



EFFICIENCY OF SALES LOGISTICS IN OWN AND PARTNER NETWORKS

Łukasz Brzeziński¹, Piotr Cyplik²

1) Poznań School of Logistics, Poznań, **Poland**, 2) Poznan University of Technology, Poznań, **Poland**

ABSTRACT. Background: Sales plays an important and simultaneously specific role in an organization's logistics system. It can be pointed out that it is the connective tissue between the supply and distribution subsystems of a business entity. Sales logistics encompasses all the activities whose core tenet is to provide the customer with the ordered product within the required time, at a satisfactory cost and quality. Additionally, it should be pointed out that sales networks in the telecommunications industry are actively involved especially in distribution. There are three types of sales networks in telecommunications companies. These are own sales networks, partner sales networks - also called external or dealerships, and mixed networks - where both previously enumerated solutions work simultaneously. The conditions for the proper functioning of own and partner sales networks differ significantly in terms of both the formal-legal side and remuneration. The purpose of the article is to analyze the impact of using sales network partners on the effectiveness of sales logistics.

Methods: The comparative analysis dealt with four entities constituting the telecommunications industry in Poland, considering such parameters as: number of employees, average number of activations per employee, average cost per one employee, average income per one employee, sales profitability. The analysis period covered the years in which the surveyed entities used own and partner sales networks in parallel (1999-2016).

Results: When comparing the functioning of own and partner sales networks based on the studied parameters, it should be noted that the latter is characterized by a much higher number of employees (by 73.19%). Besides, the profitability of sales in the partner network is much higher than in the case of own network - by 141.69 percentage points.

Conclusions: Partner sales networks are characterized by a higher average sales value and profitability than own networks. At the same time, there are a larger number of employees employed in partner sales networks. It should be noted that in respect of market penetration and income generation by organizations, this solution is more advantageous. The added value of the research is determining the level of sales logistics effectiveness of own and partner sales networks in terms of the telecommunications industry.

Key words: sales logistics, comparative analysis of sales networks, telecommunications industry, sales effectiveness of own and partner networks.

INTRODUCTION

Sales logistics is an area covering all the activities whose basic assumption is to deliver the ordered goods to the customer within the time set by him. In this aspect, it is vital to maintain a rational cost, and even minimize it as in the case of intensifying competitive fights

[Mellat-Parast, Spillan 2014, Kampf, Ližbetinová, Tišlerová 2017].

When looking at a slightly broader approach related to the entire supply chain of the telecommunications market, in terms of phases it consists of a supply (suppliers), sales (telecommunications operators, sales networks) and distribution (sales networks, courier companies). The supply concerns entities providing products offered by

telecommunications operators (telephones, smartphones, laptops, netbooks, modems, tablets and other devices). Sales of telecommunications services and products are carried out by sales networks (own and partner) of telecommunications operators. On the other hand, the distribution of products and services is carried out by courier companies, as well as by sales networks - including partner networks. Also, it should be noted that sales networks actively participate in both the sales and distribution phase [Brzeziński, Wyrwicka 2018].

Distribution logistics is the total of actions taken to achieve effective product movement from the end of the process on the production line to the consumer. It covers all tasks related to supplying the customer with products directly from production, from sales warehouses or possibly from other regional shipping centres. Typically, this stage of flows already concerns final products, but examples of different situations include the takeover by a specialized logistics distribution service provider along with the previous final assembly of the product adapting its features to the needs of the final recipient [Jazairy, Lenhardt, von Haartman, 2017].

When taking appropriate actions to place goods at the buyer's disposal, it is necessary to take into account, above all, his expectations, especially in terms of quantity and quality of products, delivery times and the scope of after-sales services, as well as the division of tasks related to the flow of goods between the supplier and the recipient. The development of service standards plays an important role in this respect.

Distribution stands for all the activities related to the movement of materials, usually products and components for the needs of the service, from the producer to the consumer. These include transport, storage, inventory management, material handling, order processing, location analysis, packaging management, information processing and communication necessary for effective coordination of all activities [Thompson, Richardson 1996, Lechner, Dowling, Welp, 2006, Gino, Melacini, Sassi, Tappia 2017].

However, despite the complexity of sales logistics and its links with aspects of distribution, the implementation of effective commercial processes seems to be more difficult and somewhat initiating activity for others - because it provides the organization with financial resources in the form of revenues. A characteristic feature of sales in the telecommunications industry is that it takes the form of a network [Fabbe-Costes, Jahre, 2008, Kościelniak 2014, Bang-Ning, Chen, Lin, 2016, Jens, Teuteberg, 2016, Urciuoli, Hints, 2017].

Cooperation has always existed in the economy resulting from the adopted tactics of the enterprise or operational needs. Contemporary cooperation relations are developed and supported by technology. They now penetrate life so strongly that the metaphor of the network becomes ubiquitous, and the characteristics describing the connections indicate that it is global [Bengtsson, Kock, 2000, Agndal, Nilsson 2009; da Mota Pedrosa, Blazevic, Jasmand, 2015].

The creation of network forms of sales processes results from the search for new forms of task implementation. Important features of networking include: goal - creating a sense of identity that allows effective management of resources, participants, their activities in a way that enables the implementation of the assumed strategy; high degree of specialization; network structure often determined depending on the goal or problem being solved; coordination based on self-organization, problem solving, employee involvement; spontaneity [Peterson, Zimmerman 2004]; low formalization - few written rules, information flow through the network of connections, knowledge resources perceived as a common good, available to everyone [Hadas, Stachowiak, Cyplik, 2011; Oláh, Karmazin, Pető, Popp, 2018].

The development of network forms means that new forms of work organization are used. An employee can be used to create value in an enterprise. In sales networks, employees increasingly have a relatively wide range of rights and responsibilities. The model of self-managing teams and time forms - e.g. task-

based (e.g. partner sales networks) is becoming more common [Hakansson, Havila, Pedersen 2000, Cachon, Swinney, 2009, Metcalfe 2010, Manuj, Sahin, 2011, Tereyağoğlu, Veerarahavan, 2012, Wudhikarn, Chakpitak, Neubert, 2018, Solakivi, Hofmann, Töyli, Ojala 2018].

CHARACTERISTICS OF OWN AND PARTNER SALES NETWORKS IN THE TELECOMMUNICATION INDUSTRY

A network is an organizationally related structure that occurs inside and / or outside an enterprise with its separate resources and tasks. This structure is also a link between the market and the enterprise, through which, for example, the sale of goods takes place [Bradford, et. al., 2019, Agnihotri, et. al. 2017, Gustafson, et. al, 2018, Palmatier, et. al., 2018].

There are three types of sales networks in telecommunications companies. These are own sales network and partner sales network - also called external or dealerships, and mixed networks - where both previously mentioned solutions work simultaneously. The functioning of your own sales network depends entirely on the company's resources: employees are employed under employment contracts. On the other hand, partner sales networks are usually based on commercial contracts, and most of the operating costs are passed on to entities operating in this type of network. [Davis-Blake, Broschak 2009, Smith, 2015].

Entities forming a partner sales network are enterprises. Thus, the leading entity - the parent enterprise (forming the network) establishes cooperation based on commercial contracts (cooperation agreements) with partners who are to implement the processes of selling products and services for the parent enterprise. The partners, in turn, further shape their own sales structures.

The functioning of the sales network depends on many elements, which include, in particular, the persons employed in them, providing an appropriate offer to recipients,

providing support for employees in the form of IT tools, allocation of material resources in the form of e.g. offices and their equipment. Also, the distribution of structures in the area covered by sales activities should be based on current needs and market trends [Davis-Blake, Broschak 2009, Smith 2015].

When examining the context of sales logistics in the aspect of own and partner network forms, it is worth pointing to an interesting level of functioning, primarily of the second type of network. An affiliate sales network is an alternative or joint solution (in the case of mixed networks) concerning own sales networks. It is a structure composed of entities performing sales activities for the commissioning company, which use its resources, but do not fall directly into the organizational scope of the entity - the ordering party [Lin, Shi, Zhou 2010].

Therefore, one can indicate several leading concepts that shape the essence of partner sales networks. These include, among others, strategic alliances, contracting, cooperation, partnering and shared resources (Fig. 1). Sometimes the functioning of partner sales networks can be based on organizational cooperation of partners.



Source: own work

Fig. 1. Potential ideas for the functioning of partner sales networks

Essentially, outsourcing consists of entrusting the performance of the function of an enterprise to an external entity or a unit established for this purpose, e.g. a daughter

company. The concept, scope and purpose of outsourcing have changed over time. Initially, it was a way to reduce costs, then the possibility of reducing exposure to the risk of technological changes, reducing the scope of operations, as well as a strategic orientation. Therefore, outsourcing can be considered the initial element based on which subsequent elements were created [Davis-Blake, Broschak 2009, Smith 2015].

The Alliance is a union of several enterprises that are competitors and operate on the same market, usually of a long-term nature, whose goal is to implement a joint venture. In comparison to typical cooperation relations between enterprises, strategic alliances are distinguished by a broader scope that may apply to the entire market, and potential directions of activity, a small number of partners [Dziaduch, Knokol 2009]. Contracting - instead of an employment contract, an agreement is concluded between the cooperating entities under which the terms of cooperation are established. Cooperation is the cooperation of many entities aimed at achieving a common goal, and individual entities mutually support each other in achieving it. This applies to cooperation, e.g. in the provision of services, i.e. the scope covers all types of relationships between enterprises. Cooperation stands out in relation to outsourcing: joint implementation of partial tasks, the contractual nature of cooperation, freedom in determining the form of cooperation. Partnering is associated with the identification of mutual relations between the customer and the supplier as a result of which both parties gain benefits. Partnering is focused on developing high-quality contacts with the recipient of products or services. In a sense, this concept is synonymous with outsourcing, but in this approach, the most important are relations between partners. Shared resources concern the joint use of enterprise infrastructure, e.g. computer network, provision of computer programs, data, mass storage devices, printers [Inkpen, Tank 2005, Davis-Blake, Broschak 2009, Smith 2015].

Entities forming a partner sales network are enterprises. Thus, the leading entity - the parent enterprise (forming the network)

establishes cooperation based on commercial contracts (cooperation agreements) with partners who are to implement the processes of selling products and services for the parent enterprise. The partners, in turn, further shape their own sales structures. Operating costs result from the workload of tasks. Therefore, the remuneration for the provision of sales processes to the parent enterprise by the partner is based on the commission, which is specified in the contract. This is due to the allocation of tasks between individual entities. Similar relationships occur between the partner and sales representatives employed in the partner sales network. All operating costs are "passed on" to sales representatives.

Own and partner sales networks, despite a certain convergence in the very purpose of their operation, which can be synthetically described as the highest possible efficiency of sales processes, in the very operation and integration into the company structure differ significantly. Therefore, it seems reasonable to compare them.

Common features and differences between own sales networks and partner sales networks will be compiled in the following categories: employees, sales plans, organization, costs, salaries, entitlements and responsibility, assets, and control and supervision. The comparison is presented in Table 1.

The main difference between the two types of sales network considered here is the contract with a sales representative, based on which employees are employed. In the case of own sales networks, this is an employment contract (in principle), while partner networks have cooperation agreements (which is a reference to contracting). The differences are also manifested in the organization because own sales networks are included in the structures of the leading enterprise. The partner network has no such connection, the only link is the person of the director of the partner network who is employed in the contracting enterprise. Own networks are characterized by significantly higher operating costs. In partner networks, remuneration is based on commission, if the people employed there will not finalize sales transactions, there will be no basis for payment for the work done. In the case of their own

sales network, the company's management or board of directors can fully control and interfere in operations.

Table 1. Features of own sales networks and partner sales networks – comparison

Specification	Own sales networks	Partner sales networks
Employees	Employed on the basis of an employment contract	The cooperation between the parent company and the partner is based on a cooperation agreement. The partner also employs employees based on a cooperation agreement (contracting)
Sales plans	Monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual sales goals are set for the employees	In the case of a partner, an overall sales goal (for the entire entity) is set, as well as individual goals for individual employees - sales representatives and sales managers
Organisation	The sales network is included in the company structure as part of the Sales Department or Division and is managed by the Sales Director in accordance with the objectives set by the Management Board	Partner networks operate outside the enterprise structure and in addition, the entity implements its own organizational solutions. However, contractual subordination remains with respect to the parent enterprise, and the supervision of the partner network is usually performed by the Partner Network Director employed in the parent enterprise.
Costs	All operating costs of the company's own sales network are borne by the home company, you can distinguish, inter alia, the costs of remuneration (along with mark-ups, bonuses, premiums, etc.), training, work tools (e.g. company cars, fuel costs, cell phones, laptops, tablets, computer software, customer database, etc.) and promotional activities (advertising materials, promotional campaigns, customer bonuses).	All costs of the partner sales network are borne by the partner and his employees, including training, work tools (e.g. mobile phones, laptops, tablets, computer software, customer database, etc.) and promotional activities (advertising materials, promotional campaigns, bonuses for customers).
Earnings (revenue - for partner networks)	Borne by the parent company based on the employment contract, bonus and other extra regulations	The partner as an institution receives remuneration for services rendered, and then pays them to employees based on sales volume and commission rates
Entitlements, responsibility	Employees of own sales network have proxies and full rights to sell services and products	The independent entity has full authority and responsibility for the performance of the function
Assets	Fixed assets such as real estate, e.g. land, buildings, structures, premises constituting a separate real estate, their parts or shares; machinery and equipment as well as means of transport belong to the parent enterprise	Fixed assets such as real estate, e.g. land, buildings, structures, premises constituting a separate real estate, their parts or shares; machines and equipment as well as means of transport belong to a partner or sales representatives and it is private property. Partial use of the leading enterprise infrastructure
Control and supervision	The management board and management of the parent enterprise are free to control the activities of an own sales network, have full market access, and possibility of ongoing implementation of changes and modifying the specifics of operations	From the perspective of the parent company, there is a limited possibility of controlling the functioning of the partner network, the modifications are difficult and more time is needed for them to start functioning, the partner has full control and supervision, implementing changes in current operations and others

Source: own work

Referring to certain similarities in the activities of own and partner networks, one should indicate the rights - employees in both cases have the power of attorney to conclude contracts, sell products and services. The next element is assets (enterprise resources), which are jointly used to a certain extent.

The functioning of the sales network depends on many elements, which include, in particular, the persons employed in them, providing an appropriate offer to recipients, providing support for employees in the form of IT tools, allocation of material resources in the form of e.g. offices and their equipment. Also, the distribution of structures in the area

covered by sales activities should be based on current needs and market trends.

METHODOLOGY OF OWN STUDY

In the research process, inferences were made about the entire statistical population based on information collected during the statistical (representative) sample survey.

The research sample consisted of all (four) enterprises, which at the same time, per the adopted baseline criteria, simultaneously created the entire telecommunications market

in Poland. Based on the data from the Office of Electronic Communications, it can be concluded that in 2015, 23 business entities operated on the telecommunications market in Poland. However, only four entities meet the following criteria:

- enterprises operate on the territory of the Republic of Poland
- enterprises operate in the mobile telephony segment in particular,
- enterprises covered by the survey use partner networks,
- partner networks operate on behalf of enterprises in the telecommunications industry in Poland realize sales both on the business market and the individual customer market (sales to other natural persons),
- enterprises offer post-paid services, i.e. subscription services.

The research activities undertaken were utilitarian and in particular, referred to business practice. The research assumption was to confront the effectiveness of sales logistics obtained by own and partner sales networks in the telecommunications industry in Poland.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the impact of using sales network partners on the effectiveness of sales Logistics.

On this basis, the following research problems were formulated:

Are partner sales networks more efficient than own sales networks (in terms of sales logistics)?

P1: What is the average cost per employee in own and partner networks?

P2: What is the average income per employee in own and partner networks?

P3: What is the average number of activations per employee in own and partner networks?

P4: What is the profitability of sales logistics of own and partner sales networks?

The effectiveness was analysed based on values: number of employees, average number of activations per employee (activation of the customer's SIM card in the telecommunications network of the telecommunications operator), average cost per one employee, average income per one employee, sales profitability.

Variables selected in this way, used in the operation, perform sales logistics effectiveness assessments. On the one hand, they include the cost side. In the case of employees belonging to the sales network, gross remuneration, costs associated with reaching the customer and the costs of providing telecommunications equipment, as well as the revenues generated by these employees (average number of activations based on). In turn, in the case of partners in the sales network, costs related to the payment of commission are included. It is also irrelevant to indicate the number of employees to indicate the scale of activity. On this basis, you can assess the logistics efficiency and compare the effectiveness of sales logistics.

The leading research method was comparative analysis, which services identify the type of elements forming a given whole based on their features and assess the efficiency of the whole functioning against the background of the adopted pattern. The comparative analysis concerns a specific object, which is usually complex and differs from others, therefore it is a set of its proper features with different potential information. The study of complex objects or phenomena means that comparative analysis has many dimensions [Reynolds 2000, Zimmerman and Szenberg 2000].

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SALES LOGISTICS EFFICIENCY OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENTERPRISES IN POLAND

The following entities will be subject to comparative analysis: Enterprise A, Enterprise B, Enterprise C, Enterprise D.

Enterprise A has been using partner networks since 2008 when it employed 33 people in its own sales network and 70 in the partner sales network. In 2016, 956 people were employed in the enterprise, whose daily duties were directly related to sales in their own sales network (showrooms and sales representatives), and 1356 people in the partner network. It is worth noting that until 2012 there was a significant increase in sales and employment outlets in both own and partner networks. In subsequent years, there was a systematic decrease in the number of showrooms and employment in both types of sales networks.

Enterprise B has been using partner networks since 1999. In 2016, the total number of employees of the own network was 665. However, in the case of the partner network, it was 1340 people. The number of own showrooms in 2016 was 220, and there were 530 in the partner network. Also, the number of sales representatives in the partner network in 2016 was much higher (420 people) than in the case of own sales network (225 people).

Enterprise C launched a partner sales network in 2001. This entity has the most extensive sales structures compared to enterprises A, B and D. In 2016, there were 270 own and 850 partner showrooms. The total number of employees in the own network was 1000 and the partner network 2130.

Enterprise D launched a partner sales network in 2002. In the same year, 200 employees were employed in their own sales network. In 2016, this number was 1095. 190 people were employed in the partner network in 2002, and in 2016, 950.

The analyses carried out were based on three main values: the average annual number of activations per employee (activation of the customer's SIM card in the telecommunications network of the telecommunications operator), then the average annual cost per employee, which in the case of employees of the own network consists of remuneration with mark-ups, bonuses, business trips, fuel costs, the purchase of a car fleet, business phones, business laptops and other items necessary for work. However, in

relation to employees of the partner network, it is the cost of commission and possible bonuses for obtaining high sales results. The average income per employee is the inflow of funds resulting from all activations. These are subscription services, i.e. the customer bears the monthly costs of using a specific SIM card, plus one-time activations and the purchase of additional paid services.

The average number of employees of own sales network in all enterprises covered by the survey was 877.00 (median 887.00). The average number of activations sold by one employee was 148.47. The average employer's cost per employee was PLN 90,575.70. The average income per employee was PLN 19,118.10. The profitability of sales was at 125.12%.

The average number of employees of the partner networks of all the analysed enterprises was 1517.00 people, besides, the average sales of activations per employee were 176.56. The average cost of one employee was PLN 62,744.46, and the average income per employee was PLN 22,702.10. Sales profitability was 266.71% (Table 9).

Comparing the calculated parameters for own and partner sales networks, it should be noted that the latter employs significantly more employees (by 73.19%). Concerning the average number of activations in the annual average, the employees of the partner network sold 18.92% more. Costs per employee in the content network were 30.73% lower than in the case of the own network. The average revenue per employee of the partner network was higher by 18.91% compared to own sales networks. The profitability of sales in the content network was much higher than in the case of own network - by 141.69 percentage points. A comparison of the values of own and partner networks is presented in Table 2.

Summing up the analysis carried out in terms of the average number of activations per employee, average income and cost per employee and sales profitability, in each of the examined elements the partner networks achieved better results.

Table 2. Number of regular destinations and passenger traffic in 2013

Specification	Element of descriptive statistics	Own sales network	Partner sales network
Number of employees [pers.]	Average	875,71	1516,67
	Median	878,90	1320,75
	Minimum value	708,33	1197,67
	Maximum value	1036,67	2227,5
Average number of activations per employee [PLN]	Average	148,47	176,56
	Median	146,82	179,08
	Minimum value	137,44	163,06
	Maximum value	162,80	185,00
Average cost per one employee [PLN]	Average	90575,70	62744,46
	Median	90663,83	62991,34
	Minimum value	77202,22	59551,88
	Maximum value	103772,90	65443,28
Average income per one employee [PLN]	Average	191148,10	227302,10
	Mediana	18985,30	224325,90
	Minimum value	169851,10	212447,80
	Maximum value	214874,20	248108,70
Sales profitability [%]	Average	125,12%	266,81%
	Median	122,43%	265,69%
	Minimum value	91,55%	245,27%
	Maximum value	164,06%	290,58%

Source: own work

own sales networks - should be verified positively.

CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

The goal of the research - to analyze the impact of using sales network partners on the effectiveness of sales logistics - has been executed.

While partner sales networks are, in principle, more effective than own sales networks, the added value of this research is to determine the scale of this phenomenon in terms of the entire telecommunications industry. There are no similar studies of this type in Poland - conducted on such a scale. The authors also failed to find this in foreign literature, even in relation to other industries. Therefore, it should be pointed out that the authors have made a significant contribution to acquiring new knowledge.

Employees of partner sales networks generate higher sales (recognized as the average annual number of activations per employee - by 18.92%, with lower costs per employee by 30.73%). This shows the significant advantage and legitimacy of creating partner sales networks. On this basis, the research hypothesis - partner networks are characterized by better sales efficiency than

own sales networks - should be verified positively. It seems that employees of partner networks - from the perspective of the due commission are motivated to more active sales activities and showing greater initiative - which also translates into remuneration. Besides, taking into account the context of the parent enterprise - lower costs resulting from the specificity of the operation of partner networks are an additional factor prompting management to create such structures. Therefore, in the context of sales logistics, the creation of partner structures is a more beneficial solution for an economic entity, where reaching the client with the offer and closing the sale takes place at a lower cost, also, a higher level of transactional efficiency is not without significance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND FUNDING SOURCE DECLARATION

This paper has been the result of the study conducted within the projects pursued at the Poznan University of Technology, Faculty of Engineering Management [project number: 11/140/SBAD/4168] and Poznan School of Logistics [project number KSL 2/17].

REFERENCES

- Agndal H., Nilsson U., 2009. Interorganizational cost management in the exchange process, *Management Accounting Research*, 20, 2, <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2008.07.001>.
- Agnihotri, R., Colin B.G., Itani O.S., Jaramillo F., Krush M.T., 2017, Salesperson Ambidexterity and Customer Satisfaction: Examining the Role of Customer Demandingness, Adaptive Selling, and Role Conflict, *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 37 (1):27–41. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2016.1272053>.
- Bang-Ning H., Chen T.T., Lin J.T., 2016. 3PL Selection Criteria in Integrated Circuit Manufacturing Industry in Taiwan, *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 21, 1, 103–124. <http://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-03-2014-0089>.
- Bengtsson M., Kock S., 2000. Coopetition in Business Networks – Cooperate and Compete Simultaneously, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 29, 411-426.
- Bradford K.D., Yongmei L., Yuying S., Weitz B.A., Xu J., 2019. Harnessing Internal Support to Enhance Customer Relationships: The Role of Networking, Helping, and Allocentrism, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 27, 2, 140-158.
- Brzeziński Ł., Wyrwicka M.K., 2018. Development factors of partnership sales networks in the supply chain of a telecom - case study, *Research in Logistics & Production*, 8, 4, 329-339, <http://doi.org/10.21008/j.2083-4950.2018.8.4.4>.
- Cachon G.P., Swinney R., 2009, Purchasing, pricing, and quick response in the presence of strategic consumers, *Management Science*, 55, 3, 497-511.
- da Mota Pedrosa A., Blazevic V., Jasmand C., 2015. Logistics innovation development: a micro-level perspective, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 45, 4, 313-332. <http://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-12-2014-0289>.
- Davis-Blake A., Broschak J.P. 2009. Outsourcing and the Changing Nature of Work, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 321-340. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134641>.
- Fabbe-Costes N., Jahre M., 2008. Supply chain integration and performance: A review of the evidence. *International Journal of Logistics Management* 19, 2.
- Gino M., Melacini M., Sassi C., Tappia E., 2017. Assessing Efficiency and Innovation in the 3PL Industry: An Empirical Analysis, *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications* 20 (1): 53–72. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2016.1226789>.
- Gustafson B.M., Pomirleanu N., Mariadoss B.J., 2018. A Review of Climate and Culture Research in Selling and Sales Management, *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 38 (1):144–167. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2018.1426992>.
- Hadas L., Stachowiak A., Cyplik P., 2011. Decision Making Model in Integrated Assessment of Business-Environment System: a Case Study, in: Golinska P. (Ed.), Fertsch M. (Ed.), Marx-Gómez J. (Ed.), *Information Technologies in Environmental Engineering*. Environmental Science and Engineering, 3. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Hakansson H., Havila V., Pedersen A., 2000. Learning in Networks, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 28, 5, 443-452, [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-8501\(99\)00080-2](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-8501(99)00080-2).
- Inkpen, A.C., Tang, E.W.K., 2005. Social capital, networks and knowledge transfer. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 148.
- Jazairy A., Lenhardt J., von Haartman R., 2017, Improving logistics performance in cross-border 3PL relationships, *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 20:5, 491-513, <http://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2017.1306036>.

- Jens M., Teuteberg F., 2016, Understanding the 4PL Approach Within an Agricultural Supply Chain Using Matrix Model and Cross-Case Analysis, *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 19 (5): 333–350. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2015.1107533>.
- Kampf R., Ližbetinová L., Tišlerová K., 2017. Management of Customer Service in Terms of Logistics Information Systems, *Open Engineering*, 7, 1, 26-30. <http://doi.org/10.1515/eng-2017-0006>.
- Kościelniak H., 2014. An improvement of information processes in enterprises –the analysis of sales profitability in the manufacturing company using ERP systems. *Polish Journal of Management Studies* 2014; 10, 2, 65-72.
- Lechner Ch., Dowling M., Welpel I., 2006. Firm Networks and Firm Development: The Role of The Relational Mix, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21, 514-540.
- Lin Y., Shi Y. Zhou L., 2010. Service supply chain: nature, evolution, and operational implications, in: Huang G.Q. (Ed.), Mak K.L. (Ed.), Maropoulos P.G. (Ed.), *Advances in Intelligent and Soft Computing*, Vol. 66, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg, 1189-1204.
- Manuj I., Sahin F., 2011. A model of supply chain and supply chain decision-making complexity, *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, 41, 5, 511-549.
- Mellat-Parast M., Spillan J.E., 2014. Logistics and supply chain process integration as a source of competitive advantage, *International Journal of Logistics Management*, 25, 2, 289-314.
- Metcalfe, A.S., 2010. Examining the Trilateral Networks of the Triple Helix: Intermediating Organizations and Academy-Industry-Government Relations. *Critical Sociology*, 36, 4, 503–519. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0896920510365920>.
- Oláh J., Karmazin G., Petó K., Popp J., 2018. Information technology developments of logistics service providers in Hungary, *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 21:3, 332-344, <http://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2017.1393506>.
- Palmatier R.W., Houston M.B., Hulland J., 2018. Review Articles: Purpose, Process, and Structure, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 46, 1, 1-5.
- Peterson N.A., Zimmerman M.A., 2004. Beyond the individual: Toward a nomological network of organizational empowerment, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 34, 1-2, <http://doi.org/10.1023/B:AJCP.000004015177047.58>
- Reynolds N.L., 2000, Benchmarking International Marketing Research in Practice in UK Agencies Preliminary Evidence, *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 7, 5.
- Smith D.R., 2015. The outsourcing and commercialization of science, *Science & Society*, 16(1), 14-16. <http://doi.org/10.15252/embr.201439672>.
- Solakivi T., Hofmann E., Töyli J., Ojala L., 2018. The performance of logistics service providers and the logistics costs of shippers: a comparative study of Finland and Switzerland, *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 21:4, 444-463, <http://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2018.1439906>.
- Tereyağoğlu N., Veeraraghavan S., 2012. Selling to conspicuous consumers: pricing, production, and sourcing decisions, *Management Science*, 58, 12, 2168-2189.
- Thompson J.L., Richardson B., 1996. Strategic and Competitive Success: Towards a Model of the Comprehensively Competent Organization, *Management Decision*, 34, 5-19.
- Urciuoli L., Hintsala J., 2017. Adapting Supply Chain Management Strategies to Security –an Analysis of Existing Gaps and Recommendations for Improvement, *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 20, 3, 276–295. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2016.1219703>.

Wudhikarn R., Chakpitak N., Neubert G., 2018. A literature review on performance measures of logistics management: an intellectual capital perspective, *International Journal of Production Research*, 56:13, 4490-4520, <http://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2018.1431414>.

Zimmerman A.S., Szenberg M., 2000. Implementing International Qualitative Research: Techniques and Obstacles, *Qualitative Market Research An International Journal*, 3, 3, <http://doi.org/10.1108/13522750010333906>

EFEKTYWNOŚĆ LOGISTYKI SPRZEDAŻY WŁASNYCH I PARTNERSKICH SIECI SPRZEDAŻY

STRESZCZENIE. Wstęp: Sprzedaż pełni istotną i jednocześnie specyficzną rolę w systemie logistycznym organizacji. Można wskazać, że jest spójnikiem pomiędzy podsystemem zaopatrzenia i dystrybucji podmiotu gospodarczego. Logistyka sprzedaży obejmuje swoim zakresem ogół działań, których podstawowym założeniem jest dostarczenie klientowi zamawianego produktu, w wymaganym czasie, przy zadowalającym koszcie i jakości. Dodatkowo należy wskazać, że sieci sprzedaży w branży telekomunikacyjnej, uczestniczą aktywnie w szczególności w dystrybucji. W przedsiębiorstwach telekomunikacyjnych spotyka się trzy rodzaje sieci sprzedaży. Są to: własna sieć sprzedaży i partnerska sieć sprzedaży - nazywana również zewnętrzną lub dealerską oraz sieci mieszane - gdzie oba wymienione uprzednio rozwiązania działają jednocześnie. Uwarunkowania funkcjonowania własnych i partnerskich sieci sprzedaży znacząco się różnią - zarówno od strony formalno-prawnej jak i wynagrodzenia. Celem artykułu jest analiza wpływu wykorzystania partnerów sieci sprzedaży na efektywność logistyki sprzedaży.

Metody: Zastosowano metodą analizy porównawczej czterech podmiotów tworzących branżę telekomunikacyjną w Polsce z uwzględnieniem takich parametrów jak: liczba pracowników, średnia liczba aktywacji na pracownika, średni koszt na jednego pracownika, średni dochód na jednego pracownika, rentowność sprzedaży. Okres analiz obejmował lata, w którym badane podmioty stosowały równolegle sieci własne i partnerskie sprzedaży (1999-2016).

Wyniki: Porównując funkcjonowanie własnych i partnerskich sieci sprzedaży w oparciu o badane parametry, należy zaznaczyć, że te drugie cechują się znacznie wyższą liczbą zatrudnionych pracowników (o 73,19%). Ponadto rentowność sprzedaży w sieci partnerskiej jest o wiele wyższa niż w przypadku sieci własnej - o 141,69 punktów procentowych.

Wnioski: Partnerskie sieci sprzedaży charakteryzują się przeciętnie wyższą wartością sprzedaży i rentowności niż sieci własne. Jednocześnie zatrudniona w tej formie jest większa liczba pracowników. Należy wskazać, że pod względem penetracji rynku i uzyskiwania przychodów przez organizacje, to rozwiązanie jest korzystniejsze. Wartością dodaną badania jest określenie poziomu efektywności logistyki sprzedaży własnych i partnerskich sieci sprzedaży w branży telekomunikacyjnej.

Słowa kluczowe: logistyka sprzedaży, analiza porównawcza sieci sprzedaży, branża telekomunikacyjna, efektywność sprzedaży sieci własnych i partnerskich

Łukasz Brzeziński ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4948-7118>

Poznań School of Logistics
Faculty of Management and Logistics
Department of Management Sciences
ul. E. Estkowskiego 6, 61-755 Poznań, **Poland**
e-mail: lukasz.brzezinski@wsl.com.pl

Piotr Cyplik ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5775-6760>

Poznan University of Technology
Strzelecka 11, 60-965 Poznań, **Poland**
e-mail: piotr.cyplik@put.poznan.pl