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This study analyses the function of value co-creation in mediating the relationship between brand orientation, brand performance, and innovation capacities in China’s small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Using the organization’s size differential characteristic, additional testing of these criteria across disaggregated SME levels is performed. The empirical examination of 240 enterprises in an emerging market setting was conducted using Structure Equation Modeling (SEM). According to the results of the moderation and mediation research, value co-creation and capabilities often displayed positive moderating effects across all organization sizes, but they are conditional and not invariant when disaggregated by enterprise size. The research reveals that business owners and managers must decide the most successful complements to their brand orientation efforts based on the appropriate combinations of business abilities for the size of their particular firms.
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Introduction

Studies on strategic orientation (SO) have garnered a lot of attention in the field of business studies because of the function that it plays in assisting management choices and allowing organizations to achieve higher levels of performance. Companies who place a higher value on their brands have greater success in the financial markets compared to competitors that place a lower value on their brands. There is evidence in the academic literature to show that the capacity of businesses to get SOs is controlled by a combination of internal and external factors. According to research conducted by Piha et al. (2021), the brand orientation and performance of Finnish businesses are affected by external influences. Experts are led to conclude, among other things, that due to the competitive nature of business environments, following a single orientation may have less of a direct influence on performance than seeking complementarities. In
the existing body of research, the question of whether or whether companies of any size should pursue multiple orientations in addition to their core competencies, as well as the question of how such an activity would improve the companies’ overall level of success, is still open for debate (Gul et al., 2021a).

However, there are important holes in both management research and management practice that need to be filled by academics. These holes need to be filled. The existing study on brand orientation has not been able to provide any evidence that the relationship between brand orientation and business competence has any impact on the success of companies (Balmer, 2021; Gul et al., 2021b). To begin, there is no scientific evidence to back up the assumption that the size of the corporation has any bearing on whether or not these links exist. Because authentic information from small and medium-sized firms (SMEs) is frequently disregarded, the literature pertaining to brand orientation comes across as hazy. This is especially the case in emerging economies. It is tough for management to decide how to combine organizational strengths with larger corporate proclivities since there are theoretical gaps, and the business landscape as a whole makes it much more complicated. Many small and medium-sized companies (SMBs), as a result of the fast rise of digital economies, are still confused of how to adopt technology solutions into their day-to-day operations. This is a major obstacle for these organizations (Pardeshi and Khanna, 2021).

According to Al Ashq and Hossain (2019) small and medium-sized companies (SMEs) in a variety of developing nations typically do not have access to the resources that are required to compete in a market space that is dominated by multinational firms. In addition, because of shifts in the way people consume information, small and medium-sized businesses (SMEs) are being forced to embrace social media in order to communicate with the customers they want to attract. However, there is no information available about whether or not these businesses could successfully implement this change. There are theoretical and practical holes in both research and practice as a direct result of the issues that have been presented thus far. Until further data is developed to back up these statements, the debate in the published research on the management of small businesses will not be resolved (Chang et al., 2018; Jamil et al., 2021a). In order to solve the highlighted gaps between academics and practice, our conceptual model is assessed using real data from businesses operating in a market that is still in the process of development. As a result, the findings of this study contribute to our existing understanding of the development of the practice of aligning SOs with the capabilities of organizations in order to improve performance.

It has been shown that the managerial orientations of a firm may have both positive and negative consequences on the performance of the organization. Many people believe that branding and new technologies, such as social media, are complementing skills that, for the purpose of achieving optimal performance, should be utilized together (Foroudi, 2020). It is believed that there may be a connection between innovation and marketing through the use of this new hybrid component of the promotion mix. No matter how remarkable these strategic qualities are, research shows that the complementing advantages they give to different organizations are not always the same. This is the case even when comparing organizations of the same type. In a similar vein, the research that has been conducted in the field of business management has not investigated the linearity of the interaction affects that social media and innovation have on the link between brand orientation and firm performance (Jamil et al., 2021b). As a result, the purpose of this research is to explore how social media and innovation, which are two distinct but complementary company capacities, govern the link between brand orientation and business success. The theoretical and empirical contributions to both fields are presented in this study in three distinct ways (Merk and Michel, 2019).

In the first place, it expands on what is previously known about how the brand performance of a firm is impacted by the capacity of that organization to align its complementary talents and activities. In the framework of this study, literatures on branding and small businesses are empirically underrepresented. There is data that suggests that businesses in developing countries contribute a large amount to the gross domestic product of their respective nations, despite the low survival and growth rates that these businesses experience. Because of this, we are able to investigate the hypothesized correlations between the outcomes of measuring brand orientation and the size of the firm in greater depth (small vs. medium).

**Literature review and hypotheses development**

**Relationship between brand orientation and brand performance**

The dynamic capacity theory asserts that successful businesses cultivate a wide range of capabilities, which in turn allow them to better control and organize the resources and procedures at their disposal in order to accomplish their strategic goals. In addition, the incorporation of these skills or processes into a company’s business plan can be of assistance to the company in maintaining its competitive edge in an ever-changing industry and market. According to the Piha et al. (2021), companies that operate in less developed markets make use of both internally produced and externally created capabilities in order to maximize the advantages of their market- and brand-driven activities. “The company’s actions center around the establishment, development, and maintenance of brand identity in a continual engagement with target consumers
to gain long-term competitive advantage,” says the notion of brand orientation (Awan et al., 2021a). According to Hodge et al. (2018), brand orientation is defined as the degree to which a company’s marketing strategy and activities are centered on the brand in order to emphasize difference. In other words, brand orientation measures how much of a company’s focus is on the brand (Sarfraz et al., 2021).

Keeping the company’s brand front and center helps ensure its continued existence, as well as its expansion, brand equity, and success. One of the reasons for this links is brand orientation, which is a mindset for turning brands into strategic assets. This is one of the explanations for how these brands are linked (Gul et al., 2021c; Sepulcri and Mainardes, 2022). Those that are making progress in their industry are more likely to place emphasis on their brand than companies that are falling behind in their field. It is commonly believed that authentic brands have high degrees of brand orientation, which can then lead to synergistic trajectories such as market orientation (Awan et al., 2021b). Therefore, marketing actions that are centered on improving a brand’s reputation result in a number of brand-related performance benefits, such as increased brand recognition, a favorable reputation, positive public perceptions, and an overall improvement in market performance. These brand-related performance benefits can be broken down into four categories: Hence, we proposed following hypothesis:

H1: Brand orientation significantly improves brand performance.

**Relationship between brand orientation and value co-creation**

Consumers and businesses used to do business at the exchange, which served as the conventional point of contact between the two parties. Customer engagement is becoming increasingly important to businesses as customers become more aware and empowered in their efforts to assert control over the whole corporate process (Iyer et al., 2018). Co-creation occurs when the duties of a company and its customers overlap, and they work together to create value. Brands are co-created by a wide range of parties involved in various social activities (Jamil et al., 2021c). Each stage in the co-creation process includes acquisition, stability, and augmentation of the connection. Co-creation becomes more complex at each phase because of increased stakeholder experience. It is necessary for co-creation to have a transparent dialogue between equal parties when stakeholder experience levels converge (Naiwen et al., 2021). Since stakeholders’ participation can alter over time depending on discursive techniques and resources created or gained, Bertilsson et al. (2021) results reflect the dynamic nature of stakeholder engagement. As a result of the dynamic formation of connections that drive a brand’s identity, co-creation eventually involves devising mechanisms for customers to interact with and co-shape their expectations with brands.

Brands collaborate with their consumers to improve the perceived value of their products. Co-creation facilitates the alignment of brand perception and brand identity, which is a critical step in the development of a successful brand. People who took the survey noted that businesses are increasingly working with their consumers to develop new products and services as part of a more strategic approach to brand development (Gul et al., 2021d; Kusi et al., 2022). Because “connecting with consumers helps us generate better, more relevant content, which means we are simultaneously developing equity and enhancing ROI,” co-creation is carried out. Consumers are, in the end, “extensions of our brands.” Without them, we lose our position in the market and our relevance (Mohsin et al., 2021).

Brands use co-creation as a way to build customer loyalty. Customers become more loyal to a brand the more they connect with it. Because of “the desire to enhance sales and brand loyalty,” as stated by those polled. “Is there an alternative?” you ask. The life and connectedness of our brands is maintained and ensured via consumer brand contact (Schmidt and Baumgarth, 2018; Jamil et al., 2022). As a result, “we want people to acquire our products, thus customer engagement is essential”; “we want to become a beloved brand.” Moreover, for our brands, “client pull is tenfold more crucial (than it is for our competitors), who have better distribution” in addition, “We appreciate long-term relationships with our clientele,” concludes the statement.

H2: Brand orientation has significant effect on value co-creation.

H3: Value co-creation significantly improves brand performance.

H4: Value co-creation mediates the relationship between brand orientation and brand performance.

**Moderating role of innovation capabilities**

The degree to which the goods, services, and processes of an innovative firm differ from those offered by the company’s rivals is a key indicator of the company’s innovativeness. According to the published research, there are a number of different causes and pieces of evidence that indicate to a connection between innovation and the success of businesses. According to Anees-ur-Rehman et al. (2018), an innovative strategy enables organizations to develop unique processes and brands in order to get an advantage in the marketplace. This is a key takeaway from their research. According to Dressler and Paunovic (2021), there is some evidence that organizations may increase their brand competency by focusing on technological innovation or design innovation management strategies. This assertion
is supported by the data. Even though there haven’t been that many studies done on the topic, it’s impossible to stress how important branding and innovation are to the overall profitability of a company (Mohsin et al., 2022).

It has been demonstrated that high levels of innovation are beneficial to brand-focused companies in their efforts to build a powerful brand image and reputation asset. According to Giannopoulou et al. (2021) another benefit that is attributed to brand identity is that it enables businesses to better manage risk and react more quickly to shifts in the market. Another benefit that is attributed to brand identity is that it protects corporate innovations from being copied by competitors (Awan et al., 2021c). In addition, Iglesias and Ind (2020) discovered that branding helps to attenuate the connection that exists between innovation and sales success in companies. It is possible to draw the conclusion from these examples that branding and innovation work together to reinforce the strategic complementarity of the two concepts (Naseem et al., 2021).

Companies that are expanding their reach are turning to social media in order to disseminate the message of their brand and gain a deeper understanding of their target markets, consumers, prospects, and rivals than was previously considered feasible. The small and medium-sized businesses (SMEs) that are prevalent in emerging nations have not been excluded from this trend. According to a research that was conducted not too long ago by Van Nguyen et al. (2021) strategic capabilities in social media offer organizations with a governance mechanism that supports and develops other firm-specific talents. If social media abilities are considered enough, one might anticipate an increase in the influence that brand orientation has on the performance of a brand.

H5: Innovation capabilities moderates the relationship between brand orientation and brand performance.

Research methodology

For the purpose of this investigation, the researcher solicited participation from a wide range of senior executives working in the fashion clothing industry. These executives included brand managers, marketing general managers, product managers, and vice presidents. Irshad et al. (2020), had conducted study on a comparable regional fashion industry earlier. In addition to this, we collected information from both small and medium-sized businesses. The respondents’ average length of experience in brand management was 12 years, and their average level of competence was 8. In this investigation, the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size formula for finite populations which is well known and widely accepted was utilized to determine the appropriate size of the sample taken from a finite population. In order to increase the generalizability of the findings, a total of 480 questionnaires were sent via an online poll during the months of January through March of 2022. Following the screening of 445 questionnaires, an overall response rate of 92.7% was determined to have been achieved.

Instrument development

Researcher went through a thorough literature review to give a complete picture of the current latent variables’ relationship. The questionnaire was developed by adopting items from several different studies to finalize the questionnaire, and it consisted of thirty-three questions. Respondents had to say how right/wrong they thought each item was using a scale from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree).

Brand Orientation measured with items adapted from the study of Bertilsson et al. (2021) on a five-point Likert scale of one (strong disagreement with the item) to five (strong agreement with the item). The scale consisted of five items.

Value co-creation was assessed with six items adapted from the study of Rossolatos (2019) on a five-point Likert scale of one (strong disagreement with the item) to five (strong agreement with the item). To assess brand performance, the 8 items and these items were adopted from the work of Khare (2015). Finally, innovative capabilities were measured with five items and these items were adapted from the prior study of Babu et al. (2020).

Results of the study

In the SEM technique, a single model and test can uncover significant regression correlations (Kline, 2015). In addition, it is fair and reasonable to determine the links and the impacts of mediation on the outcome (Chin, 1998). The research model’s hypotheses were tested using SEM in this study. The structural model is examined and evaluated using standard scale data using the analysis of moment structures (AMOS). The validity and reliability of the constructs were tested using CFA. The data were analyzed with the statistical tool AMOS version 24. In contrast, the bootstrapping approach was used to evaluate the significance of the study hypotheses.

Measurement model

The AMOS 24.0 software was used to do a confirmatory factor analysis on 240 survey responses. A Structural Equation Model indicator established by Bagossi and Yi (2012) shows that the model’s fit indices are satisfactory, indicating that the CFA findings are a good match to the data (CMIN/DF = 1.481, GFI = 0.793, SMR = 0.549, AGFI = 0.632). The particular findings and cutoff criteria for the measurement model.

The individual Cronbach’s alpha Ca coefficients ranged from 0.832 to 0.935, all of which were over the recommended minimum of 0.7, and were used to assess the success of
### TABLE 1 Confirmatory factor analysis results.

| Items          | Loadings | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | CA | CR  | AVE  | MSV | MaxR(H) |
|----------------|----------|----------|------|------|----|-----|------|-----|---------|
| **Brand orientation** |          |          |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| BO1            | 0.757*** | 1        |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| BO2            | 0.856*** | 1.165    | 0.678| 12.569|    |     |      |     |         |
| BO3            | 0.893*** | 1.274    | 0.258| 10.367|    |     |      |     |         |
| BO4            | 0.938*** | 1.390    | 0.386| 13.743|    |     |      |     |         |
| BO5            | 0.872*** | 1.368    | 0.259| 12.649|    |     |      |     |         |
| **Value co-creation** |          |          |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| VCC1           | 0.745*** | 1        |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| VCC2           | 0.741*** | 1.789    | 0.189| 11.674|    |     |      |     |         |
| VCC3           | 0.985*** | 1.234    | 0.154| 12.570|    |     |      |     |         |
| VCC4           | 0.850*** | 1.564    | 0.160| 11.567|    |     |      |     |         |
| VCC5           | 0.837*** | 1.890    | 0.130| 10.563|    |     |      |     |         |
| VCC6           | 0.842*** | 1.674    | 0.184| 12.679|    |     |      |     |         |
| **Innovation capabilities** |          |          |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| IC1            | 0.956*** | 1        |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| IC2            | 0.937*** | 1.356    | 0.045| 12.252|    |     |      |     |         |
| IC3            | 0.790*** | 1.285    | 0.089| 11.627|    |     |      |     |         |
| IC4            | 0.839*** | 1.452    | 0.689| 13.625|    |     |      |     |         |
| IC5            | 0.957*** | 1.734    | 0.073| 14.631|    |     |      |     |         |
| IC6            | 0.830*** | 1.270    | 0.062| 12.729|    |     |      |     |         |
| **Brand performance** |          |          |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| BC1            | 0.746*** | 1        |      |      |    |     |      |     |         |
| BC2            | 0.854*** | 0.827    | 0.043| 12.567|    |     |      |     |         |
| BC3            | 0.827*** | 0.967    | 0.074| 12.798|    |     |      |     |         |
| BC4            | 0.967*** | 0.805    | 0.080| 11.782|    |     |      |     |         |
| BC5            | 0.761*** | 0.980    | 0.486| 13.312|    |     |      |     |         |
| BC6            | 0.982*** | 0.913    | 0.395| 11.345|    |     |      |     |         |
| BC7            | 0.845*** | 0.890    | 0.753| 12.909|    |     |      |     |         |
| BC8            | 0.790*** | 0.836    | 0.666| 11.562|    |     |      |     |         |

Significance of estimates at ***p < 0.001 level; CR ≥ 0.7; CR ≥ 0.7; AVE ≥ 0.5.

To test the hypothesis, we used SEM and methods of maximum likelihood estimation. The following indicators were used to evaluate the structural model fit: RMSEA, GFI, RMRS, and RMR, as well as the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) are all examples of absolute fit measures. Conversely, incremental fit measures include the comparative fit index (CFI), adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI), and the Tucker-Lewis coefficient (TLC), among others (TLI). According to Table 1 (CMIN/DF = 1.481, GFI = 0.793, SRMR = 0.224, AGFI = 0.632, CFI = 0.856, and TLI = 0.730), the correlations between latent components are consistent with the data.

**Structural model results**

The design measures. For further information, please see (Sarstedt et al., 2014). The convergent and discriminant validity of the cumulative measurement model was then tested using a CFA. By component loading, average variance extracted (AVE), and composite reliability, this study examines the convergent validity in line with Hair et al. (CR). Variations in the item factor loading are between −0.618 and −0.841 (all larger than 0.6). The CR ranges from 0.833 to 0.934, which is higher than the threshold value of 0.7. A wide variety of AVEs, ranging from 0.545 to 0.685, are all over the threshold value of 0.5. Table 1 shows that all measures have good convergent validity.

Fornell–Larcker criteria and heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratios are used to verify the proposed model’s discriminant validity (Ringle et al., 2015). Discriminant validity is proven by Fornell and Larcker (1981a) criteria if, after computing the square root of the AVE for each variable, the upper side of the first value in each column is significantly greater than the lower side (Fornell and Larcker, 1981b). Table 2 shows that the Fornell–Larcker criterion has been used to evaluate discriminant validity since the greatest value of the association of measurements in each column is the maximum.
BO × IC → BP (H4)+ 0.169*** 0.145 2.143 Supported

**Significant at the 0.01 level.
***Significant at the 0.001 level.

(CFI = 0.856 and TLI = 0.730, respectively). The direct, indirect, and combined effects are examined and illustrated in order to make the connection between the elements clear. Tables 2, 3 give the findings of the tests of hypotheses on the proposed model's structural link between the latent constructs.

**Direct effects**

Table 2 summarizes the results of the structural equation model's route analysis, including the conclusions for each hypothesis. Statistically significant (p-values), T-Value (standard error), and path coefficients are displayed in Table 2. These values can be used to accept or reject a hypothesis. Table 2 shows that the favorable effects of BO on BP and VCC are statistically significant. The foundation of Hypothesis 1 is the passage from BO to BP. The path from BO to BP has 0.246 route coefficients and a p-value of 0.001. The p-value is less than 0.05 and the path coefficient is positive, indicating that the BO has a significant impact on BP. Consequently, Hypothesis 1 has been confirmed. The impact of BO on VCC was analyzed differently. To establish the second association, Hypothesis 2 was formulated. The route coefficient for Hypothesis 2 is 0.1190 and the p-value is 0.001, indicating that the path is statistically significant at the 5% level of significance. Consequently, Hypothesis 2 has also been demonstrated to be true.

**Direct, indirect, and total effects**

As was indicated before, the research takes a look at both direct and indirect linkages as well as the direct paths that have already been described. In a similar manner, in order to study the interactions that serve as mediators, a mediation hypothesis was developed. The effects of VCC as a mediator of BO and BP are put to the test by the presented hypothesis. The estimated findings from the mediation testing are presented in Table 3. According to the findings, the path coefficient and p-value for the mediation of ECBR in the impact of BO on BP are 0.051 and 0.01, respectively. This suggests that ECBR plays a role in the influence. The p-value is much lower than 0.05. Therefore, we must conclude that Hypothesis 3 is correct. It has been shown and demonstrated in the past that BO possesses a positive direct influence on BP. As a consequence of this, the mediation may be said to be of the partial variety. In a similar vein, one may make the case that VCC is partially responsible for mediating the connection between BO and BP.

**Moderating effects of brand commitment**

Interactions between BO and IC were included to the model in order to evaluate the moderating effects of Brand Commitment for Hypothesis 3. The results of H3 indicate that the influence of BO on BP will increase as IC increases. The results of Table 4 show that the moderating effect of IC between BO and BP (=0.253, p 0.01) is positive and significant which suggests that IC enhances the beneficial effects of BP through BO. To evaluate the moderating effects of Brand Commitment on the relationship between VCC and BP, the interactions between VCC and IC were included to the model in order to test Hypothesis 4. According to the results, the impact of VCC on BP rises with increasing IC. The results indicated that there is significant interaction between BO on BP (=0.364, p 0.01) with the role of VCC showing that VCC bolsters the effects of BO on BP.

**Discussion and conclusion**

According to the information presented in this article, the level of effect that an emerging economy company's brand orientation and brand success have on the moderating factors of innovation and social media can range from moderate to significant. As complimentary firm skills, social media and innovation were hypothesized to have the potential to boost brand orientation and brand performance. Studies that were found in the SO literature provided support for this theory. As a consequence of this, and in accordance with the notion of organizational ecology, it is predicted that the results will differ depending on the size of the organization (small vs. medium). The findings of this study, in a number of different respects, are consistent with the findings of earlier studies. According to Dressler and Paunovic (2021), the relationship between brand orientation and brand performance is generally favorable, as well as significantly positive in relation to enterprises' innovation capabilities and social media capabilities. In addition, the relationship between brand orientation and brand performance is positively related to enterprises' ability to attract and retain customers (Pardeshi and Khanna, 2021). It is important to acknowledge that these connections exist, despite the fact that they are conditional and do not hold true across the two different company sizes that were indicated by the research data.

The results of the study have three significant ramifications for the theoretical and empirical work that will be done in
TABLE 3 Direct, indirect, and total effects analysis.

| Proposal effect | Direct effects | Indirect effects | Total effects | Lower confidence level | Upper confidence level |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| BO → VCC → IPB  | (H2a)+ 0.314*** | 0.042**          | 0.320***     | 0.03                    | 0.213                  |

***Significant at the 0.001 level. **Significant at the 0.01 level.

the future. This research includes preliminary investigations that contribute to the management literature by focusing on brand orientation in connection to social media and company innovation capabilities. This research was carried out in order to contribute to the existing management literature. Our research indicates that brand orientation has a greater impact on a company’s level of commercial success when it is combined with the other two competencies that are discussed in this article. There is now empirical evidence to support the proposition that aligned capabilities increase the relationship between the brand orientation of a firm and the brand performance of that organization when evaluated through the lens of branding. Because of the persistent resource limits that businesses face, previous research has shown that companies should avoid simultaneously utilizing a large number of their capabilities. However, the findings of our study allow us to draw conclusions from other research which suggest that social media (Casais and Monteiro, 2019) and innovation (Tajvidi et al., 2020) may provide (possibly simultaneously) complementary capabilities for achieving improved brand performance.

According to the findings of the study, the link between brand orientation and brand performance for small businesses may be adversely affected by innovation as a supplementary endeavor. This is the conclusion drawn from the data. This conclusion is especially intriguing in the context of our study because earlier research has shown that beneficial effects may be achieved. Although previous research (Lin et al., 2019) has argued for a relationship between innovation skills and branding, it may be prudent to suggest that smaller enterprises may be excused from this approach. This would be in keeping with the findings of the aforementioned studies. Because more innovation requires more resources across the whole process of brand development, it is possible that brand performance rents for smaller enterprises may be weakened by this trend. If the so-called “liability of smallness” turns out to be a legitimate explanation for this phenomenon, then so be it (Rajapathirana and Hui, 2018). The findings of this research may potentially be explained by factors such as a lack of support for radical innovation and changeable market circumstances in less developed nations (such as the one in which this study was done) (Saunila, 2020).

Implications

There have been a few insignificant additions made to management research, most notably in the fields of branding, innovation, and social media. The management and the scientists need to take into consideration these facts. The primary objective of the research was to investigate the effect of complementary corporate talents on firm orientation–performance connections. This was done so that the findings may contribute to our existing academic understanding of brand orientation literature. When organizations combine their strategic resources, talents, and attitudes, previous study has showed both positive and negative effects for the company (Arranz et al., 2019). However, empirical evidence of this study stream is scarce in the literature on small enterprises, which casts doubt on our understanding of the phenomena in commercial settings. A further addition has been made to the continuing discussion on brand orientation literature by giving an empirical validation utilizing developing market companies. This has been done in order to support the argument. The dynamic capacity theory, the complexity theory, and the organizational ecology theory all provided theoretical underpinnings for our hypotheses.

The research goes on to state that organizations have a greater chance of improving their brand performance as a result of their strategic brand orientation if they have complementary corporate skills in social media and innovation. This was found to be the case because of the strategic brand orientation. The findings of the study, on the other hand, suggest that these assumptions are not the same; hence, caution is necessary when interpreting their projected effects in connection to the size of the organization. There are variances based on the size of the organization, despite the fact that these two competencies have a moderating influence on all firms. It reveals that the interaction impact between innovation capabilities and brand orientation

TABLE 4 Discriminant validity.

| Fornell–Larcker criterion | Heterotrait–monotrait (HTMT) ratios |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| BO                        | VCC | IC | BP | BO | VCC | IC | BP |
| BO                        | 0.856 |     |     | BO |     |     |     |
| VCC                       | 0.587*** | 0.634 |     | VCC | 0.376 |     |     |
| IC                        | 0.534*** | 0.486*** | 0.721 | IC | 0.352 | 0.452 |     |
| BP                        | 0.452*** | 0.436*** | 0.341** | 0.854 | BP | 0.245 | 0.521 | 0.342 |

BO, Brand Orientation; VCC, Value Co-creation; IC, Innovative Capabilities; BP, Brand Performance. ***Significant at the 0.001 level. **Significant at the 0.01 level.
delivers higher brand performance advantages than the case of medium-sized firms’ social media skills. The synergy between a company’s social media capabilities and the attention it places on its brand is only beneficial to medium-sized businesses. In light of the theoretical implications of this finding, it is imperative that future scholars proceed with extreme caution before putting their whole faith in any of our initial two ideas. There are various scenarios in which it can be important to have a non-linear relationship between innovation and social media in order to improve the performance of a brand, with rapid shifts yielding varied results.

When making these selections, business owners and managers should take into consideration the scale of their organization, despite the fact that social media and innovation are major strategic skills for improving brand performance. In point of fact, the operations of a firm that are concentrated on its brand need to be supplemented by the suitable balance of commercial competencies. Even though not all companies have adopted social media in today’s world of brand creation and management, the concept that social media has a greater influence on performance than traditional media may not be as far-fetched as one might think. This is because social media has two distinct advantages over traditional media. This study examines the relationship between social media capabilities and brand orientation. It echoes, once again, the need for owners and managers of small businesses to adopt a new mentality and embrace social media in order to disrupt their traditional branding efforts. The study focuses on the relationship between social media capabilities and brand orientation. As a consequence of this, even smaller and more medium-sized businesses have the potential to obtain the same benefits from social media as their more established rivals.

Limitations

Despite this, the study reveals several significant shortcomings, some of which may call for more research. The method to the study makes use of cross-sectional data, which has the potential to show static correlations between the variables. Despite this, because to the nature of the methodology of this research study, data obtained at various times may suggest differing quirks. In addition, we used businesses located inside a single country to evaluate the hypotheses that we derived from our reading of the relevant literature. The findings may or may not be applicable to a variety of settings due to the complexity of the socioeconomic conditions that were investigated. Given the context-specific character of both the SOs of businesses and the outcomes they produce, as well as the time-varying nature of capacity, more study may corroborate our hypothesized linkages between the SOs of firms and the outcomes they produce. This might be performed longitudinally or by duplicating the research with other enterprises in transitional, developed, or cross-economic environments in order to confirm and generalize our findings. Both of these methods are aimed at broadening the applicability of our findings. In spite of the fact that this was not the focus of this investigation, it is still possible to investigate the relationships that have been postulated between the various areas of the economy (manufacturing vs. services).

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Author contributions

The author confirms being the sole contributor of this work and has approved it for publication.

Conflict of interest

The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher’s note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

Al Asheq, A., and Hossain, M. U. (2019). SME performance: impact of market, customer and brand orientation. Acad. Market. Stud. J. 23, 1–9.

Anees-ur-Rehman, M., Wong, H. Y., Sultan, P., and Merrilees, B. (2018). How brand-oriented strategy affects the financial performance of B2B SMEs. J. Bus. Industr. Market. 33, 303–315. doi: 10.1108/JBIM-10-2016-0237

Arranz, N., Arroyabe, M. F., Li, J., and de Arroyabe, J. C. F. (2019). An integrated model of organisational innovation and firm performance: Generation, persistence and complementarity. J. Bus. Res. 105, 270–282.

Awan, F. H., Dunnan, L., Jamil, K., Gul, R. F., Guangyu, Q., and Idrees, M. (2021a). Impact of Role Conflict on Intention to leave Job with the moderating
COVID-19: A new evidence from asymmetric ARDL cointegration approach. Environ. Devel. Sustainab. 23, 16208–16226. doi: 10.1007/s10668-021-01324-0

Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Henseler, J., and Hair, J. F. (2014). On the emancipation of PLS-SEM. A commentary on Rigdon (2012). Long Range Plan. 47, 154–160. doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2014.02.007

Saunila, M. (2020). Innovation capability in SMEs: A systematic review of the literature. J. Innovat. Knowl. 5, 260–265. doi: 10.1016/j.jik.2019.11.002

Schmidt, H. J., and Baumgarth, C. (2018). Strengthening internal brand equity with brand ambassador programs: Development and testing of a success factor model. J. Brand Manag. 25, 250–265. doi: 10.1057/s41262-018-0101-9

Sepulcri, L. M. C. B., and Mainardes, E. W. (2022). Elements that compose the non-profit BRAND orientation in an emerging country. Int. Rev. Public Nonprofit Market. [preprint] doi: 10.1007/s12208-022-00333-7

Tajvidi, M., Richard, M.-O., Wang, Y., and Hajli, N. (2020). Brand co-creation through social commerce information sharing: The role of social media. J. Bus. Res. 121, 476–486. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.06.008

Van Nguyen, L. T., Nguyen, P. N. D., Nguyen, T. Q., and Nguyen, K. T. (2021). Employee engagement in brand value co-creation: An empirical study of Vietnamese boutique hotels. J. Hospital. Tourism Manag. 48, 88–98. doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.05.015