generally assumed that 'growth is synonymous with effectiveness', that 'bigger is better, and that 'there is a positive correlation between size and age' (Ahmed & Elhag, 2017). Other definitions of success emphasize the time dimension. For example, according to Al Hila and Al Shobaki (2017), success is related to the degree to which the firms can achieve their objectives subject to the constraints of long-run viability. A related notion is organizational self-perpetuation (Al-Dhaafri, Al-Swidi & Al-Ansi, 2016), i.e., the firm's ability to survive its members. On the other hand, the organizational life cycle perspective (Ahmed & Elhag, 2017; Al-Dhaafri, Al-Swidi & Yusoff, 2016) predicts that sooner or later, organizations enter the decline phase and face death.

A major contributory area to organizational success is the development of strategies for business continuity. Organizational success in a market economy is dependent on the optimal utilization of relevant resources such as financial resources, material resources, and human resources. It is through the combination of these resources that the attainment of the goal is achieved. However, the attainment of organizational success is dependent on an organization's ability to adapt to change and be innovative. success has been the major objective of any organization be it small, medium, or large in the area of profit, people, and the planet but this has not always been the case for many insurance firms due to its volatile environment and the appropriateness of strategies to adopt for their success.

Cost leadership strategies support a firm's ability to supply a product or service at a lower cost than its rivals (Birjandi, Jahromi, Darasi & Birjandi, 2014). The basic operating assumption behind a low-cost leadership strategy is to acquire a considerable cost advantage over other competitors which will be passed on to consumers to realize an outsized market share. According to Cavusgil, Ghauri, and Akcal (2013), a low-cost strategy then produces a competitive advantage when the firm can earn a higher profit margin than results from selling products at current market prices. In many cases, firms attempting to execute low-cost strategies aim to sell a product or service that appeals to a mean customer during a broad target market.

Cost leadership strategies are based on a firm's ability to provide a product or service at a lower cost than its rivals (Birjandi, Jahromi, Darasi & Birjandi, 2014). The basic operating assumption behind a low-cost leadership strategy is to acquire a substantial cost advantage over other competitors that can be passed on to consumers to gain a large market share. According to Cavusgil, Ghauri, and Akcal (2013), a low-cost strategy then produces a competitive advantage when the firm can earn a higher profit margin than results from selling products at current market prices. In many cases, firms attempting to execute low-cost strategies aim to sell a product that appeals to an average customer in a broad target market. Thus, this study seeks to examine the effect of cost leadership and organizational success of insurance firms in Port Harcourt.

1.1 Statement of Problem

The quest for success and success has been of great concern to major players in most industries in Nigeria and the construction industry is not exempted. The construction industry in Nigeria has gone for a very long time without achieving the expected level of success. This is heavily attributed to factors such as an unstable economy; a stable economy promotes the necessary investments in construction activities which is a prerequisite for achieving a viable industry that can help sustain economic growth (Roman & Munuera, 2005). Construction companies are sensitive to economic fundamentals and sometimes have to factor in a lot of economic variables to make the right investment decisions. These variables include foreign exchange reserves, government debt, government deficits, inflation, interest rates, and exchange rates which have all suffered in recent years as a result of Nigeria's financial indiscipline and misappropriation.

What this means is that for the construction industry to thrive and attain its potential, the government must be sincere in promoting a favorable environment that will allow private economic businesses to thrive and encourage private sector involvement in construction. This will help increase the operational efficiency of the construction industry (Milne & Culnan, 2004). It is because of these challenges this work sets out to highlight strategies for organizational success in the construction industry with a focus on the six South-South states of Nigeria.

1.2 Aim/Objectives of the Study

This study aims to investigate the relationship between cost leadership and organizational success. The study however has some specific objectives:

i. To ascertain the relationship between cost leadership and market share.
ii. To examine the relationship between cost leadership and competitiveness.

1.3 Scope of the Study

This study covers areas of cost leadership and organizational success which have market share and competitiveness in its proxies. Geographically, this study will encompass all employees, supervisors, and managers of construction companies in six south-south states in Nigeria. This study will be carried out at the organizational level.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Cost Leadership

As people do not work in isolation but need to be guided and inspired, an important asset that helps to organize, and induces inspiration and motivation is the Leader. Traditionally, Leader rule by issuing instructions under which employees are expected to comply. However, motivation involves fundamentally altering how we think about the workforce and the employment relationship (Pfeffer, 2005). Inspirational leaders which also mean transformational leaders influence their subordinates to do more than they were originally expected to do thereby subtly giving them room to self-actualize. Armstrong (2001) has described four main characteristics of a transformational leader and they are Ethical behaviors, sharing of visions and goals, improving performance through charismatic leadership, and leading by example. Achieving success in the organization means working with people, encouraging them, and continually refining their performance. Always employees beheld their leaders for motivation, direction, and acknowledgment. Leaders, who are thus able to inspire and innovate, experience a workforce that is both positive and enthusiastic about their work and makes a tremendous difference to the atmosphere, the quality of work, and the level of productivity (Maughan, 2009).

Cost leadership strategy refers to gaining a competitive advantage by charging sustainably lower prices than other competitors (Porter, 2001). This will be achieved by reducing costs incurred in production and distribution to lower the general cost of items. In business sectors where there is value control, this is still conceivable through computerization, adaptability, and enhanced generation along these lines dispensing with the extensive rate of inefficiencies in the creation process. At the point when an organization continues bringing down costs without a reduction in operating costs, it risks it runs the risk of depletion of resources and becoming insolvent, particularly in a wildly aggressive competitive market (Woodruff, 2007). This system confronts numerous difficulties in various areas and is just pertinent in specific situations, for example, in manufacturing where the level of yield is higher when contrasted with the business sector estimate consequently having the capacity to accomplish economies of scale.

Cost leadership strategies are based on a firm's ability to provide a product or service at a lower cost than its rivals (Birjandi, Jahromi, Darasi & Birjandi, 2014). The basic operating assumption behind a low-cost leadership strategy is to acquire a substantial cost advantage over other competitors that can be passed on to consumers to gain a large market share. According to Cavusgil, Ghauri, and Akcal (2013), a low-cost strategy then produces a competitive advantage when the firm can earn a higher profit margin than results from selling products at current market prices. In many cases, firms attempting to execute low-cost strategies aim to sell a product that appeals to an average customer in a broad target market. Cost leadership strategy is the dominant strategy for this industry and the company, which can achieve the lowest cost position, will emerge as a winner in this deflated market. Otherwise, once the competitors reach the same cost level and engage in price wars, all the cost advantages will be lost, handing over all the benefits that were achieved through a cost leadership strategy to the customers.

2.2 Organizational Success

Researchers and practitioners have struggled to define organizational success in both profit and non-profit organizations, and more specifically, organizations in the insurance sector (Lee & Nowell, 2015; Sawhill & Williamson, 2001; Turbide & Laurin, 2009). Although performance measurement primarily started as a financial practice, researchers indicate that it ought to be a multidimensional process including financial indicators, internal management systems, and processes, and alignment to the strategic initiatives derived from mission statements (Kaplan, 2001; Lee & Nowell, 2015). The crucial element is how to measure alignment with the mission statements. Different researchers have conceptualized alignment to mission goals in different ways. Some research focuses on overarching concepts that can relate to any organization, such as organizational perceived performance, goal attainment, quality of services provided, growth, and balanced budgets (Brown & Iverson, 2004). Others have focused on creating goals that directly align with elements found in the mission (Sawhill & Williamson, 2001). However, as Kaplan (2001) reminds us, there is a need to link the key accountability component to the organization (i.e., service provided) and the environment (i.e., those served).

Success in today's highly competitive marketplace will impose new and different demands on organizations. In many industries, a variety of highly similar products and services proliferate to the point where it is not uncommon for customers to have difficulty differentiating one from another. The road to corporate success no longer can be traversed merely with good products and clever marketing. Now, more than ever, companies must look to their human resource, not just to their goods and services, as a primary means to ensure continued profitability, if not success. The chauffeur along the road to success will be employees who are very efficient and effective at their daily tasks and responsibilities.

However, organizational success depends on human capital development, which is the employee and other resources both tangible and intangible. There is a large and growing body of evidence that demonstrates a positive linkage between the development of human capital and organizational success. The emphasis on human capital in organizations reflects the view that market value depends less on tangible resources, but rather on intangible ones, particularly human resources. Recruiting and retaining the best employees, however, is only part of the equation. The organization also has to leverage the skills and capabilities of its employees by encouraging individual and organizational learning and creating a supportive environment where knowledge can be created, shared, and applied and this can be done through the organization management where decisions can be reached concerning the future of the organization as well as the individual that drives the success of the organization.

It is commonly believed that an organization is successful when it can achieve certain outcomes that allow it to be profitable and competitive in its industry or marketplace. The exact nature of these outcomes depends on the organization itself but can include such things as the realization of certain sales, revenues, or market share levels, the attainment of certain production figures, the maintenance of certain quality standards, or even the occurrence of certain safety records. Each of these outcomes is a global or composite index of how a company is doing as a whole. Organizations are accustomed to examining their global outcomes as a routine part of tracking corporate well-being and success. Global outcomes are not the result of one or two people or even a single department.

2.3 Market Share

Increasing market share is one of the most important objectives of a business, especially in a competitive market (Fadipe, 2009). Market share is a strong indicator of a firm's competitiveness in the industry. A firm's market share and market position are an indicator of how well the firm is doing against competitors. It is used not only to judge the total market growth or decline but to monitor the trends of customer acceptance or rejection of their products against competitors' products in the market and the industry (Oyefesobi, 2013). It should be noted that sales growth or market share growth that occurs as a result of primary demand for a firm's products is less costly and more profitable than what is gained or achieved through capturing market share from competitors. To this extent, losses in market share will pose a long-term danger to an organization; this may however require a strategic approach one of which is diversification. In most instances, organizations make use of a diversification strategy because their present lines of business can no more be expanded. Finding an alternative investment opportunity requires the firm to consider alternatives in other types of business (Graham, Micheal, & Jack, 2002). Firms may also pursue an unrelated diversification strategy as a means of increasing the firm's growth rate and market share. Growth in sales may move the firm to assume different market positions as the case may be. Growth in sales may also make the company more attractive to investors and give the executive more power and prestige. Unrelated diversification will be effective if the new area has growth opportunities greater than those available in the existing line of business. This will enable firms to achieve growth in sales and invariably achieve increment in the market share i.e., in the industry and to a firm in totality.

The aspect of the organization's market share is one of the organization's strategic plans. It means how a firm can increase sales, assets, and profit in an industry. It is about the position of a firm in the industry concerning the percentage of the sales it controls or has a share of it in that industry. The issue of market share is centered on competitive marketing strategy. Kotler (1980, 2004) opined that a market share structure is based on the market position of the firm in an industry which can be divided into four market positions (i) Market Leader (ii) Market Challenger (iii) Market follower (iv) Niches. Olomi (2004) stated that when the number of products produced by the business increases, it means invariably that the market share of the firm is also increasing. One significant fact about the market share position of a firm is that it gives them a "market power" which Shepherd (1970) says is the ability of a market participant or group participant to influence price, quality, and the nature of the product in the marketplace.

Market share is the percentage of a market (defined in terms of either units or revenue) accounted for by a specific entity. In a survey of nearly 200 senior marketing managers, 67% responded that they found the revenue-"dollar market share" metric very useful, while 61% found "unit market share" very useful. Marketers need to be able to translate and incorporate sales targets into a market share because this will demonstrate whether forecasts are to be attained by growing with the market or by capturing share from competitors. The latter will almost always be more difficult to achieve. Market share is closely monitored for signs of change in the competitive landscape, and it frequently drives strategic or tactical action. Increasing market share is one of the most important objectives of the business. The main advantage of using market share as a measure of business performance is that it is less dependent upon macro-environmental variables such as the state of the economy or changes in tax policy. In the United States market, however, increasing market share may be dangerous for makers of fungible and potentially hazardous products such as medicine, due to a US-only legal doctrine called market share liability (Beri, 2006).

Rego, Morgan, and Fornell, (2013) opined that market share measures a company's market penetration and, to some extent, the selling unit is responsible for it. Safarnia, Akbari, and Abbasi, (2011) stated that competitive sales performance constitutes a natural benchmark for evaluating selling units' market performance. Market share brings the added dimension of industry sales and consequently, competitive performance. Market share is said to be a key indicator of market competitiveness—that is, how well a firm is doing against its competitors. Somarathna (2016), opined that sales growth resulting from primary demand (total market growth) is less costly and more profitable than that achieved by capturing share from competitors. Conversely, losses in market share can signal serious long-term problems that require strategic adjustments. Firms with market shares require strategic adjustments. Firms with market shares firm product lines and market share trends for individual products are considered early indicators of future opportunities or problems (Song, Nason, Anthony & Benedetto, 2018). Increasing market share is one of the most important objectives of business The main advantage of using market share as a measure of business performance is that it is less dependent upon macro-environmental variables such as the state of the economy. Market share provides a clear indication of a firm's standing in its market. Increasing or even maintaining sales volume and/or profits in a declining market are indicative of higher market performance than the same achievement in a fast-expanding market.

2.4 Competitiveness

Organizations face globalization, faster environmental changes, higher competition, and complex requirements of clients. This tendency of constant change, rivalry, and open markets increase competitive pressure on all the firms that participate in the industry, introducing concepts such as innovation, flexibility, and differentiation from competitors (Baker & Sinkula, 1999). Academics and practitioners have studied competitiveness from different levels: National, regional, industry, and firm levels. The first level analyzed the competitiveness of a nation, which according to Porter (1980) focuses on the concept of productivity, to achieve a better level of life for residents of a nation. Another definition is proposed by the World Economic Forum (2017-2018), considering competitiveness at this level as a set of institutions, policies, and determinant factors of the productivity of a country. This level understands the construct from a macro level. The second level analyzed the Competitiveness as a region, industry, or cluster, the objective is achieving better performance and obtaining competitive advantages. These levels understand and analyze the importance of collective associations of people, companies, and public institutions for developing competitiveness at this level (Ilpes, 2003).

Competitiveness describes the extent to which the organization is aggressive in driving its success and goals (Jiang, Chai, Shao, & Feng, 2018). Organizational competitiveness is considered unavoidable when organizations have to advance their service features to draw in customers alongside other organizations with similar goals. That is to say, markets that have organizations vying for the attention and interest of shared customers tend to engage in competition or perceive themselves as competitors. Jacobs, Vickery, and Droge (2007) opined that competitiveness ensures the relevance and survival of the organization, and within highly populated markets, requires that organizations not only advance innovations that address existing gaps but also adopt features and structures that are engaging. Competitiveness is considered as a relative factor and as earlier noted, is more severe in some contexts than others. Lee and Walsh (2016) affirmed that service industries are some of the most competitive; this is reflected in their advancement of technologies and processes that in most cases can be disruptive and unsettling.

Competitiveness has been described as a multidimensional and relative concept (Nachiappan, Gunasekaran, Yu & Ning 2014), that changes with context and time. It embraces different approaches, from classical theories of mercantilism, which introduced the notion of trade rivalry between nations, to absolute advantages of notions, the theories of competitive and comparative advantages, and up to neoclassical critiques of the international competitiveness of countries (Razvan, & Moisoiu, 2015). It constitutes a major economic objective in the current context of globalization, and rapid technological change and is frequently invoked by policymakers worldwide (Salvador, Rodríguez, & Luque, 2015). Competitiveness defines the economic strength of an entity concerning its competitor and it has the country, industrial and enterprise perspectives (Sadegh, Senin, & Tourani, 2015). There is no agreed definition of national competitiveness (Chiang, Wu, Hsieh, & Chen, 2008). However, the WEF, (2013) refers to national competitiveness as a set of institutions, policies, and factors that determine the level of productivity of a country (Schwab, 2013). Chiang et al (2008) defined national competitiveness as a measure of the relative ability of a nation to create and maintain an environment in which enterprises can compete so that the level of prosperity can be improved. According to Wilfred, Matoke, Yegon, and Egessa, (2014) organizational competitiveness refers to its ability to create more economic value than other competing firms. On the other hand, enterprise competitiveness refers to its ability to design (Yosuke, & Shibata, 2013), produce, and/or market products superior to those offered by competitors, considering the price and non-price product qualities (Sadegh, et al 2015).

2.5 Cost Leadership and Organizational Success

A study carried out by Atikiya, Mukulu, Kihoro, and Waiganjo (2015) examined the relationship between cost leadership strategy and the performance of manufacturing firms in Kenya. A survey questionnaire and an interview guide were used to collect data from 131 firms drawn from 12 key industrial subsectors located within Nairobi and its environs. The study adopted a descriptive and explanatory research design. The findings revealed that the performance of manufacturing firms is significantly influenced by cost leadership strategy. However, the study used an explanatory research design which uses small sample sizes, and thus findings cannot be generalized to a larger population.

Marangu, Mwiti, and Thoronjo's (2017) study analyzed the influence of cost leadership strategy on organizations' competitiveness of Sugar Firms in Kenya. A descriptive cross-sectional research design was used in this study. Questionnaires were the data collection instrument of this study mainly to collect the primary data. Correlation analysis was carried out to measure the strength of the association between cost leadership strategies. The study concluded that there was a statistically significant influence of cost leadership strategy on organization competitiveness. However, the study was based on Sugar Firms in Kenya using a descriptive cross-sectional research design.

Chepchirchir, Omillo, and Munyua's (2018) study investigated the effect of Cost Leadership Strategy on the Organizational Performance of Logistics Firms at Jomo Kenyatta International Airport, Kenya. The study data came from 10 logistics firms with active websites operating at JKIA Nairobi. The respondents identified were selected using a simple random sampling technique. Analysis of data involved the use of descriptive and inferential statistics. It was found that cost leadership had a significant positive effect on logistics firms' performance. However, the study focused on Logistics Firms at Jomo Kenyatta International Airport, Kenya.

Musila (2013) analyzed the growth strategies and the competitive advantage of commercial banks in Kenya. His research intended to establish growth strategies used by commercial banks in Kenya. Operating with a sample size of 45 respondents the study applied to mean, standard deviation, and regression analysis to analyze data. The researcher established that commercial banks in Kenya adopt growth strategies to achieve a competitive advantage in the market. The study also established expansion strategy as one of the many strategies that banks have adopted. The study concluded that firms need to use product development strategies comprising of redesigning the existing product to suit customers and as a result, will lead to market expansion. The study recommended that the firms should have clear formulation and plan the implementation of strategies, and ensure these strategies are implemented, ensure the staffs have the right knowledge and skills for these strategies to become a success. Also, the firm should participate in social responsibilities as this will enable customers to have their firms in mind.

3. METHODOLOGY

A survey design was adopted for its descriptive nature, causal relations, and power to draw inferences from particular to general through the use of statistical control and appropriate test statistic. Specifically, an explanatory and cross-sectional survey through the use of a self-reported questionnaire was adopted; the choice of this design was informed by the nature of the phenomena of interest. For instance, change is best investigated in a given context defined as conditions and participants. The explanatory survey measures antecedent factors that cause change (cause-and-effect); thereby, leading to the building and/or validating theories as well as predicting and controlling the phenomena under investigation. The cross-sectional study measures the snapshot of opinions of management and subordinate staff of the construction industry in Nigeria.

The population represents the entire set of cases from where the sampling units are drawn - it is the total of the units of analysis that conforms to the laid-down standards. More specifically, we focused on staff in firms located in Port-Harcourt (Rivers State), Uyo (Akwa Ibom State), and Yenegoa (Bayelsa state). The choice of these three cities and states was informed by proximity. A preliminary investigation shows that a total of 45 construction companies exist in the three states studied. One thousand, eight hundred and fifty-one (1851) management and subordinate staff are in the (9) selected firms. The firms were selected on the basis that they employ over 500 employees. The determination of the sample size was done using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table and the result was 331. This study generates primary data by carefully constructing data collection instruments needed to obtain valid, relevant, and standardized information from the subjects. Questionnaire instruments were used; the choice is based on their simplicity, cost-effectiveness, higher reliability, more objectivity. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to analyze the data obtained from the questionnaire.

4 .ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

A total of 331 (100%) questionnaire copies were distributed based on the adopted sample size, and 326 (98%) copies were retrieved successfully from the target organizations however, after collation and the error assessment of the retrieved copies, only 291 (88%) copies were considered admissible in the study. It was observed that 35 copies had issues with some sections which were either blank or were even missing from the questionnaire.

Table 4.1 Relationship between cost leadership and the measures of organizational success

		Cost Leadership	Market Share	Innovativeness	Competitiveness
Cost Leadership	Pearson Correlation	1	.976**	.983**	.981**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	291	291	291	291
Market Share	Pearson Correlation	.976**	1	.983**	.972**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	291	291	291	291
Competitiveness	Pearson Correlation	.981**	.972**	.992**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	291	291	291	291

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

SPSS output, Version 25

The result from the analysis of the relationship between cost leadership and the measures of organizational success is stated as follows:

i. The relationship between cost leadership and market share has a correlation coefficient of rho = 0.976 at a P = 0.000. The null hypothesis is rejected based on the evidence of significant associations between the variables.
ii. The relationship between cost leadership and competitiveness has a correlation coefficient of rho = 0.981 at a P = 0.000. The null hypothesis is rejected based on the evidence of significant associations between the variable

The result from the tests presents cost leadership as a significant predictor of the measures of organizational success. This is because the evidence shows that cost leadership contributes significantly and positively towards measures such as market share, innovativeness, and competitiveness. Based on the evidence all hypothetical statements about the relationship between cost leadership and the measures of organizational success are rejected.

In line with the facts and results generated in this study, it is affirmed that survival strategies such as cost leadership, are crucial to the well-being and success of construction firms, particularly in Port-Harcourt (Rivers State), Uyo (Akwa Ibom State), and Yenegoa (Bayelsa state). The related findings of this study reveal that Cost leadership contributes significantly and positively toward outcomes of organizational success such as market share and competitiveness

The findings of this study, identify cost leadership as a significant predictor of the outcomes of organizational success such as market share, and competitiveness. Cost leadership as a strategy of survival emphasizes the control and the minimization of cost in the actions and behavior of the organization. The purpose of the cost leadership strategy in line with Ramaswamy and Namakumari (2011) is to take advantage of the distinctive benefits of the organization in facing the challenges of the atmosphere. The productive companies build their strategic priority to create their core competencies and semi-permanent competitive blessings, so they're going to serve the importance keep a copy of the business-level methods of the business units within the corporation. To amass competitive advantage in any market, a firm must be ready to deliver a given set of client benefits at lower prices than competitors or offer customers a bundle of advantages its rivals cannot match. Hsu (2016) insists that costing plays a significant role in the product strategy, encompassing three different mixes that is the market and needs, key features and differentiators, and business goals. Product strategy requires a long-term vision by the organization. It is a serious work of research that requires to have data on the different market needs, and the business goals that the product aims to undertake. Gautam (2015), in his reference to high technology companies, explains that cost leadership strategy and its control and emphasis on the optimal utilization of the organization's resources is rather a function that should be approached in a very consistent and cohesive manner.

5. CONCLUSION

This study examined the association between cost leadership and organizational success of construction companies in three States (Rivers, Bayelsa, and Akwa Ibom States) in Nigeria. As a survey, the study adopted a quantitative methodological stance, emphasizing more on the summarizing and generalization of observations, with participants selected from a sampling frame established based on their involvement within the industry and the specified context of the investigation.

The findings of the tests reveal that cost leadership significantly contributes to enhancing the outcomes of organizational success in the examined organizations. The results indicated highly significant associations between cost leadership and the measures of organizational success; this is as strategies and practices which can be regarded as focused on establishing cost leadership, differentiation and focus are observed to significantly impact the success of the organization. In the same vein, related strategies of survival, when integrated within the context of the culture of the organization, enhance outcomes of success for the organization. Hence all null hypotheses and previous assumptions of none significant associations between the study variables were based on this observed empirical evidence rejected.

The conclusions of this study are drawn and premised primarily on the results of its empirical activities about the investigation of the relationship between the variables (cost leadership and organizational success) of the study. The study thus concludes that cost leadership is a significant antecedent of organizational success. This is premised on the observation that the evidence of cost leadership significantly impacts the market share and competitiveness of construction organizations in Nigeria.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations put forward herein are based on the evidence and conclusions of the study. The study thus recommends that the adoption of cost leadership by the construction firms in Nigeria should emphasize the effective control and management of resources in ways that build on the organization's choices of suppliers, networks, and even its monitoring of its behavior – all of which would determine its ability to address its efficiency concerns

REFERENCES

1. *Ahmed, A. & Elhag, L. (2017). The Impact of Strategic Attributes on Organizational Performance in Pakistan Banking Sector: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences. 7, 12 - 30.*
2. *Armstrong, M. (2001). A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*
3. *Atikiya, R., Mukulu, E., Kihoro, J., & Waiganjo, E. (2015). Effect of cost leadership strategy on the performance of manufacturing firms in Kenya. Strategic Journals, 2(8), 134- 143*
4. *Baker, W.E. & Sinkula, J.M. (1999) The Synergistic Effect of Market Orientation and Learning Orientation on Organizational Performance. Academy of Marketing Science Journal, 27, 411 - 432*
5. *Birjandi, H., Jahromi, N. M., Darasi, S. M., & Birjandi, M. (2014). The Effect of Cost Leadership Strategy on ROA and Future Performance of Accepted Companies in Tehran Stock Exchange. Research Journal of Finance and Accounting, 5(70, 152 – 158*
6. *Brown, W.A. & Iverson, J.O. (2004). Exploring strategies and board structure in non-profit organizations. Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly, 33(3), 377-400.*
7. *Cavusgil, S. T., Ghauri, P. N. & Akcal, A. A. (2013). Doing Business in Emerging Markets, 2 and ed., SAGE, London*
8. *Chepchirchir, A. B., Omillo, F., & Munyua, J. (2018). Effect of Cost Leadership Strategy on Organizational Performance of Logistics Firms at Jomo Kenyatta International Airport, Kenya. European Journal of Management and Marketing Studies, 2(1), 123 – 132*
9. *Chiang, K., Wu, W.Y., Hsieh, W.J., & Chen, L.H., (2008) Measuring the national competitiveness of Southeast Asian countries. Eur J Oper Res 187: 613-628.*
10. *Fadipe, J.O. (2009). Change and innovation process in formal organization. Educational Management: Theories and Tasks.*
11. *Graham, J., Micheal, L., & Jack, L., (2002) Does corporate diversification destroy value? Journal of Finance 57, 695-720*
12. *Jacobs, M., Vickery, S., & Droge, C., (2007). The effects of product modularity on competitive performance: Do integration strategies mediate the relationship? International Journal of Operations and Production Management 27 (10), 1046-1068.*
13. *Jiang, W., Chai, H., Shao, J. & Feng, T. (2018), "Green entrepreneurial orientation for enhancing firm performance: a dynamic capability perspective", Journal of Cleaner Production, 19(8), 311-1323*
14. *Kaplan, R. (2001). The Nature of the View from Home: Psychological Benefits. Environment and Behavior, 33(4), 507–542.*

15. *Lee, C. & Nowell, B. (2015). A Framework for Assessing the Performance of Nonprofit Organizations. American Journal of Evaluation. 36. 64 -81*
16. *Lee, Y.-N. & Walsh, J.P. (2016), "Inventing while you work: knowledge, non-R and D learning and innovation", Research Policy, 45(1), 345-359.*
17. *Marangu, N. W. Mwiti, E., & Thoronjo, E. (2017). Analysis of Cost Leadership Strategy Influence on Organizations' Competitiveness of Sugar Firms in Kenya. European Journal of Business and Management, 9(28), 38 – 40*
18. *Maughan, E.D. (2009). Validity and Reliability: What Do These Terms Mean? NASN School Nurse, 24(3), 119–120.*
19. *Musila, J.W. (2013). "Does Democracy Have a Different Impact on Corruption in Africa?" Journal of African Business, 14(3), 162-170.*
20. *Nachiappan S, Gunasekaran A, Yu J, & Ning K (2014) Customer satisfaction and competitiveness in the Chinese E-retailing: Structural equation modeling (SEM) approach to identify the role of quality factors. Expert Systems with Applications 41: 69-80.*
21. *Oyefesobi, O.O. (2013). Environmental scanning and diversification strategy in selected diversified manufacturing firms in Lagos and Ogun State. Ph.D. Thesis, Babcock University, Ilishan- Remo*
22. *Porter, M.E. (2001). The Value Chain and Competitive Advantage. In Understanding Business: Processes. New York: The Free Press.*
23. *Razvan, V, & Moisoiu, C (2015) Competitiveness, Theoretical and Policy Approaches. Towards a more competitive EU. Procedia Economics and Finance 22: 512-521.*
24. *Rego, L.L., Morgan, N.A. & Fornell, C (2013) Reexamining the market share–customer satisfaction relationship. Journal of Marketing 1(7): 1-20.*
25. *Sadegh, R., Azadeh, T. & Aslan, S. (2015). Effect of Organizational Factors on University-Industry Collaboration: A Conceptual Model. International Journal of Business and Management. 10, 88 - 98*
26. *Safarnia, H., Akbari, Z., & A. Abbasi, (2011). Review of market orientation & competitive advantage in the industrial estate's companies (Kerman, Iran): Appraisal of the model by Amos graphics. World Journal of Social Sciences, 1(5): 132-150.*
27. *Salvador, P., Rodríguez, M.B., & Luque, M., (2015) Assessing global competitiveness under multi-criteria perspective. Economic Modelling.*
28. *Sawhill, J. & Williamson, D. (2001). Mission Impossible? Measuring Success in Nonprofit Organizations. Nonprofit Management and Leadership. 11. 371 - 386. 10.1002/nml.11309.*
29. *Schwab K (2013) The global competitiveness report 2013-2014. WEF.*
30. *Somarathna, K.Y.J., (2016). Strategic orientation and organizational performance; The case of Sri Lankan SMEs. International Conference of Inclusive Innovation and Innovative Management.*
31. *Song, M., R.W. Nason, C. Anthony and D. Benedetto, 2018. Distinctive marketing information technology capabilities and strategic types: A cross-national investigation. Journal of International Marketing, 16(1): 4-38.*
32. *Turbide, J. & Laurin, C. (2009). Performance measurement in the arts sector: The case of the performing arts. International Journal of Arts Management. 11. 56-70.*
33. *Wilfred, N.M., Matoke, J., Yegon, R., & Egessa, R., (2014) Moderating effect of Organizational Factors on the relationship between Diversification Strategies and Competitiveness: Case of Sugar Firms in Kenya. Eur J Bus Manag. 2(2)*
34. *Yosuke, K., & Shibata, S., (2013) Organizational Factors in the Product Design Development Process. Int J Bus Manage 8: 15-26.*