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1.0 Introduction

The Finnish Defence Forces International Centre (FINCENT) is a nationally and internationally recognised organisation in the field of crisis management training and education. FINCENT was founded in 1969 and it was the first peacekeeping training centre in the world. At first the organisation operated as a separate entity within the Finnish Defence Forces, but in 2015 the centre became a part of the National Defence University of Finland (NDF). This decision was made in order to improve the education and training provided by the NDF, to incorporate the crisis management training and education to the NDF’s curriculum and to improve the Finnish military sciences in the field of the crisis management.

The centre was the first of the military crisis management organisations to adopt and to develop the doctrine of comprehensive approach. International experts in the field recognised that the modern conflicts and crisis are complex by their nature and that civilian, police and military forces have to cooperate in the conflict and post conflict areas to maintain and build long lasting peace and security. The attention was directed from short-term engagements towards a focus on long lasting presence in which all three of the components work together seamlessly by pooling resources and capital to fulfil their mission mandates. This view became known as the comprehensive approach and it has become the main paradigm of the current crisis management training and education.

As an organisation, FINCENT is responsible for training and educating the leaders, commanders and experts from the UN, NATO, EU and AU led crisis management operations in the field of comprehensive approach. This is done in close cooperation with the national and international partners from the civilian, police, and military fields.

1.1 Background

Currently, FINCENT is the only international crisis management training and education organization that holds ISO 9001:2015 with the highest grade, the NATO Quality Assurance,
the United Nations Certificate of Training Recognition and the NDU's Assurance of Training Quality. This record of accomplishments was achieved through combining years of continuous work, research, development and field experience.

The work to achieve the current quality of the training and education was documented and captured by the Finnish Defence Forces International Centre’s Quality Management System Standard Operating Procedure (QMS SOP). The QMS SOP is currently the only one of its kind in the world and there are no competing versions or products like it. The QMS SOP was developed to its current form in 2017 when FINCENT as an organisation achieved the new ISO 9001:2015 quality standard with the highest grade.

After the finalisation of the QMS SOP, the leadership of FINCENT understood the potential of it as a marketable product to improve the overall quality of the crisis management training and education provided by the crisis management community. The majority of the organisations giving training and education in the sector have rarely documented their quality management practices or their training and education work in detail. This lack of documentation has multiple implications for the crisis management training and education community.

First of all, it is hard to measure the quality of the education and training courses from year to year within the same organisations or between different education and training organisations. This does not only mean that is hard to measure the consistency, effectiveness and efficiency of the training and education courses, but it also makes it hard to estimate if courses fulfil the similar training needs and requirements.

The second major implication that the lack of standardisation causes are challenges to cooperation between the organizations in the sector. For example, it is currently difficult to measure the skills and competencies of experts, trainers and teachers working in the different organisations. This causes challenges, especially when the organisations want to exchange experts and, resources, or come to an agreement on training curriculums.

The third challenge is measuring the financial aspects of the training. Without standardisation, it is next to impossible to conduct the cost-benefit analysis within and between organisations. Currently, measuring the financial effectiveness and efficiency of the training and education
provided by the different organisations in the context of crisis management is becoming more and more important due to political pressure directed towards the sector.

The list mentioned above includes just some of the many justifications for the creation and existence of the QMS SOP, but they synthesise the importance of the product very well. The wasted resources are directly drawn away from furthering the development of the training and education in the sector. The lack of sufficient training and education has multiple implications for the peacekeeping and peace support operations, ultimately making the deployed civilian, police and military elements less effective and more costly, which directly affects the people living in the areas where these elements have been deployed. The inefficiency and ineffectiveness not only prolongs the conflicts, but also directly results in the loss of more lives and unnecessary utilisation of additional resources. Because of this, it is vital to develop universally recognised ways to achieve satisfactory training and education quality around the world and in different organisations to improve the capabilities, efficiency and effectiveness of the training and education efforts that can be measurable, documentable and comparable. The QMS SOP was developed for this very reason and now the leadership of FINCENT wants to make it an international standard to be used by the organisations belonging to the crisis management training and education community. This thesis was conducted in order to initiate the first steps of developing the marketing strategy and plan in order to achieve this goal.

1.2 Research Problem

The marketing of QMS SOP is in its initial stage. Currently there is a limited amount of knowledge and data available on the potential customer organisations, their connections, locations, financial situations, acquisition forms and limitations and so on and so forth. The organisations operating in the sector have worked together and cooperated, but this work has mainly concentrated on providing training itself while the understanding of the partner organisations themselves has stayed relatively limited. This is why more data and information is needed to support the marketing of the QMS SOP.
In order for the QMS SOP to be marketed in an effective and efficient manner, it is vital to deepen the understanding of the overall network of FINCENT, apply the leading marketing paradigms to understand the network, and then develop effective marketing strategies to penetrate the organisations in it. What makes this research special is that the supplier is a public organisation and its potential customers are operating in the public and private sectors.

The potential customers are military, police and civilian training and education organisations that all operate under different rules, laws, rights and levels of autonomy, much depending on the country where they are located and the international organisations they belong to. The data available on these factors is relatively scattered and often must be pieced together from multiple sources. Many of the partner organisations do not have updated or working websites, which makes data gathering slow and somewhat challenging. Much of the data provided on the websites of partner organisations is outdated and should not be relied on.

This research aims to gather, explore and synthesise data into an easily comprehensible form, and to utilise it in tandem with current marketing paradigms to help the development of FINCENT’s marketing strategy and other activities. The aim of this is to learn to understand the plausible customer organisations, list them and give tools for the staff of FINCENT to continue marketing research in the future beyond this research.

1.3 Research Questions

This Research aims to answer the following questions:

1. Who belongs to the current network of FINCENT and can it be visualised based on the knowledge available?

2. How can the possible visualisation be built with current data and without diverting too many FINCENT’s resources to the activity?
3. Can the visualisation be utilised as an aid for the creation of marketing strategy and can it be utilised for other marketing activities?

4. Can the data be used in other ways to help the management and the leadership of FINCENT?

5. Who are the most suitable beachhead customers that should be further researched and targeted?

1.4 Research Objectives

The research objectives of this research are following:

1. Explore, list, analyse, and if possible visualise the current network of FINCENT.

2. Create a document of the current network to support FINCENT and its organisation in the accordance of QMS SOP.

3. Utilise the current marketing theories to analyse the marketing of QMS SOP and the marketing of the Product in the context of FINCENT and the organisation’s network.

4. Form an initial understanding of the network and form recommendations of the most promising and suitable beachhead customers for further research.

1.5 Involvement of Finland in the sector of crisis management

Finland has participated in the activities of the crisis management ever since of the first peacekeeping operations. During the Cold War era the country tried to stay neutral between West and East. A part of this political process was participating in the peacekeeping operations and committing to the work of international peacebuilding. In order to facilitate this
purpose, the Finnish Defence Forces established the International Centre of Finnish Defence Forces (FINCENT).

The active participation to the peacekeeping operations led to knowledge accumulation, and Finland became one of the leading nations in the sector of peacekeeping. The lessons learned and the documented work ultimately led to the creation of the Management System Standard Operating Procedure (QMS SOP), which encompasses the work of the FINCENT.

1.6 Author and the Statement of Academic Integrity

To uphold the academic and scholarly integrity of this research the reader needs to be informed that the author Jasse Rajamäki has been an employee of FINCENT. He has served the centre two times, first as a conscript officer candidate from January 2016 to his honourable discharge in June 2016. The second time as a project employee from December 2016 to May 2017. His duties included assisting the centre in all ordered tasks, including the research and the development activities. As an officer candidate, he participated in the Improving the Effectiveness of Capabilities in Conflict Prevention project (IECEU –project) and worked as a co-author for the D3.3 Central African Republic Review (Norvanto, Humic and Rajamäki, 2017). As a project employee, he was responsible for conducting the research for and screenwriting the video Ethics in Peace Operations with the cooperation of the other staff members of FINCENT and CMC Finland (Black Lions Pictures, 2017).

This research was done as a part of the BScBA –degree of the Aalto University. The work was done in close cooperation with FINCENT for the use of the centre. Mr. Rajamäki conducted this research and he takes the full academic responsibility for all statements and claims contained within. Any mistakes done are solely his responsibility. The writer ensures that the work was done independently without FINCENT or any member of its personnel trying to influence the work, the findings or the conclusions.
2.0 Literature review

The International Centre of Finnish Defence Forces (FINCENT) finalised the creation of the QMS SOP, a quality management system intended to improve and uphold the quality of the management and the products and services that the centre provides in the context of peacekeeping and peace support (Finnish Defence Forces International Centre, 2017). Soon after the finalisation of the QMS SOP, it became evident that the organisation had created an innovation that has market demand. FINCENT is a part of the National Defence University of Finland and thus a part of the Finnish Defence Forces and the state of Finland. The organisation has extensive networks around the world, both in private and in the public sectors. In this literature review, the aim is to explore the current marketing theories, demonstrate their theoretical strengths and weaknesses and discuss the possibilities of combining the network approach and the value-marketing model and using combination in the marketing of the QMS SOP.

2.1 The Network Approach – IMP

The networks approach and the value-marketing model are both relatively new and yet unestablished approaches. Both views challenge frequently used marketing mix –model that has dominated the field of marketing (Cullinton, 1948; Borden, 1964; Goi, 2009; Londhe, 2014). Instead of concentrating on the four Ps, Product, Price, Place and Promotion, the network approach and value marketing model are interested in value creation in long-term and to mutually benefiting manner (Achrol, 1997; Kumar, Narus and Anderson, 2007; Möller and Rajala 2007; Ratazjcak-Mrozek, 2017). The shift from the traditional marketing mix – model and the hegemonic paradigm started initially slowly without one single and clear path. The network approach and the value marketing models are both multidisciplinary. In order them to emerge there was a need for new developments in the multiple scientific fronts (Anderson, 2002; Ratazjcak-Mrozek, 2017). Ratajczak-Mrozek has well summarized the current situation of the network approach and the internal divide that it has faced (Ratazjcak-Mrozek, 2017). Currently there are two competing theory families in the network approach.
The first one is the IMP Network Approach (Industrial Marketing and Purchasing Group’s Approach) and the second the Strategic Network Approach (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). The IMP group is in some sources referred as the Nordic School of Marketing, but for the consistency of this review, this name will not be used. Ratajczak-Mrozek views that the network approach started emerging in the 1970s due to the clear theoretical gap in the marketing (ibid). This historical narrative is widely accepted by many scholars (Ford and Håkansson, 2006; Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014). Ratajczak-Mrozek and Grönroos describes that the hegemonic view of the era was to analyse companies and their actions independently and to see the action in autonomous light, leaving out researching the wider impacts that these actions had (Grönroos, 1994a; Grönsroos, 1994b; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017).

Ratajczak-Mrozek and others see that the IMP approach’s origins are rooted in development of the social exchange theory, anthropology, interorganizational theory, distribution channel studies, transaction cost theory and the new economic studies of the era (Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017 pp. 29). The basic assumption of the IMP approach is that organisations do not act in isolation. The actions that they take and the decisions that they make have an effect to the network that they are operating in. Because of this, the organisation should not view interactions with their stakeholders as short-term single time engagements, but rather long-term exchange relations. (Håkansson, 1982; Håkansson and Snehota, 1989; Håkansson and Ford, 2002; Håkansson and Snehota, 2006; Ford and Håkansson, 2006). The key breakthrough of the emerging new paradigm was that the management of a company or the customers of the company are not the only ones affecting the organisation, but any type of organisation or an individual that is somehow connected to the network of the organisation can influence it (Möller and Halinen, 1999). According to Ratajczak-Mrozek, the focus of the IMP scholars soon shifted from analysing connections between two individual actors to analysing formal direct and informal indirect links in the entire organisational network (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). This led to the development of Actors/Resources-Activities Framework (ARA), which is widely known and referenced (See Figure 1. 1. ARA-Model Håkansson and Snehota).
The development of ARA is often credited to Håkansson and Snehota (Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014; Ratajczak-Mrozek and Herbéc, 2014). Ratajczak-Mrozek and Herbéc state the following:

“Within the conceptual framework, the relationships between firms and entities from the surrounding business environment based upon the ARA model (the basic model used for analysis under the network approach) are used as a reference point.” (Ratajczak-Mrozek and Herbéc, 2014).

Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg support this view:

“The ARA-model is widely referenced. Håkansson and Snehota (1995) have more than 3,000 citations in Google Scholar.” (Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014).

They also point out that the model was later revised in 2009 (ibid).

Figure 1. ARA-Model Håkansson and Snehota

Source: (Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014).
2.2 The Strategic Network – SNA

The network approach soon led to development of the second theoretical approach known as the Strategic Network approach (SNA) (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). Ratajczak-Mrozek states that the SNA is widely based to the same theoretical origins as the IMP approach, but there are some differences (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). According to her, the SNA is based on the context of Structuralism. She has cited Hawkes’ book Structuralism and Semiotics from the 1977 and states that according to Hawkes each action that an actor can take are conditioned by the structures in which the action takes place and because of this the actions should not be analysed independently (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). It is hard to find the original work of Hawkes, but more available second edition of the same book confirms the statement of Ratajczak-Mrozek (Hawkes, 2003). To simplify the idea of structuralism: Analysing a single action in the network context would be the same as analysing a single part of a car and not analysing how that part with other parts makes the car to work and perform. Multiple scholars of the network theory support the idea of structuralism (Cravens, Percy and Shipp, 1996; Dyer and Singh, 1998; Möller, Rajala, and Svahn, 2005). What is important to note is that idea of structuralism is used in multiple branches of scientific research and there are differences on how it is understood. However in this review and research structuralism is viewed through the lens of the network approach.

According structuralism the relationships and connections between organisations should be viewed as tools or methods to reach the wanted outcome (Czakon, 2009). The supporters of the view do not only see that organizations should use their networks to reach wanted outcomes. According to them networks and the network relationships should be managed in an active strategic manner for an organisation to reach the desired outcome; in other words, in order to be efficient the organisation has to manage its network (Möller, Rajala and Svahn, 2005; Möller and Rajala, 2007). What is unclear is how this should be done. One model in the SNA-context is the flagship organisation model (Möller and Rajala, 2007). A Flagship organisation can be a company, think tank, university or any similar type of an organisation that acts as a facilitator, and integrates the other members to the network and makes them work towards a goal (Rugman and D’Cruz, 1993; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). The other largely mentioned model is Möller’s and Svahn’s network portfolio model (Möller and Svahn, 2003).
These approaches have been questioned by the IMP scholars, because they see that the networks are constantly changing and there are multiple actors trying to create situations that benefit their interest in the networks (Håkansson and Ford 2002; Fonfara, Abrahamsen, Henneberg and Naudé, 2012; Cheng and Holme, 2015; Ratajczak-Mrozek, and Leszczynski, 2016). Because of this IMP views that there cannot be such thing as a flagship organisation, but rather there is multiple parties infighting in the network for the largest returns. Thus according to the IMP, it would be extremely rare and difficult to align the interest of all parties to one common direction (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017, pp. 36). Ratajczak-Mrozek quotes Gadde, Huemer and Håkansson about strategic management in IMP context: “"Strategic management is often defined as focusing on how companies may improve their performance in competitive interactions with other firms” (Gadde et al- 2003, p. 358)” (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017, pp. 49).

The IMP and the SNA do not only differ from each other from the managerial strategic perspective. Differences in understanding can be found from the idea of network picture, network boundaries, strategy implementation, competition and cooperation (Håkansson and Ford 2002; Möller and Rajala 2007; Cheng and Holme 2015; Fonfara, Ratajczak-Mrozek, and Leszczynski, 2016; Fonfara, Ratajczak-Mrozek and Leszczynski, 2017; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). To criticise the IMP and the SNA, it is important to discuss these differences. To start with, the network picture, IMP sees that there are no clear network boundaries, the network is ever changing and that the organisation within a certain network will always define the network differently (Håkansson and Ford 2002; Ritter, Wilkinson and Johnston, 2004). Two organisation within the network could thus see the scale of the network differently. For example, one could include its suppliers to its network, while the other could leave them out. This is why the network pictures can be very limited or incomprehensively vast. The scholar and supporters of the SNA approach see this as faulty idea and they assume that network is clearly limited to certain boundaries and that the organisations in the network known these, effectively creating a common understanding of the entire network for all the actors in it (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). The network picture can thus be sizable, but there are clear limitations to the scale it can reach. The size and the understanding of the network, according to the SNA, can be communicated between members of the network. This communication is essential for the SNA network approach to work.
Comparing the views of strategy and strategy implementation between the IMP and the SNA is vital for understanding the difference of two approaches. The IMP emphasises the interdependence between the organisations in the networks. The idea of interdependence has made scholars of the IMP to believe that network and the members evolve together to certain direction (Håkansson and Ford, 2002; Ritter Wilkinson and Johnston, 2004; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). According to Ford and Håkansson, one organisation or group of organisation in a network cannot control the network to shift to certain direction and because of this the direction of the evolution is unknown (Håkansson and Ford, 2002; Ford and Håkansson, 2006; Ford, and Mouzas, 2008). This gives strategic management and strategy creation an interesting element. It is commonly believed that companies are ultimately competing against one another; however, IMP sees that pure competition is not a reality, nor is the idea of pure cooperation. This situation is called coopetition (Le Roy and Czakon, 2016). Le Roy and Czakon describe that coopetition is not always beneficial and in the context of IMP, it can mean strategy implication that can lead to win-win, win-lose, lose-lose outcomes (Le Roy and Czakon, 2016). The coopetition idea of the IMP is greatly different from the approach that the SNA has towards strategy and strategy management that is more interested in the idea of relational advantage (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). The idea that an organisation is in a certain network or outside of it. Being inside of a network can create advantages for the organisation and the network partners, such as greater profit creation, better situational awareness and access to expert skills and so forth. According to the SNA the focus should not be on analysing individual organisations as single components, but rather analysing the benefits that the entire network creates, known as relational advantage (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Zigger and Henseler. 2009). Because the SNA assumes that the networks and network partners can be actively managed, also the relational advantages can be managed, for example including or excluding organisations.

Discussing about the network approach is easy and hard at the same time. The network approach is a theoretical approach to understand the complex macro level and because of this it can be seen as a beneficial approach to study business and business marketing. For the survival of organisations, especially businesses, being aware and understanding the macro environment is vital. What becomes, and already is, the challenge for the network approach practitioners is that there is no common approach or overall meta-theories
(Anderson, 2002; Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014). This is not helped by the fact that network approach is inherently a multidisciplinary approach that has been constructed from different scientific families, such as social, business and technological sciences. Thus depending on the theorist’s background the approach will always be influenced by the views and the elements of the theorist. This is clearly manifested in the debate between IMP and the SNA.

This is a not a minor challenge, especially when the network approach is used in the combination with other theories. The lack of the theoretical foundation can be seen problematic due the fact it allows misusing the original ideas of the network approach. For example, if a researcher wants to confirm the ideas of his or hers research, the person can select the theoretical approach that better suits for that particular research. Researches are thus operating with unfinished theories that might work, might not work, or might work in certain setting and environment, while being destructive in some. The other clear problem with the network approach is that the field is dominated by handful of scholar that have locked themselves into a long debate, a fact that can be seen in this review and is confirmed many scholars (Cheng and Holme, 2015; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017).

Because of the lack of research on the network approach, it can be stated to be an experimental approach. Anderson, Achrol, Mattson and, in some sense Möller and Halinen, are just some of the scholar, who have seen this, especially the IMP, to be the main new paradigm for the B2B-marketing environment (Achrol, 1997; Möller and Halinen, 1999; Anderson, 2002; Möller, 2013). Researchers Wilkinson and Young have noted that there has been some resistance towards complexity and complex theories and models of marketing and market research (Wilkinson and Young, 2013). They estimate that this might have been caused by the lack of training and existing skills, but also due the tendency towards micro type studies that are important, but are too specific to be used to understand the larger marketing research context (Wilkinson and Young, 2013). It is possible that the network approach in the B2B-marketing has suffered from lack of interest and the concentration to the traditional models of marketing, namely to the marketing mix approach.
Table 1. Differences between the IMP and the SNA by Ratajczak-Mrozek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>IMP network approach</th>
<th>Strategic network approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network emergence/creation</td>
<td>The result of interactions and relationships between entities</td>
<td>The result of a strategic process of creating a network by a focal company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network boundaries</td>
<td>Diffuse network boundaries, almost non-existent</td>
<td>Clearly defined boundaries, despite the importance of relationships with entities from the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network picture</td>
<td>Relative, arbitrary network picture, visualized differently by each network actor</td>
<td>One objectively known picture of the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network management</td>
<td>Nobody manages the network, management is only possible within the network</td>
<td>The network is managed by the focal company. Management involves relationships, their portfolios and the entire network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal company</td>
<td>No central entity. It is possible to create an arbitrary, relative visualization of the network from the perspective of the focal company</td>
<td>The focal company plays the key role in the process of managing the network and creating relationships; has a complete picture of the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Implemented in the context of a company’s influence and position within the network</td>
<td>Complies with strategic activities and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>A fuzzy notion of competition resulting from a greater emphasis on interdependence and cooperation</td>
<td>Network actors compete with companies outside the network; the concept of a relational rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopetition</td>
<td>Based on certain assumptions about coopetition</td>
<td>Based on certain assumptions about coopetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Through interdependence and interactions</td>
<td>The mechanism of network coordination (market, hierarchical and social coordination)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017, pp. 51).
2.3 Comparing the Network Approach and Marketing Mix Approach

In order to discuss the differences between the network approach and the marketing mix approach, the latter needs to be introduced. As stated earlier in this review, the origins of the marketing mix approach lie in the works of Cullinton, Borden, Kotler and McCarthy (Cullinton, 1948; Borden, 1964; Goi, 2009, Londhe, 2014). The marketing mix approach was intended to help marketers to create and fine-tune their offerings to their customers. The most commonly used model of marketing mix revolve around the 4Ps: price, place, promotion and product (Londhe, 2014). The main idea being that by changing and modifying these the marketer is able to sell the product to the certain customer segment (Grönroos, 1994b; Goi, 2009). Depending on the situation and the organization, the approach can be used in long term planning and strategies and/or in shorter term tactical planning and implementation (Pride and Ferrel, 2016). Grönroos has stated that marketing mix became one of the main approaches, because it is relatively simple to understand, it allows separating marketing from other business functions in an organisation and delegating the marketing task to experts within an organisation (Grönroos, 1994a; Grönroos 1994b).

The marketing mix approach has been modified through the years. For example, Borden initially suggested the model of 12 Ps, which was refined to the 4Ps and later a newer model of 7Ps was suggested (Borden, 1964; Ragif and Ahmed, 1995; Goi 2009). Some scholars have also tried to alter the marketing mix model by other elements, such as including services (referred as S) (Vignali and Davies, 1994). It is clear that marketing mix approach is used and will be continued to be used, but there are some key challenges and problems that make it less suited to the B2B-marketing. Especially Möller has seen shortcomings in the marketing mix model. He considers that there can be value in the model and recognizes that whether it works or not, it has influenced the thinking of marketers and the marketing theories (Möller, 2006). Möller identifies the following problems with the marketing mix:

1. “The Mix does not consider customer behaviour but is internally oriented.”

2. “The Mix regards customers as passive; it does not allow interaction and cannot capture relationships.”
3. “The Mix is void of theoretical content; it works primarily as a simplistic device focusing the attention of management.”


Based on this criticism it is easy to understand why the network approach and the marketing mix approach are currently incompatible. The Network approach assumes all actors in the network are active, while marketing mix literature often assumes that the customers are passive receivers. As Möller points out marketing mix model is currently unable to capture relationships and effects of these relations, while the network approach sees capturing the interactions vital in order for an organization to succeed (Möller, 2006). Marketing mix approach separates the organisation and the environment, and even within the organisation differentiates the people doing the marketing from the people working in the other functions. The network approach does not make such differentiation, but rather sees that actors within an environment are connected to one another in one way or the other and that these connections affect the working of the actors, which means that organisations or the actors cannot be separated from the environment (Möller, Rajala and Svanh, 2005). Companies are thus never acting or working in an isolation, something the generic marketing mix assumes (Goi, 2009; Londhe, 2014).

Möller raises the point that the marketing mix model is void of theoretical content, but the very same can be claimed about the network approach (Anderson, 2002; Möller, 2006). The background theories of the IMP and the SNA are competing against one another and currently there is a clear lack of unifying theoretical background (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). Both approaches, marketing mix and the network approach, are thus incomplete.

Möller gains support for his view from Goi who has continued Möller’s list by listing the ideas of the website Fakeideas:
1. “The mix does not take into consideration the unique elements of services marketing.”

2. “Product is stated in the singular but most companies do not sell a product in isolation. Marketers sell product lines, or brands, all interconnected in the mind of the consumer”

3. “The mix does not mention relationship building which has become a major marketing focus, or the experiences that consumers buy.”

4. “The conceptualisation of the mix has implied marketers are the central element. This is not the case. Marketing is meant to be ‘customer-focused management’.”

(Goi, 2009).

The source Fakeideas (2008), in not an academic article and any conclusion that it has made need to be carefully applied. However the list brings up the challenges that the marketing mix is facing, but to state that the marketing mix model is completely wrong, or in this fake, would not do justice to the model or the scholars in the field. Londhe points this out and states that the model can be reformed (Londhe, 2014). The ideas raised in this list are close to Möller’s and Grönroos’ ideas and they summarize very well the academic debate around the marketing mix and the challenges that need to be solved in order for the marketing mix model to challenge the network approach (Grönroos, 1994b), namely, how it takes in to consideration the question of isolation and how can this question be solved, how the model deals with the relationships and relationship building between organisations, how services should be viewed through the mix and what position they have in the model. It is also clear that marketing mix approach assumes that the end goal is to sell a product, but this is not always the case. For example, Marketing can be conducted to promote non-financial goals, such as social issues.

What must be understood about the differences between the network approach and the marketing mix approach is that the theories were developed in different times (Grönroos, 1994b; Goi, 2009; Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014). The formulation of the marketing mix approach started about 30 years earlier compared to the network approach.
(Anderson, 2002; Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014). This is important because the key assumptions of the approach were conducted in the world in which information did not and could flow in the similar manner as nowadays. Thus it is justified to expect that the approach needs remodeling in order to be applicable in the same manner as the network approach, which started to be formed in much later stage (Grönroos, 1994a; Ford and Håkansson, 2013; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). We must also note that the theoretical ideas and marketing environment have also changed through the years due to the development of scientific and social fronts (Hadjikhani and LePlaca, 2013).

To understand the differences between the marketing mix approach and the network approach it is beneficial to look to the work of Andersson that leans heavily on the work of Gummesson (Gummesson, 1999; Andersson, 2002). Andersson states that the network approach is inductive by its nature, while marketing mix is deductive (Andersson, 2002). He states the second major difference is that marketing mix is prescriptive and aims to explain how to act in an environment. The network approach is descriptive and it seeks explanations on how market and market actors work, how this happens and what it means from the marketing perspective (ibid). Third difference according to him is that marketing mix approach is focused on the B2C-markets, while the network approach is more interested in the B2B-markets (Andersson, 2002). The fourth clear difference, according to Andersson, is the different view on planning. The network approach sees planning and implementation are actions that happen simultaneously and are inseparable from marketing and overall business strategy (ibid). Marketing mix approach, according to him, is based on idea that actors and their decision making are rational and because of this they can be influenced with the right set of push and pull factors (ibid). Andersson states that the network approach does not take firm’s hierarchy for granted and that the top and the middle management have only limited ability to influence the outcomes, while the marketing mix approach does not consider this (ibid). The approaches also differ from each other based on their view towards competition (Andersson, 2002; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017). Andersson’s view about this is that marketing mix approach believes in the economic growth through competition, while the network approach considers possibilities of cooperation (Andersson, 2002). The last difference is the view towards information gathering and time orientation towards relations. The network
approach sees that the relationships are long-lasting exchange relations, while marketing mix approach sees that there are more time transactions (Andersson, 2002). Grönroos points out that the arguments about time orientation should not be taken for granted and that it is a debated topic among marketing scholars (Grönroos, 1994b).

Much of Andersson’s work leans and partly agrees with the thinking of Håkansson, Möller, Ford and Halinen (Achrol, 1997; Möller and Halinen, 1999; Andersson, 2002; Håkansson and Ford, 2002; Fonfara, Ratajczak-Mrozek and Leszczynski, 2017). He rightfully admits that more research is needed and that the network approach is far from being complete (Andersson, 2002). What must be noted is that Andersson’s thinking does only partly support the SNA, for example, his article does not state, does he consider flag-organization or the network portfolio management to be possible, nor does he state his ideas on managing the network itself. Neither does he consider any managerial implications of the network approach to the managers themselves. Andersson’s work also leans on the Gummesson’s article (See Table 2. Marketing Theories).

**Table 2. Marketing Theories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of product</th>
<th>Type of buyer</th>
<th>Consumers</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing management/mix 4Ps</td>
<td>Network approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Services marketing theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Andersson, 2002).

From table 2. It can be seen that Gummesson, and also Andersson, who uses the same table, see that the network approach is applicable to marketing both goods and services to organizations, while marketing mix approach, according to them, is more suitable for marketing goods in the B2C-environment. What makes this interesting is the introduction of
the third approach, the Services marketing theory. Gummesson’s table shows that the network approach and the services marketing theory overlap. Mattsson states that in the 1970s it was noted that services marketing needs its own marketing theories (Mattsson, 1997). In the same work, he states that the scholars and practitioners of marketing noted, around the same time, that industrial and consumer goods need separate approaches to their marketing (ibid). From the services marketing perspective this meant formation of the relationship marketing approach that has both been influenced and contributed to the development of the network approach and vice versa (Mattsson, 1997; Gummesson, 1999). The relationship marketing (RM) has been used in the field of the services marketing and that is why it needs to be addressed.

2.4 Words on Relationship Marketing

The key principle of RM was to develop and maintain a strong relation to the customer, idea being the creation of a mutually beneficial value-creating relationship for a long period of time that would satisfy both the customer and the seller (Raval and Grönroos, 1996; Miquel-Romero, Caplliure-Giner and Adame-Sánchez, 2014). Long-interactions were believed to decrease the costs for the both the seller and the customer, by decreasing the search and procurement time and misunderstandings between the actors (ibid). To note, Miquel-Romero, Caplliure-Giner and Adame-Sánchez refer to finding and principles from the works of Kotler, Evan, Laskins, Berry, Parasuraman (ibid). It can be seen that these principles, unlike the principles of the marketing mix approach, are compatible and somewhat overlapping with the ideas of the network approach. Mattsson noted in his work in the late 1990s that scholars of the relationship marketing and the network approach have not cooperated in manner that would have benefitted both in the best way (Mattsson, 1997). Later research however shows that network approach and the relationship marketing have become more merged and that both theories have contributed to each other (Möller and Rajala, 2007; Ballantyne and Williams, 2008; Ford and Mouzas, 2013; Cheng and Holme, 2015). Because of this, the RM cannot be ignored and it needs to be taken into the consideration, when discussing about the network approach. Going to deeper analysis of the RM would be beneficial, but because this
thesis is concentrating on the methodology of the network approach the RM, will be left for latter discussion.

2.5 The Value Marketing and the conceptual benefits

The Value marketing model was introduced in the works of Andersson, Narus and Kumar in the early 1990s (Anderson and Narus, 1995; Anderson and Narus, 1998). They collected data and refined their ideas in the work Value Merchants: Demonstrating and documenting the superior value (Anderson and Narus, 1998; Kumar, Narus and Anderson, 2007). Rather than discussing the importance of the networks these woks concentrated on explaining and defining the meaning of value as a theoretical concept and how it is created and managed. They diverted their thinking from the traditional marketing mix model, because they believed that the marketers should try to understand what the markets and the customers perceive valuable (Kumar, Narus and Anderson, 2007 pp. 21-39). Each customer assesses the value differently depending on their own perspective, which can be similar or completely different compared to the perceptions of other actors. Kumar, Narus and Anderson developed tools, value calculator and value proposition, for the marketers to use in their work (Kumar, Narus and Andersson, 2007 pp. 69-79). The first tool is a spreadsheet that demonstrates in monetary terms where and from what the marketer derives the value of the value proposition. The latter, value proposition, is the actual offering that the marketer presents to the prospective customer (Anderson and Narus, 1998). In the book Value Merchants, Kuma, Narus and Anderson have collected examples in which their idea of value marketing has worked (Kumar, Narus and Anderson, 2007 pp. 170). What is lacking from the book are the cases in which it has not worked, or has been implemented in incorrect manner.

What makes the wok of Kumar, Narus and Andersson interesting is their conceptualization of value presented in figure 2. Superior Value Offering:

**Figure 2. Superior Value Offering**

\[(\text{Value}_s - \text{Price}_s) > (\text{Value}_a - \text{Price}_a)\]  
(Source: Anderson and Narus, 1998)
They have defined the value to mean:

“Value in business markets is the worth in monetary terms of the technical, economic, service, and social benefits a customer company receives in exchange for the price it pays for a market offering” (Anderson and Narus, 1998).

In the expression the Value (s) and the Price (s) represent the best available value offering, while Value (a) and Price (a) represent the next best offering available. The best value offering is referred as superior value or superior value offering (Kumar, Narus and Anderson, 2007).

This conceptualization is important. First, it acknowledges that the customers value different elements of the offering differently and that the value is derived from multiple elements. The definition is not a perfect one and it has multiple competing definitions (Zeithaml, 1988; Ravald and Grönroos, 1996; Woodruff, 1997; Menon, Homburg and Beutin, 2005; Wikström and Decosta, 2018). Anderson admits and acknowledges in his later works that the definition that he presented with Narus and Kumar in the 1990s is not perfect and that research work needs to be continued (Anderson and Wynstra, 2010). For example, the conceptualization raises the question can everything be measured in monetary terms, for example how are historical landmarks valued through this equation. This debate also brings up the fact that currently there is no consensus on the concept of value. Scholar’s background influences his or her perception on the concept of value and value elements. Because of this, it is justifiable to use the definition used by Kumar, Narus and Anderson and because it is can be used in the context of network research, while remembering it is not perfect and it might carry a guiding effect.

The two other useful and important concepts that Kumar, Narus and Anderson introduced are value leak and value drain. They define value drains to be add-ons such as services, programs, systems and so forth, which cost more to the supplier to provide than they create value to the customer. They have no strategic importance for the customer or the value offer itself. Value leaks, unlike value drains, are activities or practices that the customer itself does.
They increase costs for the customer and can be wasteful for the supplier. Because of value leaks the overall costs increase (Kumar, Narus and Anderson, 2007).

The Final notification about the works of Kumar, Narus, Anderson and Wynstra is that their work concentrates much on the selling and not only marketing. They are not the only ones supporting value marketing model and there have been other scholars as well, who have made important scientific contributions in the field (Töytäri and Rajala, 2015; Terho, Eggert, Ulaga, Haas, and Böhn, 2017). The value selling is a developing field and there have been attempts to conceptualize it (Terho, Haas, Eggert and Ulaga, 2012). What the latest research reveals is that Anderson, Narus and Kumar have established themselves in the field and their works are well recognized. Based on this it is justifiable to use their concepts and ideas in the investigation of this thesis and to see if their works can contribute to the network approach research and understanding of complex networks.

2.6 Synthesis and Conceptual Framework

This literature review reveals that the network approach, the marketing mix approach, theories of service marketing and value marketing are approaches in progress. The marketing mix approach, by the far most influential, has its theoretical foundations, but is hardly applicable to the B2B-context. It has challenges on explaining the long-term interactions with the customers and the generic 4Ps commonly used are not sufficient to explain how value is created to the customers. The approach has long historical roots and the scholars wanting to reform the approach have countered conservative resistance. The approach is simple to use and implement, but these facts do not justify the usage of it.

The network approach has been divided to two major branches: the IMP and the SNA. The main differences between the branches is their views on management of an organization in a network, management of a network, network borders and awareness of a network picture, cooperation, competition and communication. The network approach emerged much later than the marketing mix approach. It is more complex to understand, comprehend and to implement. It recognizes that actors have only limited ability and rational to influence the
outcomes. The network approach does not suffer from the similar historical challenge as the marketing mix approach. However the research on the approach is more limited and the field is dominated by handful of scholars. The network approach is emerging approach to B2B-marketing and there are might be possibilities to utilise it in the B2C-context.

The services marketing theories, especially the relationship marketing, overlaps with the network approach. It shares some common assumptions with the network approach, such as long-term orientation and value creation. Many scholars have contributed both to the RM and the network approach and thus the former could not be ignored in this review. Nevertheless, to prevent over stretching this review or the later research of this thesis, this approach must be left for later research.

The Value Marketing model is highly compatible with the network approach and the concept of value used by the key scholars of the model are applicable to the context of the network approach. As the other marketing approaches, it does not have a complete theoretical backing. It is a young model, but rather than creating one overall theory it is more like a toolkit to be used by the managers, marketers and researchers.

The final statement that must be made is that the value of all the approaches and models mentioned lies in future experimentation and later research. The unperfected models of marketing have been widely used due the lack of better methodological models and tools. In the field of scientific research, and especially the business sciences, this is nothing new or uncommon. Much of the usage of the models has been dependent on the technological progress. The technological development has made possible testing the models and the access to wider amount of data has allowed models like the network approach to emerge.

The purpose and the aim of this research are captured in the conceptual framework presented in the figure 3. This literature review has discussed about the theoretical foundations of the different marketing theories and explained their strengths, weaknesses and limitations. The later parts of this research are dedicated on discussing the data collection,
data on the organization in the FINCENT’s macro network and the models that can be used to compress this data in an easily comprehensive visualized form.

The aim of this is to give the staff of FINCENT a tool that can be used in the marketing of the QMS SOP, to support the organisation during any organisational changes and in the creation of the situational awareness. The second aim of this is analyse FINCENT’s network, to understand it better and to form justified recommendations on the most suitable beachhead customers to be targeted with the future marketing efforts. The third aim is to discuss about the research gaps found and to identify aims for the later research in the field of marketing, network approach and in the marketing of the QMS SOP.

**Figure 3. Conceptual Framework**
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3.0 Methodology and Data collection

This section describes the research methodology and the research objectives of this thesis. To understand the research objectives, questions and the limitations of this research, it is vital to discuss the methodological approach selected. The Oxford dictionary defines methodology to mean “A system of methods used in a particular area of study or activity” (Oxford Dictionaries, n.d.). This definition highlights the importance of the researcher to provide his reasoning of the selection of the research methods and methodology for the reader.

This research is divided into secondary data exploration, primary data gathering and discussion regarding the visualisation model. This research design was chosen in order to understand the wider context of the B2B-marketing and to connect the theory with the case of FINCENT and the marketing of the QMS SOP. The aim is not only to understand the context of B2B-marketing theories and visualisation types, but also to relate them to the practice.

The literature review shows that marketing is a complicated and divided field of research, and only by discussing about the different scholarly views, can a useful theoretical foundation be discovered and adopted. In the context of FINCENT, this means understanding how these theories can be applied to the visualisation of primary data to achieve better situational awareness for the creation of the marketing strategy and to understand the value elements from the viewpoint of the potential customers. Ultimately, the aim is to aid the marketing team of FINCENT to sell the QMS SOP to potential customer organisations in the network. Because of the complexity of this task, primary data gathering was needed, which led to the creation of the listing of the partner organisations of FINCENT (See Appendix 14: Organisation list).

The macro level list was created through qualitative research methodology. The macro list is a combination of the different micro level lists, such as the member listing of the NATO credited partner training and education centres by NATO and the membership list of the European Association of Peace Operations Training Centres (EAPTC). These lists were publically available and do not include any business secrets or classified information. The decision to use the open source data was selected because this thesis is publically available. As such, including any secret or otherwise sensitive data would have slowed the research
process, effectively making it impossible to carry out the research in the provided time. Thus it must be acknowledged that the research outcomes may be affected by the exclusion of certain data elements.

The organisations not directly providing crisis management training and education, such as national ministries, were excluded from the macro level list. This network border was selected due to multiple reasons. Firstly, the organisation giving and providing education and training in crisis management are the intended customers of the QMS SOP and they are the ones able to derive most value from the implementation of it. The purpose for this is to align FINCENT’s organisational interest with the interest of the entire crisis management training community. Common sense dictates that improving the effectiveness and efficiency of FINCENT’s partner organisations not only create opportunities for FINCENT, but also lowers the value leaks and drains of the overall crisis management training and education community.

Secondly, these organisations will be the end users of the QMS SOP. It is certain that marketing the product through channels like defence ministries could be beneficial, but this could create unwanted complexity. With the limited resources of FINCENT, extending the marketing efforts too extensively could harm the overall marketing process, the marketing strategy, the sales and the implementation of the QMS SOP. It is fair to assume that the organisations providing crisis management training themselves have the needed expertise to analyse the need for the QMS SOP based on the value propositions that FINCENT delivers to them. It is important to understand that this assumption is not based on researched data due the limited scope of this research. If needed, it is possible to modify the organisation list to include actors directly not giving training and education. This can be done relatively quickly because the preliminary work has already been done and the encoding structure created.

Even though the training and education organisation might not have the authority to acquire the QMS SOP, it is vital to gain their support for the acquisition. These organisations operate in different microenvironments, which have certain barriers of entry, such as national laws. Due the resource constraints of FINCENT, it is not viable to study all these microenvironments. Rather it is better to gain allies in each microenvironment to guide the marketing and sales efforts towards the right actors. The training and education centres are
the subject matter experts of their own operational microenvironments and trying to market the QMS SOP directly to actors higher in the hierarchies would lead to resistance towards the adoption of the QMS SOP by lower level actors. Avoiding this is in the best interest of all network actors.

The third reason for placing the network border to include only the training and education organisations are the theoretical foundations of the IMP and the SNA network approaches. Regardless of the theoretical approach chosen, the selected network border is sufficient. If the IMP approach is chosen, the networks borders are accepted to be arbitrary. If the SNA approach is taken, adopting the stated border should be sufficient for two reasons. Firstly, influencing a macro network does not require the identification of all micro networks or actors in them. Thus making QMS SOP the international standard through effective marketing does not require capturing the entire macro network, but merely a share large enough. Secondly, according to the theory macro networks typically have few major actors able to influence the networks by building coalitions. From this viewpoint it is not beneficial to concentrate on all of the actors, but only to the most important and influential ones. The marketer should thus concentrate marketing efforts to organisations that would benefit and create the most value to the network and would act as network leaders. In the context of the SNA approach, this would mean influencing flagship organisations in the macro network. Any marketing activities should thus be conducted with the value perspective in mind. It is clear that FINCENT cannot serve all of the organisations listed due the limited resources it has for the marketing and guiding the implementation of the QMS SOP. This is why it is important for FINCENT to choose how the actual marketing will be conducted and which organisations it wants to serve first. This is a strategic level question and it should be studied by a study of its own.

The organisational list would have benefited from data that could have been collected through the questionnaire designed for this research, but which could not be utilised due to time and resource constraints (See Appendix 15: Questionnaire Design). The questionnaire uses the Eisenhardt's and Graebner's ideas on the case methodology and it aimed to discover the customers’ perceptions on the value elements (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007; Kumar, Narus and Anderson, 2007). The questionnaire is not alone sufficient to discover the value elements, but it is a part of the task. It utilises the open-ended questions
and qualitative methodology. With the current state of knowledge, it is hard to investigate the value elements in quantitative manner. Quantitative methodology would have relied on guessing. Without a firm theoretical foundation, it would have had limited use.

The discovery of the exact value elements of each individual organisation is left for later research. Understanding the links between the value elements, strength between organizational relations and the shape overall macro level network would be beneficial for the visualisation, but it is not necessary. The sphere model created and suggested to be used by FINCENT is a model that is able to create the network visualisation without the exact knowledge of the data and variables stated above.

An important caution about the sphere model is that it is an untested and experimental model. Its validity needs to be proven by later research and the model needs to be tested empirically. At this point, the model should be seen as a tool to aid the researchers and staff of FINCENT in understanding the macro network. The model can later be changed to a more traditional web visualisation or the web visualisation can be built into the sphere model.

3.1 Primary data collection and coding

Primary data was collected through finding and analysing the lists created by FINCENT's partners. Only the organisations directly providing crisis management education and training were included to the macro list. The data was encoded for the categorisation process and to make one coherent list, which is simple to read, modify and understand (See Appendix 14: Organisation list).

The data was encoded by following characteristics:

1. Training audience of the organisation: Military, Civilian and Police. Marked as MIL, CIV or POL.

2. Organization type: Governmental organization, Non-Governmental organization, International governmental organization, International Non-governmental organisation,
university, other entity, unknown. NATO Partner Training and Education centres (PTEC) and NATO credited Centres of Excellence (NATO CoE) were separated to their own categories to better suit the needs of the FINCENT as a NATO Department Head (NATO DH).

3. Location by country.

4. Location by continent: Europe, North America, South America, Africa, Asia and Australia. This information is stated in in a separate column and the name of the country is colour coded by the continent (Blue - Europe, Red - Asia, Dark Green - North America, Light Green - South America, Orange - Africa and Violet - Australia and New Zealand).

5. Regional organisation (European Union – EU, African Union – AU, Empty)

6. Operational status: Operating, under establishment, unknown.

The list also includes the links to the webpages of the organisations or to the webpage of the organisation that the potential customer belongs. If a contact email address was stated, it was included under the column “contact email 1.”. Other ways of messaging an organisation was placed in the column “contact 2.”.

The coding was done to help the theory building, analysis and the modelling processes. The secondary purpose was to create a base for further network and marketing research for FINCENT, which could be utilised also in the training activities and during any organisational changes.
3.2 Limitations of the used methodology

This research is limited by the methodology used. As stated in the literature review, the theoretical foundation of marketing and marketing research are rooted to incomplete theories and the network approach and the value marketing model are not exceptions. The theories that this study was built on and the key assumptions it presents should not be accepted at face value, but with healthy levels of criticism. The scholars and their opinions are divided and some of them have even questioned the value of the network approach in marketing. The existing literature on the network approach is still narrow and highly influenced by a handful of scholars, some of whom have built their entire career on researching these theories.

There is also a limitation presented by the organisational list. It has been created based on open source data and on the knowledge and experience of the author. The list does not take into consideration the informal relationships between actors on the individual or organisational levels. Understanding the informal relations between actors requires a study of its own and it could provide completely different understanding of the macro network. Any assumption stated on the macro level or any of the micro levels are thus based on the construct of the organisation list and the limitations it has. The statements made based on the list should be viewed with scepticism and the findings and conclusions should be validated by further research.

The last clear limitation is the sphere model developed and intended for the later visualisation. Based on the research conducted and secondary data exploration, similar models have not been suggested. The sphere model proposed should be viewed as a construct and a tool, rather than a proven or finalised academic idea. It should not be implemented or used for any marketing activities or strategic planning without acknowledging that there are risks attached for it not being empirically tested. Further research is needed to tests its validity in practice.

For this research, the sphere model is a tool for analysing FINCENT’s network in the accordance of the guidelines of the QMS SOP as well as in the marketing of the product itself. The visualisation of the model presented are prototype versions devised by using PowerPoint. For the later refinement of the model, a better computer program should be used. This
research was conducted for a commercial actor and using the programs provided by the Aalto University would have been unethical, because they all use educational licenses. The second important notification is the data security. Free visualisation programs exist, but using them would not have been compatible with the data security rules and guidelines of the Finnish Defence Forces. The third challenge with free programs is the questions of the intellectual ownership. Using free modelling programs often require accepting terms and conditions and signing up an agreement in which the creator gives the intellectual ownership of the creation to developer of the program in exchange for use the program. This would have had multiple implications for the later usage of the macro level list created and could have harmed the work of FINCENT. Before the visualisation is actually built, the ethical and other questions of the proper program need to be addressed and the needed resources for acquiring the right program attained.

Summa Summarum, no conclusion in this research should be viewed as final nor can be validated or invalidated with full confidence. The research could not be carried out in the scale it was originally meant to, which is not a flaw itself, but which should be understood. The validity of the theories and models used and suggested to be used should be confirmed or invalidated by further data collection and research. To achieve this the methodological and the research scope should and would need to be extended. Any conclusions and recommendations in this research should be understood through these limitations.

4.0 The Network Picture

A network can nearly always be visualised in some form, regardless of the network approach chosen. The IMP approach and the SNA differ from each other based on their ideas of the network. The first one assumes that there are no clear network boundaries (Håkansson and Ford 2002; Cheng and Holme, 2015; Fonfara, Ratajczak-Mrozek, and Leszczynski, 2016; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017 pp. 51). According to it creating a network visualisation consisting of multiple actors would be extremely challenging and the visualisation would always be artificial (Håkansson and Ford, 2002; Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017 pp. 51). It would be next to impossible
to gather in resource efficient manner all the views of each individual actor in a network and combine these to a network visualisation, which could be shared by everyone in the network. This could perhaps be done in a narrow industry or a sector in which there are a few actors and the network would be limited be external forces. An example of this could be organisations operating in communist command economies.

According to the IMP and the SNA the network is always evolving (Håkansson and Ford 2002; Cheng and Holme, 2015; Fonfara, Ratajczak-Mrozek, and Leszczyński, 2016). For the IMP approach, this means that even though the network picture of all network actors could be identified, building a coherent network picture in time and before any changes happen would be a resource consuming undertaking that would yield small amount of value. As stated in the literature review the SNA holds an opposite view. In order to effectively to manage the network and the actors, the network needs to be well known. The approach views that visualisations are tools to be used to understand the networks, actors and their complex interconnections. For example, in order for the flagship model and the network portfolio models to work the actors in the network need to be known. This does not mean that the exact shape of the network or that every connection in the network must be known and documented, but there must be an understanding between actors, which actors belong to the common network and this view needs to be shared among the actors in the network (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017, pp. 51). The situation could be compared to playing chess. In order to have a satisfactory game the players must know that they are competing against one another and the rules of the game. However they do not need to know every possible opening or formation that can be played. In order to effectively manage and lead a network an actor must have knowledge about its existence, have a general understanding about the actors belonging to it and the environment that the network operates. An effective organisation needs to know its position and other actors in the network. Otherwise it does, if it is leading the network or being led by some. Nor does it know to which direction the network is evolving or going. This would not only mean inefficient and ineffective management, but also wider inability to plan or to develop a working strategy and general weakness of the situational awareness.
4.1 Organization list

The organizations belonging to the network of FINCENT are listed in the appendices and the list consists of 165 organisations (See Appendix 14: Organisation list). The organisation list was created for this research and for the use of FINCENT and the crisis management training and education community. Due the limited data used available and quickly evolving community, the list should not be seen to be perfect and should be updated regularly. The list was created between the 1\textsuperscript{st} of December 2017 and the 20\textsuperscript{th} of February 2018. Changes after this are not included or taken into consideration.

4.2 Macro and Micro

To understand the differences between the macro- and micro networks, it is vital to understand different network structures. Whelan (2015) identified the following network structures, which have been visualised by Roelofs, Kerstholt and Van Bemmel (See Figure 4. Basic Network Structures):

**Figure 4. Basic Network Structures.**

(Sources: Whelan, 2015; Roelofs, Kerstholt, and Van Bemmel, 2017).
Three visualisations are not the only existing or possible ones, but in the context of this research, they shed important insights. There are implications regarding each type of the three network models presented. One clear example of this is the information flow. In a hub network a single actor controls the information flow between actors (Whelan, 2015). In an all-channel network all actors communicate and share information directly between one another without an intermediary and in chain network information flows from one actor to another until the intended actor has received it (Whelan, 2015; Roelofs, Kerstholt, and Van Bemmel, 2017).

The different network types demonstrate the variation of power dynamics in the networks, because the information is not controlled by any single actor in the all-channel network. The actors communicate with one another without barriers. Even though this does not mean that the actors all have an equal footing in the network, the network type is democratic from the information flow perspective compared the other two. Theory states that the central actor has always a positional advantage in a hub network because it controls the information flow. This means that the central actor can be viewed as a bottleneck for the other organisations and the development of the network. Any failure in the communication and message relaying means that the sender cannot reach the intended network actor. This failure in the process can be intentional or it can happen due to other reasons. A chain network is somewhat more democratic compared to a hub organisation, but it suffers from similar inefficiencies as the hub organisation. The information flow can be compared to the game Chinese whispers: if one actor in the network misunderstands the message, fails to forward it or alters it any way, the next organisation in the chain is affected. This failure in the communication can be intentional, or it could happen due to some other reason.

The identification of these models is highly useful and they can contribute to the network approach and the value marketing model. However with the data available, it is currently impossible to construct a network visualisation with this high level of precision. As stated earlier, only the formal connections at the macro level are known. It would require further investigation to analyse the strength of relations and exact connections between the actors at the micro levels. The other challenges for modelling FINCENT’s network is that there is no data available on the network leadership, culture, trust relationships, policies or technologies.
limiting and enabling actions in the network (Roelofs, Kerstholt, and Van Bemmel, 2017). The knowledge about these elements would be beneficial for the marketing of the QMS SOP and for the management of FINCENT in general, but investigating these elements would be out of the scope of this research and unattainable with the resources available. The current data of the network can be illustrated with the figure five (See Figure 5. The Network visualisation starting point).

**Figure 5. The Network visualization starting point.**

In this visualisation, a ball represents an individual organisation and the box the limits of a sector or an industry, in the context of this research the crisis management training and education community. The model does not consider the relations between the organisations and only shows that certain organisations/actors are known to operate and/or influence the industry or/and other actor(s) in that industry or sector. Even though the relations are not shown, it does not mean that they do not exist. The figure plainly shows that there is no knowledge on how these relations are constructed, how they influence the organisations or their actions or the overall environment. The visualisation is not useless, but rather a starting point for understanding a network and a base for further research. The organisation that is able to identify the actors and influencers in an environment already has better situational awareness than those operating in the same environment unable or unwilling to do so. It is important to view this model through the two competing theories of the network approach and to understand what it can contribute for them.
The IMP approach sees that managing a network is not possible, but management within the network is (Håkansson and Ford 2002; Cheng and Holme, 2015; Fonfara, Ratajczak-Mrozek, and Leszczynski, 2016). This means that it is highly unlikely that an organisation can force a network to change or to influence the evolution of that specific network. The organisations have the ability to manage themselves within different networks and align their actions to the changes happening in the environment and in the network. Even though the visualisation of figure 5. does not capture the relations, it helps organisations to identify and monitor the actors that they are competing or cooperating with.

According to scholars of the SNA approach having knowledge of the actors is not only beneficial, but vital for the long-term survival and success of an organization. If an organisation does not have knowledge of the other actors it cannot choose the best possible actions and thus does not have a strategic direction and it becomes a reactive organisation rather than proactive or innovative. If this is looked through the flagship model, it is clear that an organisation cannot be a network leader, if it does not know to whom to lead or influence (Möller and Rajala, 2007). The same is true on the network portfolio model. Unless there is knowledge of the other organisations or actors, there cannot be portfolios to manage or from which to benefit from (Möller and Svahn, 2003).

If the visualisation process looked in the context of B2B-marketing, it is clear that it forms the base for any marketing action, plan or strategy. Simply stated, without the knowledge of the customers, it is highly unlikely that a supplier is able to calculate the value of a service or a product that it is offering. Delivering superior value would thus be highly unlikely and instead the offering being based on the proven data it would be based on scientifically unjustifiable intuition. Long term survival for a supplier would be hard to nearly impossible in such situation. Creating and having a good situational awareness and understanding about the customers should be common sense and the base for any marketing activities and strategy creation, but as Narus, Kumar and Anderson point out it is not (Narus, Kumar and Anderson, 2007 pp. 1-9). Because the value marketing model is based on the information gathering and far-reaching understanding of the customer, it should be seen as impossible to successfully implement the ideas of the model, if there is no knowledge of the macro level that an
organisation is operating in, who the other actors are in that environment and which forces are affecting that specific environment. Without a doubt a marketer can succeed implementing a value proposition in an organisation without knowing the operational environment of that organisation, but as stated this would be based on luck rather than knowledge or competence.

For a marketer the knowledge of figure 5. is also important from the viewpoint of seeking new customers. Like a snowball sampling method, if a supplier knows the potential customer's operational environment and the other actors in that environment, it is likely that the supplier is able to find new customers through the networks, especially if the already acquired customers hold influential network positions. A priori, the customer base will increase faster after the first sales have been created and even more so, if the first customers hold favourable network positions. This claim should hold true even if the supplier is not able to use the knowledge and the value calculators from the previous cases. In the case of FINCENT, the marketing of the QMS SOP should be viewed through this light. If the QMS SOP can be sold to a member of a certain micro network, it is likely that other members in that particular micro network will become interested, if the superior value of the QMS SOP could be demonstrated in the first organisation. If a sizable part of a certain micro network adopts the QMS SOP, it is likely that it becomes a standard in that micro network and that new members wanting to enter that network will need to procure it, if not when entering the network then at least when starting to operate in the network.

These claims can be reinforced by the analysis of the macro level list of FINCENT's network and the overall environmental forces influencing the crisis management training and education sector. It is clear that the majority of these organisations are located in Europe and in the countries that belong to either NATO or to the EU or in many cases both of these international governmental organisations (See Appendix 14: Organisation list). If FINCENT manages to achieve a successful market entry to organisations belonging to these micro networks and to demonstrate the value of the QMS SOP, it is possible to advance in two micro networks at the same time. It is also clear that many organisations on the list belong to important international organisations influencing the crisis management and training sector.
like the European Association of Peacekeeping Operation Training Centres (EAPTC) and to the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centres (IAPTC). Even though the relations between the organisations belonging to the international organisation are unknown, it is clear that they exist and that the organisations in these micro networks influence one another. Because the different micro networks are interconnected on the macro level it is likely that a successful entry in one micro network would work as a beachhead in other micro networks. Thus the marketing activities conducted in one micro network are likely to influence the other branches of the macro network. The staff members of FINCENT responsible for creating the final marketing strategy for the QMS SOP should keep this reality in mind, while they conduct and carry out their planning.

As mentioned, the visualisation of figure 5. is an initial step for an organization to understand the environment and its network. In the case of FINCENT and the marketing of the QMS SOP the majority of the potential customer organisations in the sector of crisis management have been identified on the macro level in the listing created for this research. The unfortunate fact is that the exact micro networks and their connection to other micro networks have not been identified and could not be identified with the data available. This challenge can be solved with further research, but the challenge can also be solved by utilising a different visualisation type.

4.3 Introduction of the Sphere Model

Based on the challenges identified in the previous sections, there is a clear need to find or develop a visualisation type or a tool that can be adopted by the staff of FINCENT for the marketing activities of the QMS SOP. The current models of the network approach highlight the importance of the relations between actors and the strength of these relations. The commonly used web network modelling is dependent on knowing these relations and because of this it cannot be utilised effectively. Whelan (2017) and Roelofs, Kerstholt, and Van Bemmel (2017) have stated that understanding networks also requires understanding of the network culture, trust relationships, policies and technologies. Studying these factors in depth in any network requires a comprehensive study of that particular network. Viewing this
challenge purely from the marketer’s perspective, it is clear that studying all these variables could be beneficial, but from the visualisation perspective not as useful due to practical reasons. It would be extremely resource consuming work to create and keep a web visualisation updated and consistent, if the work was done manually. The more variables are taken into consideration the larger the complexity of the visualisation gets.

If the challenge of visualisation is looked through the IMP approach or the SNA approach, it is clear that the importance of knowing the variables, mentioned above, cannot be avoided in a web visualisation. As stated earlier the IMP approach views that network borders are always arbitrary, because actors do not have a shared network picture and each actor chooses the network borders from its own viewpoint. The borders are set based on preference or a strategic need. Because of this, two actors rarely have similar views or shared understanding about the network they are operating in, even though they operate in the same industry or sector. The approach also views that managing the network is not possible meaning that a single actor cannot force the network to evolve in a certain direction. An actor can, however, manage itself in the network. This management and creating effective strategies require understanding of the operational environment and the other actors in the environment. Thus it must be concluded that the IMP and using it as the theoretical basis for a web visualisation cannot escape the need for knowing the relations between the actors or the variables mentioned by Whelan (2015) and Roelofs, Kerstholt, and Van Bemmel (2017).

Utilising the SNA approach for the web visualisation the network of FINCENT also faces challenges. According to the SNA approach networks are established through strategic processes, network boundaries are clearly established and communicated between the actors in the network. The network itself can be managed by an actor or actors and the evolution of the network depends on the needs and wants of the central actors. Establishing an effective strategy requires an organisation to be aware of the existence of the network and to cooperate with the network partners to achieve its strategic goals. Knowing the network and the actors in the network is thus not an option, but necessary for the survival of an organisation.

If we look at the challenge of visualisation and the question of knowing the relations in the network from the perspective of the value marketing model, it is clear that understanding the
former cannot be avoided. In order to be able to create and deliver superior value to customers the supplier must understand the needs and the operational environments of the customer and how these influence organisational goals and overall strategy of that customer. This does not only mean understanding the actors in the customers’ organisations, but also the other actors affecting the customers, such as the competitors and the suppliers. The marketer must thus conceptualise the networks of the customers, if not for the customers then at least to itself. In this sense the value marketing model cannot be separated from the network approach. The actor doing the marketing must have some sense of the possible customers, their networks and the overall operational environments of the customers and the other important forces affecting them. An organisation wanting to utilise the value marketing model cannot avoid facing similar challenges as the two network approaches.

The challenge of understanding and creating the network picture of FINCENT is that the macro level organisational list created for this research does not capture actor relations. The current data is unable to answer the following questions: What are the exact relations between the organisations in the list? How strong these relations are and how are they impacted by the informal relations? and What kind of roles the variables like network culture and network technologies have in the network? To solve these challenges and the challenges presented by the theoretical approaches used in this research, the network model suggested to be used by FINCENT in the marketing of the QMS SOP is the sphere model (See Figure 6. Sphere Model).
The sphere model presented in the figure 6. is a combination of the network approach and the value marketing model and it is aimed to fill the theoretical gap between the two approaches concerning the web visualisation model as well as to serve as a starting tool for an organization transferring to use the network approach or/and the value marketing model. The model does not capture the strength of the relationships in the network between the organizations, but instead it estimates and positions the organizations within a network compared with the marketer or the central entity while instructing the staff of the central entity on how to align their actions with the actors in the network.

In order to understand the model and its possible benefits for FINCENT and the marketing of the QMS SOP it must be thoroughly explained. In the sphere model the supplier/marketer is placed in the centre and the red line around it means the organization’s own sphere (See
Figure 7. Sphere model inner spheres close-up.). This sphere encompasses the key competences and the knowledge that the actor has. In the case of FINCENT, the red sphere consists of the knowledge of implementation, usage and adoption of the QMS SOP. A partner or a customer organisation could gain the documents created explaining the content of QMS SOP, but the organisation would not benefit from this because it would not have the knowledge and the needed skills to implement the QMS SOP. The implementation without the expertise of FINCENT would require significant research on the behalf of the customer and it is likely that the quality and the success of implementation of the reverse developed QMS SOP would not be high. The reverse developing or engineering the QMS SOP would also require resources, which would be away from the implementation work and the main work of the organisation. This is why the organisation with the key competences is separated to its own sphere in the model. If there was a product that was a jointly developed by two or more organisations both would be included to the inner sphere, but they would be separated as shown in the figure eight (See Figure 8. Sphere model inner spheres, Cooperation situation close-up.).

Figure 7. Sphere model inner spheres close-up.
In figure 8, the area between the organisational spheres of FINCENT and the organisation X show the jointly developed skills, knowledge, product etc. These are accessible to both organisations. The bigger the area gets, the more organisations cooperating share knowledge and resources. Both organizations remain in this example as independent and one organisation can only partly access the sphere of the other organisation.

The next sphere between the red and the orange line consists of the organisations that are already customers of the central entity (See Figure 7. Sphere model inner spheres close-up). In the case of FINCENT, they are organisations that are the first to purchase and implement the QMS SOP. The theoretical idea is that a supplier or/and a marketer are able to extract information and data from these organizations and use them as platforms for further sales and marketing efforts in accordance of the value marketing model (Narus, Kumar and Anderson, 2007. pp. 59-69). The information gathered can include knowledge such as cost-benefit analysis, information on how to improve the current product and how to implement it better in the customer organization and so on. For FINCENT and for the future of the QMS SOP it is vital that more information is gathered in order to improve the product and in order for FINCENT to be able to create needed value calculators. The information is needed so that
superior value can be demonstrated based on factual knowledge, and to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the QMS SOP in the customer organisations. This information can be used for benchmarking and for the purposes of case history creation in accordance of the QMS SOP and the value marketing model.

The next sphere, from the orange to the yellow line, shows the highly likely customers, those that have stated their interest towards a product or a service and with whom the supplier/marketer has initiated talks and for which the supplier/marketer has created value calculators (See Figure 9. Sphere model, the fourth sphere close-up). The organisations in this sphere are the ones that the supplier is able to demonstrate the value of a product and there is sufficient information given by the potential customer to the supplier to do this task. The possible customer organisation has also invested in the relationship by diverting organisational resources to investigate and to acquire knowledge of a product or a service. The supplier has an opening to close to the sale, move the potential customer organization to the inner sphere in the model, and to make it an information point. The failure to do this is not only loss for the supplier, but also to the possible customer, because both have invested time and resources to the information gathering and the acquisition process, which will turn to sunk costs, if the process fails.

Figure 9. Sphere model, the fourth sphere close-up.
The sphere between the yellow and the green square shows the organisations that are operating in the environment and can be the possible future customer for the supplier (See Figure 6. Sphere model). They are the organisations that the supplier might have contacted or that have contacted the supplier without clear intentions and have not yet initiated further talks. The supplier has not created or started to create value calculators for them and is waiting for a further reply or the supplier/marketer is currently creating a reply. In the case of FINCENT the organization in this sphere are known to operate in the field of crisis management training and education and have stated their initial interest, but nothing else. In order to move an organisation to the next sphere FINCENT’s marketing team needs to proactively contact it and provide it with more information about the QMS SOP and its benefits and to request more information from the organisation for the creation of a value calculator. FINCENT can also market the QMS SOP by providing case histories created from the previous sales.

The last sphere, between the green and the black lines, includes the organizations known to operate in the field of crisis management training and education, but which cannot be served or that have expressed no interest in acquiring the product at all (See Figure 6. Sphere model). The sphere also includes those organisations which are unable to acquire the QMS SOP due to lack of resources or skills to implement it. The sphere also includes organisations which would not benefit from the product in any meaningful way. In the case of FINCENT, these include organizations with limited budgets unable to divert resources to the procurement process. For example, an organisation in this sphere might not be able to purchase the product due to legal reasons.

The sphere model presented is not a perfect or tested model and its validity must be further investigated. However in the marketing the QMS SOP and analysing FINCENT’s network with current information it has clear benefits. Firstly as stated earlier it is not possible to construct FINCENT’s macro level network in a manner that would be sufficient for macro level visualisation using the traditional network visualisation models such as the web visualization. Currently too many important variables are missing or unknown and it would require much longer research to attain these.
With the current data, the organisational micro network visualizations could be created to some extent. For example, NATO credited Centres of Excellence could be grouped under one visualisation. However, these micro level visualizations would not serve the purpose of the marketing of the QMS SOP in the similar manner than one coherent visualisation that encompasses the entire network would. Thus, individual micro level visualisation would not hold value similar to one coherent macro visualisation, which can be scaled down or up, if needed. Because there is no data available on the strength of the micro level organisational relations, further research is needed to identify the connection between the potential customer organisations on different micro networks and how these micro networks are connected to one another. Simply stated, if the macro visualisation would be created with the current data available the result would be multiple independent networks that could not be connected between each other. Constructing and keeping multiple visualisations updated would be challenging from managerial perspective. Without exact variables that can be updated in resource efficient manner, the micro visualisation would be snapshots. They could work as a tool in a short time span, but further developments in the networks would force FINCENT to remodel and recreate the visualisations. The traditional network visualisation would also leave out the instruction for the next steps of marketing. The sphere model shows exactly the organisations that need to be connected and the steps for next sales to be created and the organisation that can be utilised in the data gathering and case history creation.

This is helpful and resource efficient in multiple ways. Firstly, if FINCENT’s marketing team changes or a member is replaced, the new team or members are quickly able to grasp the situation after comprehending how the model works and keep the visualisation updated without specialised training. Because the complexity of the model is low, there would not be a need to go to the deeper level understanding that some visualisation models require. For example, there is no need to build complex numerical databases for the sphere model, but simple statistical understanding and understanding of a sphere chart should be sufficient. Secondly, no further research needs to be diverted on the modelling of the network, but the marketing team of FINCENT can concentrate on contacting the organisations in the organisation list, updating the list to better suit the requirements of the organisations and starting to create initial ideas on the value calculators and about the elements that need to be included. Thirdly, the sphere model achieves those requirements intended for the
visualisation of the FINCENT’s network and the model has theoretical foundations, which makes it possible to alter, develop and refine the model.

The model would also be compatible with the military tradition of the Finnish Defence Forces: “What has been done, what the group is currently doing and what the group will be doing next”. Thus any current or reserve personnel of the Finnish Defence Forces trained to market the model should be able to understand the model. The model can also be modified in other ways and to suit different strategies. For example, the traditional web visualisation can be built in it, if FINCENT as an organisation wants to do this. Thus instead of only being a marketing tool, it can also be utilised for other activities such as research, overall strategy creation, information bank and so on.

4.4 Difference from Radar and Sphere charts

The sphere model has similarities with the radar and sphere charts, but it should not be viewed as a statistical tool, but rather a managerial one. Sphere and radar charts are visualisation tools for statistical working, but they themselves do not tell the user or the creator what is the next step to take. The sphere model introduced is designed for the marketing and selling activities and purposes in the context of FINCENT and crisis management education and training and it was designed to be a qualitative tool rather than a quantitative one. The model does not require complex mathematical data tables to be built, when the exact visualisation of the macro level organisation list is built. The organisations in the macro list need to be given a simple value or a symbol that places them to the right sphere in model. This is the simplest form of the sphere model, but as stated earlier more variables can be included if wanted.

The sphere model itself was constructed from the ideas of value marketing and the network approach keeping in mind the FINCENT’s limited possibilities to divert resources to the marketing process of the QMS SOP. FINCENT does not currently have staff members specialised in the marketing function and the marketing is intended to be done by members of the organisation whose main expertise is in military sciences. Introducing complex
mathematical or statistical models would thus not be beneficial because using them typically requires people with specialised skills that need to be acquired through educating the current staff members, hiring new ones or acquiring the ability through purchasing a service. All of these options would increase the operation costs for FINCENT, which is not the purpose of the visualisation and which would render it to be a less efficient tool.

The sphere model can also be modified to include micro networks and the relations between the organisations effectively building the commonly used web visualisation into the logic of the model. This is not needed and as stated earlier could be done only partially with the current data, but it is possible. The same logic is not built into radar or sphere charts directly and because of this they were not applicable to the visualisation of the FINCENT’s network or to be used by the marketing team.

5.0 Discussion and Analysis

In this part, the findings and the sphere model suggested are contrasted and analysed based on the literature review and the theories applied. The section also examines how the findings affect the marketing activities of FINCENT. Lastly, the limitations of the research will be addressed and their impacts considered.

Firstly, it can be concluded that the views of the supporters of the network approach and the value marketing model seem to offer benefits for the marketing activities and the marketing strategy creation of FINCENT as combined approach as well as separately. Secondly, a clear conclusion that the literature review and the findings show are the limitations of commonly used marketing theories. The network approach, the value marketing model and the generic marketing mix approach have all their own theoretical weaknesses and more basic research is needed in order to better our understanding of marketing and to create better general theories about the topic.
5.1 General discussion

From the research it can be concluded that members belonging to the network of FINCENT can be identified and listed for the visualisation. As pointed out, the theories used for this research and analysing the network have greatly different views towards this process. The IMP approach and the supporters of the theory see that in order to create a macro level organisational list or a visualisation an arbitrary network borders need to be established. Because organisations have different goals and strategies, it is next to impossible that two different organisations would view the network in a similar manner. From the viewpoint of the IMP approach the organisation list created for this research is arbitrary and only the perspective of FINCENT. According to the IMP approach, the network cannot be managed by the network actors, but an organisation can manage itself in the network. Because of these factors, the list and the finding of this research could not be applied in any other organisation than FINCENT and the managerial or research insights derived from the organisational list should be understood as FINCENT centric. Any web visualisation created by using it would be purely the viewpoint of FINCENT and would have little value for the other members of the network. Because the network border chosen is arbitrary, according the IMP theory, a new border could be chosen and from the theoretical viewpoint this would be as acceptable as the current network border chosen. However what is possible from the viewpoint of the theory is not always practical from the managerial or organisational perspectives. As stated the current network border was selected due the practical reasons and only the organisations directly providing crisis management education and training were included to the list in order to avoid overcomplicating the marketing efforts and the visualisation process of the network. According the IMP approach it is important to understand that the network border is the current viewpoint of the author and chosen for this research.

The findings and literature review confirm that the IMP approach is compatible with the value marketing model and there are no theoretical factors that could contradict combining the approaches. Because of this it is safe to assume that the sphere model created and suggested to be used by FINCENT could be utilised as a managerial tool and for the creation of a marketing strategy for the QMS SOP. The important contribution of the IMP approach for the sphere model is the fact that the model is actor centric at its current stage. Further
research is needed to discuss and analyse how a sphere model visualisation created by an organisation could be utilised by another organisation in the same network, but this question must be left for later research.

From the perspective of the SNA approach, the network border chosen is justified and the theory supports the idea of using the macro list as a managerial and a marketing tool. As stated in this research the network border was placed so that only the organisations directly providing education and training in the field of crisis management were chosen. Other organisation could have been included, but this does not change the fact that the organisations included in the list should have a similar view of the network and the network members and any lists that they create should be similar. It cannot be stated that these lists would be exactly similar, because the factor of human error cannot be ruled out and the author of this research could have made a mistake. For example, it is possible that a network actor could have been overlooked. However this does not mean that lists between actors would be completely different, but rather they would be similar because the network actors have a shared understanding of the entire network according the SNA approach. The shared understanding is gained through communication between the network actors and there always exists the possibility of miscommunication between them (Whelan, 2015; Roelofs, Kerstholt, and Van Bemmel, 2017). Because of this it is highly likely that there exists some variation between the network list of FINCENT and the lists of the partner organisation. However this variation exists because of human error and not because of the invalidity of the SNA approach. Because of this, the organisation list for this research created represents the view of the entire network rather than only the view of FINCENT alone. The list can be and should be utilised by the other members in the network, especially if they have not created a similar list of their own. As according to the SNA approach the list created is the current description of the overall macro level of the network, it would not benefit the network to create the list again from the beginning by another actor in the same network. The current network list should be kept updated and shared among all network members to be used to benefit the work of the entire network. What FINCENT and the members of its network must remember are the limitations of the current macro list. If the actors wanted to gain better situational awareness they should start including variables that have not been taken into consideration in the current macro list, such as the knowledge of informal relations. A final comment on the
SNA approach and the macro level organisational list that must not be overlooked is the question of the different levels of situational awareness between different network actors. In a large network it is possible that different actors have different levels of understanding of the network due factors like organisational changes. Because of this it is possible that the network pictures between different actors have some variation. This fact does not directly invalidate the views of the SNA approach, but the challenge should be understood.

The research conducted shows that the SNA approach cannot be invalidated even though there clearly exists questions that must be answered by the future research. The literature review and the findings show that there exist benefits for using SNA approach for the visualisation process and the marketing of the QMS SOP. The approach supports the use of the sphere model, but further research is needed to solve the question of actor centricity. With the current research it is hard to estimate and show what benefits the sphere model visualisation created by an actor for its own use can offer to another actor in the same network. Perhaps multiple sphere model visualisations from different organisation could be used to create the more common web visualisation of the entire network and to connect the different micro networks between one another. This is highly speculative and addressing these questions is left for future research. The research conducted did not find theoretical contradictions of combining the value marketing model and the SNA approach.

It can be concluded that the value marketing model can be used without using the IMP approach or the SNA approach. However if this path was chosen it is clear that understanding the overall marketing and the strategic environment would suffer. This would lead to a situation in which the marketing team of FINCENT would be trying to contact individual customers without utilising the knowledge of the overall operational environment. It is likely that in situation like this the value calculators and the created case histories needed by the model to work would not have similar strategic value, if the model was used without either of the two network approaches. The lack of overall situational awareness that could be achieved with the network approach would also slow and harm the creation of the value calculators. Without understanding the overall operational and strategic environment, it is unlikely that the created value calculators would be correct and it would be likely that the created value calculators would be organisation centric. Thus the value marketing model should not be
utilised in isolation of the network approach, but rather as a complementing theoretical approach. Either of the two network approaches do not include the concept of value, but the value marketing model can bring this element to their theoretical foundations. The value marketing model also has the inbuilt logic of the marketing steps, which the network approach does not have. The marketer using the value marketing model knows the exact next steps to be taken, something that the network approach does not consider.

From the analysis it can be concluded that the first four research questions have been addressed, but the question of identifying the most suitable beachhead customers could not be answered in a satisfactory manner. More research is needed about the potential customer organisations and the value elements in order to answer the question of the most suitable beachhead customers. Any claims or conclusions done trying to answer the research question would be purely educated guesswork and they would be based on intuition rather than proven data or knowledge. Answering this question was not possible with the resources and the time allocated for this thesis. The finding that can be drawn from this is the better understanding of the future research needs discussed in the chapter “Suggestions for future research”.

5.2 The visualisation and the organisation list

Based on the literature and different visualisation types, it can be concluded that the sphere model introduced is not the only possible visualisation type that can be used to create a representation of the network of FINCENT, but the sphere model suggested has clear benefits over the traditional web visualisation model. Based on the literature review and the findings, it is evident that the web visualisation model is a resource intensive model and better applicable in situations in which the parameters governing the visualisation can be automated. The more variables are introduced to the visualisation, the more challenging keeping it updated becomes. This can be demonstrated by looking the macro level organisation list, which includes 165 organisations (See Appendix 14: Organisation list). Roelofs, Kerstholt and Van Bemmel (2017) point out that in order to understand network, it is important to understand the network culture, trust relationships, policies or technologies
limiting and enabling actions in the network. If all these variables were included to the organisation list, it would become time and resource consuming to keep the list updated and the possibility for errors would increase.

The creation of the organisation list also revealed the challenge of connecting the different micro networks to the overall macro network. The overall network of FINCENT and the list could be divided to smaller micro network with the current data, but because there currently is no data available on the relations between these networks it would be impossible to create a one coherent visualisation. The smaller individual visualisations would have their benefits, but they would not have similar value as one all-actors-inclusive macro level visualisation. Based on the secondary data exploration it would have been beneficial to collect and include research on this challenge to the literature review and to this thesis.

5.3 Limitations of the research

The findings and analysis of this research are limited as all academic works are. The first clear limitations were the time and resource limitations. These limited the scope of the research and because of this the research could not be conducted in the scope originally intended. Because of this one of the original research questions could not be answered. The second major limitation comes from the side of the theories used. All current marketing theories have their theoretical limitations. As has been pointed out, the marketing research has been largely been directed towards case studies, which are too specific to be used to create a comprehensive understanding about marketing and general overall theories (Wilkinson and Young, 2013). The challenges of the used theories were demonstrated in the literature review and in the limitations of the research methodology. Many of the academic works used highlighted these challenges and they were expected (Andersson, 2002; Goi, 2009; Wilkinson and Young, 2013; Ratazjcak-Mrozek, 2017). In addition to this, the research did not apply or discuss the relationship marketing theories, which could have improved the overall research and analysis.
The fourth clear limitation of this thesis is that the network visualisation was not actually created. The reasons for this are the ethical and data security questions for using the programs provided by the Aalto University. These typically use educational licensing and using them would have been unethical because they would have been utilised for creating value adding element for a commercial actor. Using the cost free program would have caused the question of ownership of the developed sphere model. Using them could have forced the author to give up the credit of the work done for this research. The model created by these could not have been utilised by FINCENT either due the data security reasons. This is why the visualisation work must be left for later research and work.

6.0 Conclusions

This section provides the conclusion of this research. The purpose is to discuss the main findings of this research, outline the implications of the research for the international business and for FINCENT. In addition, this part provides suggestions for further research and later discussion.

6.1 Main findings

The work of this thesis concentrates on applying the marketing theories to the context of FINCENT and the marketing of the QMS SOP. Based on the secondary data exploration and analysis of the macro level organisation list and the operational environment of FINCENT, the research concludes that the most effective and efficient method to understand and visualise the macro level network of FINCENT is to utilise the network approach combined with the value marketing model. Based on the findings it was concluded that FINCENT could apply the network approach or the value marketing model individually, but this would not be as beneficial as using them in tandem. Based on the data gathered it is clear that in order a traditional web visualisation to be created more data on the network relations between the
actors need to be gathered and most suitable parameters chosen to achieve the maximum benefits of the visualisation.

The research concluded that because of the limited data currently available the web visualisation would not be suitable to be adopted by FINCENT, but rather the organisation should utilise the sphere model. The model was developed by combining the network approach and the value marketing model and it was meant to be a low resource intensive managerial tool that could be used by any member of an organisation with basic computer skills. Because the model does not require creation of complex mathematical models or data sets, an individual can learn to use it with little additional training or education. Based on the secondary data exploration similar models have not been suggested. Because of this, more data is needed to validate the usefulness and the value of the sphere model and the further research of its usefulness and utility needs to be conducted.

The majority the research question could be answered, but the question of the most suitable beachhead customers fell outside the scope of this research and had to be left for the later research. The research and applying the theories of marketing to the case of FINCENT encountered similar problems as were identified in the literature review and the research and the overall findings were limited due the theoretical limits of the marketing theories. More basic research is needed to validate or invalidate the used theories.

6.2 Implications for international business

The importance of this research to international business is derived from three factors. The first is the usage of the network approach. This research has utilised the two main theories of the network approach and combined them with the value marketing model. These challenge the long established use of the generic marketing mix model and demonstrate the benefits of using less known and alternative approaches and theories in the field of B2B-marketing in international setting. The second implication of this research is that it serves as a case study of marketing and marketing strategy creation from a viewpoint of a public organisation. The study demonstrates that business sciences can and should be utilised by the public sector to
help them to better deliver value and to help to spread innovations and innovative thinking. The research also shows the importance of multidisciplinary thinking. This research has been influenced by multiple different scientific disciplines namely business, military and social sciences.

The third and last implication to international business is the introduction of the sphere model. The model is untested and its validity is not proven, which is why it needs to be empirically tested in different environments and organisations. As stated, the model was intended to help organisations achieve better awareness of their operational environment and the actors in that environment. The aim of the model is to serve as a managerial tool, for example by helping in the marketing activities, strategy creation and implementation. Applying the model to practice should be done with caution and scepticism.

6.3 Suggestions for research

Figure 10. shows the steps that the future research and FINCENT should take in order to advantage the marketing of the QMS SOP in scientific manner and in order to document the process and to test the sphere model empirically in the daily work of the organisation (See Figure 10. The Research process and The Future Steps). This thesis has completed the phase 1. and the content of this thesis can be used to advance to the second phase in which the sphere model is actually build and tested, the value elements are discovered and documented and the organisational list created in the first phase kept updated and modified if need be.

In addition it would be beneficial to study the usefulness of the sphere model in other organisations and industries and to test does it have practical value for organisation operating in different sectors and industries. The last suggestion for future research is studying of the marketing theories and the network approach on general level. It is evident that more basic research needs to be conducted in order to improve the overall understanding of the marketing theories and the network approach. As previously mentioned the network approach
is still a relatively new and unestablished approach and in order to test the validity of the approach more general data and studies are needed.

**Figure 10. The Research process and The Future Steps**
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Appendices

Appendix 1: ARA-Model Håkansson and Snehota

Source: (Gebert-Persson, Mattson and Öberg, 2014).
Appendix 2: Differences between the IMP and the SNA by Ratajczak-Mrozek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>IMP network approach</th>
<th>Strategic network approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network emergence/creation</td>
<td>The result of interactions and relationships between entities</td>
<td>The result of a strategic process of creating a network by a focal company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network boundaries</td>
<td>Diffuse network boundaries, almost non-existent</td>
<td>Clearly defined boundaries, despite the importance of relationships with entities from the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network picture</td>
<td>Relative, arbitrary network picture, visualized differently by each network actor</td>
<td>One objectively known picture of the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network management</td>
<td>Nobody manages the network, management is only possible within the network</td>
<td>The network is managed by the focal company. Management involves relationships, their portfolios and the entire network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal company</td>
<td>No central entity. It is possible to create an arbitrary, relative visualization of the network from the perspective of the focal company</td>
<td>The focal company plays the key role in the process of managing the network and creating relationships; has a complete picture of the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Implemented in the context of a company's influence and position within the network</td>
<td>Complies with strategic activities and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>A fuzzy notion of competition resulting from a greater emphasis on interdependence and cooperation</td>
<td>Network actors compete with companies outside the network; the concept of a relational rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopetition</td>
<td>Based on certain assumptions about coopetition</td>
<td>Based on certain assumptions about coopetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Through interdependence and interactions</td>
<td>The mechanism of network coordination (market, hierarchical and social coordination)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Ratajczak-Mrozek, 2017, pp. 51).
Appendix 3: Superior Value Offering

\[(\text{Value}_s - \text{Price}_s) > (\text{Value}_a - \text{Price}_a)\]

(Source: Anderson and Narus, 1998)

Appendix 4: Marketing Theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of product</th>
<th>Type of buyer</th>
<th>Consumers</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Marketing management/mix 4Ps</td>
<td>Network approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Services marketing theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Anderson, 2002).
Appendix 5: Conceptual Framework
Appendix 6: Basic Network Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hub network</th>
<th>All-channel network</th>
<th>Chain network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Sources: Whelan, 2015; Roelofs, Kerstholt, and Van Bemmel, 2017).

Appendix 7: The Network visualization starting point
Appendix 8: Sphere model
Appendix 9: Sphere model inner spheres close-up
Appendix 10: Sphere model inner spheres, Cooperation situation close-up
Appendix 11: Sphere model, the fourth sphere close-up
Appendix 12: The Research process and The Future Steps

The Research Process and The Future Steps

**Phase 1.**
- Visualisation model created
- Organisations discovered and listed

**Phase 2.**
- Building the model and empirically testing it
- Discovering the General Value Elements
- Updating the list

**Phase 3.**
- Building the marketing strategy of FINCENT and developing the marketing plan for the QMS SOP

**Phase 4.**
- Creating sales and developing the product

Completed

Under Process
Appendix 13: Sphere model, the third sphere close-up
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Address A</td>
<td>Phone A</td>
<td>Email A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Address B</td>
<td>Phone B</td>
<td>Email B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Address C</td>
<td>Phone C</td>
<td>Email C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Address D</td>
<td>Phone D</td>
<td>Email D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Address E</td>
<td>Phone E</td>
<td>Email E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Address F</td>
<td>Phone F</td>
<td>Email F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Address G</td>
<td>Phone G</td>
<td>Email G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Address H</td>
<td>Phone H</td>
<td>Email H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Address I</td>
<td>Phone I</td>
<td>Email I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Address J</td>
<td>Phone J</td>
<td>Email J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Address K</td>
<td>Phone K</td>
<td>Email K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Address L</td>
<td>Phone L</td>
<td>Email L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Address format: Street, City, State, ZIP
- Phone format: (123) 456-7890
- Email format: first.last@example.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 1 1</td>
<td>Row 1 2</td>
<td>Row 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2 1</td>
<td>Row 2 2</td>
<td>Row 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 3 1</td>
<td>Row 3 2</td>
<td>Row 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 4 1</td>
<td>Row 4 2</td>
<td>Row 4 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Note:**
- Column 1 describes the details.
- Column 2 contains additional information.
- Column 3 provides notes or references.
The list was created by using:


The original Excel file created is in possession of the author.
Appendix 15: Questionnaire design
By: Rajamäki Jasse

Research on the procurement processes

This questionnaire is a part of pilot research carried out to understand the procurement processes of the organizations belonging to the networks of FINCENT. The aim of the research is to help any organization belonging to the network to access, find and understand the overall procurement processes, lower any search, coordination and transaction costs and to encourage and aid the members of the network to function more effectively and efficiently. The aim is to encourage development and adoption of innovations in the context of peacekeeping and peace support and make them available more easily and cost effectively in the network, while supporting transparency. The research is interested in the limitations and barriers, such as legal restrictions, national and organizational restrictions, guarding and guiding the procurement processes of the organizations in the network.

On behalf of FINCENT, Mr Rajamäki Jasse carries out this pilot research under the direct command of Commander Schroderus. Mr. Rajamäki completed his military service in the Finnish Defence Forces and worked as research assistant and project worker at the National Defence University of Finland. He is a reserve officer and holds the rank of second lieutenant. He is a master’s degree student at the Department of Social Sciences of University of Turku and he is finalizing his second bachelors’ degree from Aalto University majoring in international business management. Part of this research is used in his bachelor’s thesis.

The organization participating in this research has the right to discontinue participating in this research at any stage and to demand that the answer it has provided to be destroyed. The organization answering this questionnaire has the right to stay anonymous if it so requests. In this case, the answer will be anonymized for later research.

We kindly ask you to write your answers under the questions or to a separate document. In the latter case, please identify your answer by using the correct question number and letter. We ask you to write freely, the more information and more details you can give the more depth this research is able to reach. If you cannot or do not want to answer a specific question(s), please just write “skip” under this question, so that we will know that you have not accidentally missed the question.

In case you have any questions, we are more than happy to answer. Please, do not hesitate to ask for further information if needed.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Definitions:

**Efficiency** – The ability to accomplish a process with the least waste of time and effort; competency in performance

**Effectiveness** - The degree to which a process is successful in producing a desired result

**Procurement** - An act of obtaining or buying goods and services for the organization to be used in an operation or a process.

**International Governmental Organization (IGO)** - IGO is an organization composed primarily of sovereign states, or of other intergovernmental organizations. IGOs are established by treaty or other agreement that acts as a charter creating the group.

**Non-Governmental Organization (INGO)** - A non-profit organization that operates independently of any government, typically one whose purpose is to address a social or political issue.

**International Non-Governmental Organization** – Has similar tasks as an NGO, but is international in scope and deals with specific social or political issues in multiple countries.

**Transparent** – Openness of the procurement process for the partners and for the larger public

**Technical aid** – Providing organization’s skill and competences for aiding other organization to develop.

**Quality** - A measure of excellence or a state of being free from defects, deficiencies and significant variations. It is brought about by strict and consistent commitment to certain standards that achieve uniformity of a product in order to satisfy specific customer or user requirements.

**Quality Standard** - A quality standard is a detail of the requirements, specifications, the various guidelines and characteristics to be demonstrated by the product in order to meet the purpose of the product, process or the service
Questionnaire:

1. **Procurement regulations, laws, agreements and documents:**

Please state the regulations, laws, agreements and the documents that are guiding and affecting the procurement processes of your organization on the following levels:

1.A **Organizational** (E.g. FINCENT does not have its own procurement process and the organization follows the procurement process of the National Defence University of Finland)

1.B **National and Federal** (E.g. The National Defence University is legally required to follow the law of public procurement of Finland “Hankintalaki 1397/2016”)

1.C **Regional** (E.g. Any public acquisitions carried out need to comply with the current EU directives and regulations, such as the EU directive 2014/24)

1.D **International** (E.g. If the organization is working in multiple countries or belongs to some International governmental or non-governmental organization(s), are the procurement protocols of these nations or IGOs and/or INGOs affecting your organization)

2. **Organizational level**

2.A What quality standard(s) does your organization currently hold? (E.g. NATO quality standard, ISO 9001:2015, etc.)

2.B How is a need for procurement identified in your organization?

2.C How is a procurement process itself initiated?

2.D Who typically initiates the process?

2.E How is the responsibility for the procurement process shared in your organization? (E.g. does a single individual take the main responsibility or some kind of committee nominated for the duration of the procurement process?)

2.F How is the final decision of the procurement conducted?

2.G What is the role of the director of the organization in the procurement process?

2.H Who is or are responsible in your organization for the communication between your organization and its suppliers before, during and after the procurement process?

2.I How long, on average, do the procurement processes of your organization typically last from the initiation to the final delivery of the procurement?
2.J How does your organization collect feedback from the procurement? (E.g. Has the procurement answered the need it was obtained for)

2.L Who is typically responsible for collecting feedback?

2.M How does your organization monitor procurement efficiency?

2.N How does your organization monitor procurement effectiveness?

2.O Who has the responsibility for monitoring efficiency and effectiveness of the procurement?

2.P How big is the annual budget of your organization? (Please answer in euros or dollars)

2.Q How much of the organization’s annual budget is typically directed to research and development efforts that are aimed to improve the organization itself?

2.R How transparent do you see your organization’s procurement process to be?

2.S Do you consider that there are major barriers to transparency? If so, please elaborate.

3. Support from other organizations

3.1 Technical assistance

3.1.A Does your organization use technical assistance from other organizations prior to or during the procurement process? If so, please identify these organizations.

3.1.B Please describe what kind of technical assistance your organization uses.

3.2 Evaluation assistance

3.2.A Does your organization use evaluation assistance from any other organization prior to, during or after the procurement process? If so, please identify these organizations.

3.2.B Please describe in detail what kind of evaluation assistance your organization uses.

3.3 Joint procurement and financial assistance

3.3.A Has your organization carried out any joint procurements with any other organization? If so, please identify these organizations.
3.3.B Does or has your organization received any financial aid from any other organization or organizations to aid with procurement?

3.3.C Does your organization receive any financial aid from any other organization for research and development efforts? If so, please identify these organizations.

3.3.D Has your organization aided or supported any other organization concerning procurement? If so, has this support been financial and/or technical?

4. Improvement of this pilot research

4.1 Do you have any suggestions to improve this questionnaire? If so, please elaborate.

Thank you for your answers.