



## INNOVATION AND MARKETING PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED CONSUMER PACKAGED GOODS MANUFACTURING COMPANIES IN ANAMBRA STATE, NIGERIA

VICTOR MONDAY DIBIE

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING

MICHAEL OKPARA UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE, UMUDIKE, ABIA STATE, NIGERIA

EMAIL: [dibie.victor@mouau.edu.ng](mailto:dibie.victor@mouau.edu.ng)

CHIDI EMMANUEL UWASOMBA

DEPARTMENT OF ENTREPRENEURIAL STUDIES

MICHAEL OKPARA UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE, UMUDIKE, ABIA STATE, NIGERIA

ANIUGA CHUKWUMA

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING

MICHAEL OKPARA UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE, UMUDIKE, ABIA STATE, NIGERIA

&

ANTHONY OSUJI

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA, UMUDIKE STUDY CENTRE

### **Abstract**

*This study examines the effect of innovation on marketing performance of selected consumer-packaged goods (CPGs) manufacturing companies in Anambra State. The major objectives of the study were, to; determine the extent to which package innovation, product innovation and market innovation affect marketing performance. To achieve the objectives of the study, survey research design was adopted. Primary data was used through the use of questionnaire. The population of the study was made up of 500 employees and management staff of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies in Anambra State. The sample was 250 after adopting purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using correlation coefficient analysis. The findings revealed that there is a significant relationship between package innovation, product innovation and market innovation on marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies. The study concluded that innovation plays a critical role in enhancing the marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods (CPGs) manufacturing companies. Based on the findings, the study recommended that CPGs manufacturing companies should prioritize innovative packaging strategies such as eco-friendly materials, attractive designs, and user-friendly features to enhance product visibility and consumer appeal.*

**Keywords:** Innovation, Marketing Performance, Consumer-Packaged Goods, Manufacturing Companies.

### **Introduction**

Innovation has increasingly become a central driver of marketing success in modern business environments. The integration of scientific advancements into product development, marketing processes, and service delivery combined with the willingness of firms to take calculated risks for commercial gains has made innovation indispensable for enhancing

marketing performance (Dibie, Nto, Unanam & Basse, 2019). In today's highly competitive and globalized marketplace, firms must continuously adapt to changing consumer preferences and technological trends in order to remain relevant and competitive (Liao & Rice, 2020). Globalization has intensified competition and expanded market opportunities, making innovation a strategic tool for firms seeking to improve

market penetration and customer engagement. Innovation enables organizations to introduce new products, refine marketing strategies, and create superior customer value, all of which contribute significantly to improved marketing outcomes such as increased sales, brand loyalty, and market share. Consequently, innovation is widely recognized as a key determinant of organizational success and long-term sustainability.

However, innovation is not without risks, the introduction of new products or marketing strategies may expose firms to uncertainties such as market rejection, competitive pressures, and operational inefficiencies. The degree of risk tends to increase with the novelty of innovation, making effective innovation management essential. Firms that successfully manage these risks often demonstrate strong customer orientation, continuous improvement in product offerings, effective marketing communication, and a strategic balance between innovation and market demands. For consumer-packaged goods (CPGs) manufacturing companies in Nigeria, innovation plays a crucial role in shaping marketing performance (Dibie *et al.*, 2019). Traditional competitive strategies such as price adjustments are no longer sufficient to sustain growth. Instead, firms must adopt innovative marketing approaches that respond to rapidly evolving consumer needs and preferences. This has led to the emergence of innovation-driven marketing strategies that serve as a guide for achieving competitive advantage. Marketing performance, in this regard, extends beyond financial indicators to include metrics such as customer satisfaction, brand perception, customer retention, and market

responsiveness. Therefore, understanding how innovation influences marketing performance is critical for CPG firms seeking to thrive in a dynamic business environment.

### **Statement of the Problem**

In today's dynamic and competitive business environment, consumer packaged goods (CPGs) manufacturing companies are expected to leverage innovation to improve their marketing performance and sustain competitive advantage. Effective marketing performance requires firms to understand consumer needs, respond to market changes, develop innovative products, and implement efficient marketing strategies. However, many CPG manufacturing firms in Anambra State appear to struggle in aligning innovation with their marketing objectives. A number of these firms seem to lack the strategic capability to integrate innovation into their marketing activities, including product development, branding, promotion, and customer relationship management. This limitation may stem from inadequate managerial skills, poor market intelligence, weak innovation culture, and insufficient investment in research and development. As a result, such firms may experience low customer satisfaction, weak brand positioning, and declining market share. Furthermore, many companies appear to have limited awareness of external environmental factors such as government policies, economic fluctuations, and competitive dynamics that influence marketing performance. The inability to effectively analyze and respond to these factors often results in poor marketing decisions and ineffective execution of strategies (Brown & Maylor, 2015).

In addition, as stated by Cottam *et al.*, (2021) deficiencies in key areas such as marketing communication, customer service, record keeping, and performance evaluation further hinder their ability to achieve optimal

marketing outcomes. It is also observed that some firms operate without clearly defined marketing goals or innovation strategies, leading to inconsistent performance and, in some cases, business failure. The absence of a structured approach to innovation may cause firms to rely on outdated marketing practices that do not meet the demands of modern consumers. Given these challenges, there is a need to examine the extent to which innovation contributes to marketing performance among CPG manufacturing companies in Anambra State. This study therefore addressed this gap by investigating how innovation practices influence marketing outcomes in the selected firms.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The general objective of the study was to examine the effect of innovation and marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods (CPGs) manufacturing companies in Anambra State. The specific objectives of the study were, to:

1. Determine the effect of package innovation on marketing performance of CPGs;
2. Examine the extent to which product innovation affects marketing performance of CPGs; and
3. Examine the extent to which market innovation affects marketing performance of CPGs.

### **Scope of the Study**

This study focused on examining the effect of innovation on marketing performance of selected consumer packaged goods (CPGs) manufacturing companies (Sylflora Industries Nigeria Ltd and Eastern Distilleries and Food Industries) in Anambra State, Nigeria. The study specifically investigates how different dimensions of innovation namely package innovation,

product innovation, and market innovation contribute to marketing performance outcomes within the selected firms. Geographically, the study is limited to selected CPG manufacturing companies operating within Anambra State. The choice of this location is informed by the presence of numerous manufacturing firms engaged in the production and distribution of consumer goods, making it suitable for analyzing innovation-driven marketing practices. Methodologically, the study is restricted to data obtained from relevant staff and management of the selected firms, focusing on their perceptions and experiences regarding innovation practices and marketing outcomes.

### **Significance of the Study**

This study is expected to be beneficial to several stakeholders, including managers of CPG manufacturing companies, marketers, policymakers, researchers, and academics. The study will be valuable to management of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies, as it will provide insights into how different forms of innovation particularly package, product, and market innovation can enhance marketing performance. The findings will guide managers in formulating effective innovation strategies that improve customer satisfaction, brand positioning, and overall market competitiveness. The study will benefit marketing practitioners by highlighting the importance of integrating innovation into marketing activities. It will help marketers understand how innovative packaging, product improvements, and market-driven strategies can influence consumer behavior and improve sales performance. Policymakers and government agencies will find the study useful in designing policies and programs that encourage innovation within the manufacturing sector. The findings may inform initiatives aimed at supporting research and development, improving

technological adoption, and fostering a more innovation-driven business environment in Nigeria.

## Literature Review

### Concept of Innovation

There are several approaches to innovation in the economic literature from Joseph Schumpeter's definition. Henrik (2017) sees innovation as the successful implementation of a creation and this innovation seems to foster growth, profits and success. In defining innovation, there is a need to distinguish the subtle difference between an "invention" and "innovation." Traditionally, innovation recognizes development as generalized economic growth. In contrast, inclusive innovation views development as active inclusion of people excluded from the mainstream development. The difference refers to the inclusion involving some aspect of innovation for/by the marginalized groups (Foster and Heeks, 2023). Paunov (2023) reports heterogeneous terminology used in practice and literature for inclusive innovation. For example, terms like "frugal innovation" "pro-poor innovation" and "innovation for the bottom of the pyramid" have been used to depict inclusive innovation. Such innovations are considered inclusive and can possibly provide solutions for reducing negative lessons regarding the innovation of business faced by many countries in Africa and elsewhere in the developing world.

### Types of Innovation

#### 1. Market Innovation

Marketing innovation is the implementation of a new marketing method involving significant changes in product design or packaging, product placement, product promotion or pricing (OECD Oslo Manual, 2015). Marketing innovations target

at addressing customer needs better, opening up new markets, or newly positioning a firm's product on the market with the intention of increasing firm's sales (Ayyagari, Beck & Demirgüç, 2023). John (2019) states market innovation is concerned with improving the mix of the target markets and how chosen markets are best served. Its purpose is to identify better (new) potential markets and better (new) ways to serve target markets. Marketing innovations are strongly related to pricing strategies, product package design properties, product placement and promotion activities along the lines of four P's of marketing (Kotler, 1991). This activity relies on accurately interpreting buying preferences but in greater detail. According to John (2019), market innovation deals with the market mix and market selection in order to meet a customer's buying preference. Continual market innovation needs to be done by a firm because state-of-the-art marketing tools, particularly through the Internet, make it possible for other competitors to reach potential customers across the globe at a light speed. Rodriguez-Cano et al., (2024) assert that market innovation plays a crucial role in fulfilling market needs and responding to market opportunities. In this respect, any market innovation has to be directed at meeting customers' demand and satisfaction (Appiah-Adu & Satyendra, 2018).

#### 2. Product Innovation

Product innovation is the introduction of a good or service that is new or significantly improved regarding its characteristics or intended uses. This includes significant improvements in technical specifications, components and materials, incorporated software, user friendliness or other functional characteristics. Product innovations can utilize new knowledge or technologies, or can be based on new uses or combinations of existing knowledge or technologies. The term product

covers both goods and services (OECD Oslo Manual, 2015). Product innovation is a difficult process driven by advancing technologies, changing customer needs, shortening product life cycles, and increasing global competition (Alpkan, 2019). Innovation in products and services is related with R&D and meeting consumer's needs (Dale et al., 2019). Andy & Jasper (2018) states the production of new products or processes strengthens a firm's competitive position in relation to its rivals but the profits and growth will be transitory and only last as long as the innovating firm can defend its position against rivals and therefore increase the firm's power (Damanpour, 2024; Daft, 2022).

### 3. Process Innovation

Process innovation on the other hand is the implementation of a new or significantly improved production or delivery method. This includes significant changes in techniques, equipment and/or software. Process innovations can be intended to decrease unit costs of production or delivery, to increase quality, or to produce or deliver new or significantly improved products (OECD Oslo Manual, 2005). Improved and radically changed products are regarded as particularly important for long term business growth (Hart, 2016). Consistent with Damanpour and Schneider (2016) the current research argues that process innovation includes the development of new tools and equipment. Jaskyte (2024) stated that in the universities should rely on process innovation. Hamel (2016) perceived innovation as encompassing process innovation such as customer services, and logistics, and management innovation such as strategic planning, project management and employee assessment. It has been

suggested that process innovation could determine an organization's success or failure (Liao, Fei & Liu, 2018). Consequently, Jimenez and Vall (2021) emphasized that organizations with greater process innovation capabilities can achieve a better response from the environment and more easily build the capabilities needed to enhance organizational performance. A research by Jimenez & Vall (2021) found process innovation to affect firm performance. Based on what has been stated here it can be argued that process innovation should have a significant positive role in sustainable competitive advantage of universities in Nigeria.

### Theoretical Framework

#### Schumpeter's Innovation Theory

This theory was propounded by Schumpeter in 1934. The theory highlights the role of innovation in the entrepreneurial process. It describes a process of "creative destruction" where wealth creation occurs through disruption of existing market structures due to introduction of new goods and/or services that cause resources to move away from existing firms to new ones thus allowing the growth of the new firms. Accordingly, Schumpeter calls innovation the specific tool of entrepreneurs, the means by which entrepreneurs exploit change as an opportunity for a different business or a different service. The theory stresses the role of entrepreneurs as primary agents effecting creative destruction, and emphasized to the entrepreneurs the need to search purposefully for the sources of innovation, the changes and their symptoms that indicate opportunities for successful innovation; as well as their need to know and to apply the principles of successful innovation. This Schumpeterian vein of thinking has been carried forward by successive scholars and researchers. Entrepreneur always searches for change, responding to it, and exploiting it as an opportunity, and engaging by this means in

purposeful innovation. The process of creative destruction is initiated by an entrepreneur, which makes innovation an important success factor within entrepreneurial orientation.

Furthermore, the link between entrepreneurship and innovativeness is supported by the results of Misyer & Normaziah (2012) who found that innovation is among the key motives to start a business. The Study of innovation has been a relevant topic as academics, policy makers and entrepreneurial representatives consider innovation as an initial basis of economic welfare, the main factor of change and a competitive advantage. Innovation researches have introduced a variety of innovation conceptual models based on different approaches. Most of researches were based on Schumpeter's theory of innovation factors where the main motives for innovation were market size and structure. However, after the comprehensive disclosure of specific industries and knowledge management features, these factors were stated no longer relevant. It is argued that external factors, such as external learning, knowledge surplus and the method of management are considered to be much more important than specific features of the whole industry. Therefore, innovation can reduce costs of production, increase production and quality of goods or services and create new markets. Any innovation that has a demand in comparison with other products should increase company's profitability (Webster, 2004).

### **Empirical Review**

Dreher and Gassebner (2023) used 2003-2005 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) data of 43 countries to analyze the impact of entry arrangements related to

entrepreneurship activities on market penetration. Number of procedures required for establishing a business and minimum capital requirement for entry have negative impact on entrepreneurship. The study concluded that average income tax rate, secondary education schooling rate and the ratio of tax revenues to gross domestic product are closely associated with entrepreneurship activities.

Djankov et al., (2020) discussed the basic statistical relationship between corporate tax rate, investment amount and entrepreneurship. They concluded that corporate tax rate have crucial and negative impact on investment and entrepreneurship. Klapper and Love (2020) examined dynamics of entrepreneurship activities in their study made using panel data about number of recently registered companies in 95 countries during 2004-2009. It is concluded that there is a negative and meaningful relationship between incorporation costs, number of days required for completing incorporation formalities, number of procedures required for establishing a business and new company registrations. Fast and simplified company registration process results with establishments of higher number of new companies. Tax rates are also considered to be an important factor for establishments to be incorporated. Higher tax rates result with less number of businesses legally registered. Variables considered about incorporation expenses, time required incorporation, number of procedures required for incorporation and management are considered as important determinants of new business registrations. Munemo (2022) concluded that number of procedures, number of days and procedural expenses have negative and statistically meaningful impact on entry density. Eliminating monitoring processes significantly encourage entrepreneurship. Lower levels of corporate tax rate and political stability have positive impact

on the entry density.

### Methodology

A descriptive survey design was used in carrying out this study. The study was conducted in Sylflora Industries Nigeria Ltd and Eastern Distilleries and Food Industries. Sylflora Industries Nigeria Limited is a company based in Nigeria, with factories within Awka/Onitsha. The company is into production of facial wipe, table tissue, toilet tissues, serviette, tissue handkerchief, and disposable baby diapers. Meanwhile, Eastern Distilleries and Food Industries Limited is a foremost manufacturer of premium alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages in Nigeria, with

factories within the same axis. For the purpose of this study, the researchers utilized structured questionnaire to source data. Five hundred (500) employees and management staff of both companies (Sylflora Industries Nigeria Ltd and Eastern Distilleries and Food Industries) in Anambra State. The sample size of 250 was determined by the use of Yamane formula. The major tools of analysis were percentages and mean rating which were used to answer the research questions. For the test of hypotheses, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used for testing relationships between categorical variables. All tests were carried out at 5% level of significance.

## Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion of Results

### Data Presentation

**Table 1: Distribution of questionnaire and response rate**

Total copies of questionnaire	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Number returned	240	96.0
Number not returned	10	4.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field survey, 2026

Table 1 above shows that out of 250 questionnaires administered, 240 representing 96% were correctly filled and returned while 10 representing 4% was not returned. This implies that a good number of questionnaires was attended to and returned and as such gave a

reliable information for the purpose of the study.

**Research Question One:** Package innovation affects marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

**Table 2**

Options	Respondents	Percentage%
Strongly agreed	120	50
Agreed	80	33
Disagreed	20	8
Strongly disagreed	16	7
Undecided	4	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field survey 2026

120 of the respondents representing 50% in table 2 above strongly agreed that

package innovation affects marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods

manufacturing companies, 80 respondents representing 33% agreed, 20 respondents representing 8% disagree, 16 respondents representing 7% strongly disagreed while 1

respondent representing 2% is undecided.

**Research Question Two:** Product innovation affects marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

**Table 3**

Options	Respondents	Percentage%
Strongly agreed	80	33
Agreed	80	33
Disagreed	40	17
Strongly disagreed	40	17
Undecided	0	0
Total	240	100

**Source:** Field survey 2026

80 of the respondents representing 33% in table 3 above strongly agreed that product innovation affect marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies, 80 respondents representing 33%

agreed and 40 respondents representing 17% both disagreed and strongly disagreed.

**Research Question Three:** Market innovation affects marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies

**Table 4**

Options	Respondents	Percentage%
Strongly agreed	100	42
Agreed	100	42
Disagreed	8	3
Strongly disagreed	8	3
Undecided	24	10
Total	240	100

**Source:** Field survey 2026

From the table above, 100 respondents representing 42% both strongly agreed and agreed that market innovation affect marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies, 8 respondents representing 3% both disagreed and strongly disagreed while 24 respondents representing 10% is undecided.

test.

**Hypothesis One:** H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant relationship between package innovations on marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

Using the correlation coefficient (SPSS 23) statistics, the hypothesis was tested and the summary of the result shown on the table below.

**Test of hypothesis**

In testing the hypothesis formulated, it is important to restate the hypothesis for the

## Correlations

		Package Innovation	Marketing Performance
Package Innovation	Pearson Correlation	1	.736**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.002
	N	240	240
Marketing Performance	Pearson Correlation	.736**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.002	
	N	240	240

**NOTE:** Accept the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) when p-value is equal or greater than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ).

**Decision Rule:** NOTE: Accept null hypothesis when significant value or p-value is equal or less than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. Decision rule: Since significant value 0.002 is less than 0.5, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between package innovations on marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods

manufacturing companies.

**Hypothesis two:**  $H_{02}$ : There is no relationship between product innovations on marketing Performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

Using the correlation coefficient (SPSS 22) statistics, the hypothesis was tested and the summary of the result shown on the table below.

## Correlations

		Product innovation	Marketing Performance
Product innovation	Pearson Correlation	1	.806**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.015
	N	240	240
Marketing Performance	Pearson Correlation	.806**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.015	
	N	240	240

**NOTE:** Accept the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) when p-value is equal or greater than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ).

**Decision Rule:** NOTE: Accept null hypothesis when significant value or p-value is equal or less than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. Decision rule: Since significant value 0.002 is less than 0.5, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between

package innovations on marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

**Hypothesis Two:**  $H_{02}$ : There is no relationship between product innovations on marketing Performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

Using the correlation coefficient (SPSS 22) statistics, the hypothesis was tested and

the summary of the result shown on the table below.

**Correlations**

		Product innovation	Marketing Performance
Product innovation	Pearson Correlation	1	.806**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.015
	N	240	240
Marketing Performance	Pearson Correlation	.806**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.015	
	N	240	240

**NOTE:** Accept the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) when p-value is equal or greater than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>).

**Decision Rule:** NOTE: Accept null hypothesis when significant value or p-value is equal or less than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. Decision rule: Since significant value 0.015 is less than 0.5, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is a relationship between product innovations on marketing performance of consumer packaged goods manufacturing

companies.

**Hypothesis Three:** H<sub>02</sub>: There is no relationship between market innovations on marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

Using the correlation coefficient (SPSS 22) statistics, the hypothesis was tested and the summary of the result shown on the table below.

**Correlations**

		Marketing Innovation	Marketing Performance
Marketing Innovation	Pearson Correlation	1	.845**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.001
	N	240	240
Marketing Performance	Pearson Correlation	.845**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.001	
	N	240	240

**NOTE:** Accept the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) when p-value is equal or greater than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>).

**Decision rule:** NOTE: Accept null hypothesis when significant value or p-value is equal or less than 0.05 otherwise reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. Decision rule: Since significant value 0.001 is less than 0.5, we reject null hypothesis and

accept alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is a relationship between market innovations on marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods manufacturing companies.

### Conclusion

The study concludes that innovation plays a critical role in enhancing the marketing performance of consumer-packaged goods (CPGs) manufacturing companies. Specifically, the findings reveal that package innovation has a significant positive relationship with marketing performance, indicating that improvements in packaging design, functionality, and attractiveness contribute meaningfully to customer appeal, brand differentiation, and overall market success. Furthermore, the study establishes that product innovation is positively related to marketing performance, suggesting that continuous improvement, modification, and introduction of new products enable firms to meet evolving consumer needs and remain competitive. In the same vein, market innovation also shows a meaningful relationship with marketing performance, highlighting the importance of adopting new marketing strategies, channels, and approaches to effectively reach and engage target customers.

### Recommendations

Based on the statement of problem, the objective of the study and the findings, the following recommendations were made.

1. CPGs manufacturing companies should prioritize innovative packaging strategies such as eco-friendly materials, attractive designs, and user-friendly features to enhance product visibility and consumer appeal;
2. The manufacturing firms should consistently engage in research and development (R&D) to introduce new products and improve existing ones in line with changing consumer preferences and market trends; and
3. The companies should leverage modern marketing techniques, including digital marketing, social media engagement, and data-driven campaigns, to improve customer reach and interaction. Firms should invest in market research and customer feedback mechanisms to identify emerging trends and tailor innovations that meet specific consumer needs.

### References

- Ayyagari M, Beck, T, and Demirgüç K.A. (2023). Small and Medium Enterprises across the Globe. Policy Research Working Paper 3127. World Bank. Washington DC.  
<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/18131>.
- Brown, S., & Maylor, H. (2015). Strategic resonant firms, mass producers, big fish & flat liners: A study of policies, practices & performance in Innovation. *Technovation*, 25. 307–319.
- Cottam, A., Ensor, J., & Band., C. (2021). A benchmark study of strategic commitment to innovation. *European Journal off Innovation Management*, 4(2), 88-94.
- Cottam, A., Ensor, J., & Band., C. (2021). A benchmark study of strategic commitment to innovation. *European Journal off Innovation Management*, 4(2), 88-94.
- Dibie, V. M., Nto, C. P. O., Unanam, E. L. & Basse, I. E. (2019). Effect of product innovation on customer acquisition and retention. *International Journal of Marketing and Communication Studies (IJMCS)*, 4 (1), 50 – 62.

- Foster, C, and Heeks, R. (2023). Conceptualising Inclusive Innovation: Modifying systems of innovation frameworks to understand diffusion of new technology to low-income consumers. *Eur. J. Develop. Res.* 25(3):333-355.
- Hamel, G., Parhald, C., (2024), *Competing for the Future*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Henrik B (2017). Risk conception and risk management in corporate innovation: lessons from two Swedish cases. *Int. J. Innov. Manag.* 11(4):497-513.
- Liao, C. C., Wang, H. Y., Chuang, S.H., Shih, M.L., & Liu, C.C. (2020). Enhancing knowledge management for R&D innovation and firm performance: An integrative view. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(14), 3026–3038.
- Liao, T. S., & Rice, J. (2020). Innovation investments, market engagement and financial performance: A study among Australian manufacturing SMEs. *Research Policy*, 39, 117–125.
- Paunov, C. (2023). *Innovation and Inclusive Development: A Discussion of the Main Policy Issues* (No. 2013/1). OECD Publishing.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1949). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press; pp. 74-86.
- Tomlinson, P.R. (2020). Co-operative ties and innovation: Some new evidence for UK manufacturing. *Research Policy*, 39, 762–775.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989). Strategic orientation of business enterprises: The construct, dimensionality, and measurement. *Management Science*, 35(8), 942-962.
- Venkatraman, N., & Ramanujam, V. (1986). Measures of business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 801-814.
- Wang, Z, and Wang, N. (2022). Knowledge sharing, innovation and firm performance. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 39:8899-8908.
- Yorklovich, P., and Entrepreneur, M. (2020). P.p. 14 – 16. *Debra Amidon, the Ken of Awakening*, USA.
- Zaltman, G., Duncan, R. and Holbek, J. (1973). *Innovations and organizations*. New York. Wiley.