

INNOVATION STRATEGIES AND SALESFORCE PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN SOUTH- SOUTH NIGERIA

Williams Okpebenyo

Department of Business Administration/Management,
Delta State Polytechnic,
Otefe-Oghara, Nigeria.

And

Orhorho Omojirhevwere Jonathan

Department of Business Administration/Management,
Delta State Polytechnic,
Otefe-Oghara, Nigeria.

Abstract: This study focused on the effects of innovative strategies and sales force performance on selected manufacturing firms. The study examined the effect of incremental innovation on sales force performance, and that radical innovation affects sales force performance. This study employed descriptive survey design. The study used well-structured questionnaire for the survey. Cronbach's alpha-based test was performed to determine the reliability of the instrument. The reliability coefficient for all the variables was above 0.70. We obtained a sample size of 175. A stratified sampling technique was used. We utilized regression analyses to analyze the data. Findings showed that incremental innovation has a significant positive effect on competitive edge, customer satisfaction and customer retention. Finding further revealed that radical innovation has a significant positive effect on motivation and adaptive selling behaviors of sales workforce. The study concluded that the manufacturing firm's performance strongly relies on theirs, which attracts active importance attached to the analysis of innovative activities and their effects. The study recommended that manufacturing firms in the South-South that are experiencing low sales performance should embark on incremental innovation, as this would increase their level of customer patronage, and that manufacturing firms whose sales are declining should adopt

radical innovation strategies by making some major adjustments to the firm and increasing their sales.

Keywords: Innovative Strategies, Sales Force Performance, Incremental Innovation, Radical Innovation, Innovative Culture.

1. Introduction

Organizations' success and viability, especially knowledge-based businesses, are increasingly dependent on their ability to be creative, innovative, and inventive in the fast-paced, fiercely competitive global business world of today. Innovation has become a key strategic objective as companies work to adjust to changing markets and customer demands because of its transformative capacity to enhance organizational performance and guarantee long-term survival (Lee, 2018). Here, innovation is defined as the acceptance and use of novel concepts, instruments, systems, goods, regulations, procedures, or services that contribute to the field. Chen and Jaw (2009) posit that it is an essential facilitator of economic dynamism, job creation, and national growth. Innovation is essential for businesses looking to gain a competitive advantage, not merely desirable.

Competition has increased across industries due to the rise of advanced technology and the acceleration of globalization. As a result, it is critical for businesses to continuously explore new markets, improve their product lines, and improve their operational strategies in addition to differentiating their offerings. Innovation is now central to businesses' strategic goals to maintain a competitive edge as a result of this drive. Since improving sales performance is directly related to a company's capacity to make money and sustain its market position, it is especially important for survival in the beverage business. Anuradha and Vijai (2011) believe that creative ideas and practices are increasingly related to sales performance, which is the efficacy of a company's sales operations and outcomes. Even while innovation can greatly improve a company's operational and sales success, there are still obstacles to overcome. Risks, including technology uncertainty, market volatility, and organizational resistance to change, are common in creative ideas. If not adequately handled, these hazards can lead to less-than-ideal outcomes (Loch, 2017). As a result, innovation should not be viewed as an opportunistic or intermittent activity but rather as a purposeful, methodical process that aims to alter organizations and increase market responsiveness.

Delivering innovative, cost-effective, and high-quality products and services while effectively meeting consumer requests is a key component of modern businesses' competitive edge. New technologies, procedures, and management techniques are frequently the result of technical advancements that increase output and value generation. Implementing new concepts that benefit stakeholders is a broad definition

of innovation (Boon et al., 2023). Innovation is essential to raising profitability and competitiveness in the market, whether it takes the form of renewed business models, new goods, or process enhancements (Ferlito & Faraci, 2022). However, in order for innovation to be effective, businesses need to match technology projects with strategic goals and leadership skills (Zaman et al., 2020).

Effective innovation implementation also requires a supportive corporate culture and governance framework. The integration of disruptive technology like artificial intelligence (AI) frequently results in bureaucratic and cultural hurdles to innovation for larger organizations. The innovation process may be slowed down and cross-functional collaboration restricted when creative employees are kept in departmental silos (Ungureanu et al., 2021). Building a culture that promotes innovation at all levels – not just from top leadership – has therefore become essential for businesses functioning in dynamic marketplaces. Startups often serve as models due to their adaptable structures and high degree of flexibility (Fox & Vahala, 2022).

As a result of external pressures, including shifting market conditions, economic reforms, and infrastructure limitations, innovation has become a vital approach in manufacturing contexts, including the beverage industry in Nigeria. Manufacturing is the process of utilizing equipment, labour, and tools to turn raw materials into finished commodities (Youssef et al., 2023). Nigeria's economic diversification strategy places a strong emphasis on the manufacturing sector, which includes the food and beverage industry. But companies in this industry encounter a wide range of obstacles that hinder innovation and production, from budgetary constraints to power supply interruptions (Ede & Acedo, 2021; Nafiu et al., 2022).

Nigerian manufacturing companies are progressively implementing innovation management frameworks that incorporate technology adaptation, cultural change, and strategic planning to overcome these obstacles and maintain their competitiveness (Mofam et al., 2023; Oladeinde et al., 2023). This change reflects a global trend that prioritizes creative leadership over conventional approaches in contemporary corporate management (Schoemaker et al., 2018). There aren't many studies looking at how new management methods affect key performance measures, like sales force effectiveness, even though more people agree that innovation is important. In light of these factors, this study aims to examine how innovation strategies affect sales force performance in the manufacturing sector, specifically in the beverage industry in Nigeria. The study specifically:

- i. Determine the effect of incremental innovation on competitive advantage.
- ii. Assess how incremental innovation affects customer satisfaction.
- iii. Ascertain how incremental innovation affects customer retention.
- iv. Examine the effect of radical innovation on motivation level of sales force.
- v. Unveil the effect of radical innovation on adaptive selling behaviour.

Gaining knowledge of this relationship can help organizational leaders who want to improve competitiveness as well as advance the conversation around innovation-driven performance methods in emerging markets. Based on this, the study formulated hypotheses that:

- H1: Incremental innovation has a positive effect on competitive advantage.
- H2: Incremental innovation has a positive effect on customer satisfaction.
- H3: Incremental innovation has a positive effect on customer retention.
- H4: Radical innovation has a positive effect on motivation level of sales force.
- H5: Radical innovation has a positive effect on adaptive selling behavior.

Literature Review

Innovation strategies

Organizational success now largely depends on innovation, which is why businesses are implementing structured innovation management techniques. Tidd and Thuriaux-Alemán (2016) claim that these techniques are technical or administrative strategies meant to make innovation easier to implement successfully. The relationship between innovation strategy and performance is well established, and researchers like Babkin et al. (2015) have shown that different industries have different innovation practices, necessitating methods tailored to the particular setting. Du Plessis and Pretorius (2017) reinforce this viewpoint by drawing attention to the specific barriers to innovation in certain industries, such as natural resources.

Scholars like Panizzon et al. (2013) and Proctor (2013) have identified determinants of innovation in their literature evaluations, which include knowledge-based capacities, internationalization, organizational creativity, and cooperation. Some research, such as that of O'Connor and Rice (2013), concentrates on ground-breaking inventions, whereas Brones and Monteiro de Carvalho (2015) incorporate eco-design and sustainability into innovation management. Abu El-Ella et al. (2016) stress the need for trust in open innovation, whereas Kremer et al. (2019) lists strategic components that foster innovation, including leadership and knowledge management.

Despite the enhanced focus on the two concepts, there is already inadequate literature that focuses on linking the strategic management approach to innovation management approaches, as stated by Svahn et al. (2017). However, there is an abundance of literature regarding other aspects of innovation, such as corporate venturing (Gutmann, 2019), digital innovation (Chesbrough & Bogers, 2017), and various innovation methods worldwide from different countries (Hanifah et al., 2019; Nagano et al., 2014).

There are primarily two primary innovation approaches: radical innovation and incremental innovation. Incremental innovation is the idea of making small changes to existing products or processes, while radical innovation entails making groundbreaking

changes to a product or process that could potentially revolutionize the industry in which the product or process is utilized, as stated by Tidd and Bessant (2018). An essential element of innovation is the innovation culture that is created by the organizations. This culture promotes innovation, the sharing of information, and the willingness of individuals in the organization to learn new skills and techniques (Bicen & Johnson, 2014; Mohammed et al., 2020). The innovation culture should be one that is vibrant and open to allowing innovations to be made within the organizations. However, literature also exists that suggests negative attitudes towards innovation within an organization can hamper the innovation process (O'Regan & Ghobadian, 2005). Thus, organizations must nurture a culture that is supportive of innovation in order to sustain the innovation process and maintain their competitive edge.

Sales force performance

Ogbadu et al. (2018) define sales performance as the assessment of sales operations, particularly the output of individual sales reps. It shows how successfully a company is selling goods or services. Anuradha and Vijai (2011) posit that sales are transactions that are started by the seller and conclude with the transfer of ownership and a legally binding commitment to pay. By interacting with customers, advertising, promotions, and product creation, the sales department contributes significantly to the expansion of the company.

Incremental innovation and sales force performance

Research done in the past reveals that incremental innovation, which refers to ongoing small changes to existing goods and services offered by an organization, significantly impacts the performance of the sales force through improving the reliability and relevance of the products in the market (Abiodun, 2017; Freixanet & Rialp, 2022). It is through incremental innovation that organizations can improve the quality of their products and offer services that give sales people a clear value proposition when talking to consumers (Anuradha & Vijai, 2011). Incremental innovation ensures that there is less risk when selling because sales representatives know what to expect, thus allowing them to focus on the new value rather than on gaining knowledge about the unknown (Johnston & Marshall, 2020).

According to research, even though environmental factors impact sales performance in a firm, incremental innovation plays the role of an enabler due to the way it influences customer interaction and communication (Abd Aziz & Samad, 2016; Babkin et al., 2015). As a tool for developing strategy, incremental innovation provides gradual responses to customer requests and preferences that result in a customer-oriented selling activity (Mahmoud et al., 2018). Moreover,

there is evidence that companies that develop their organizational culture and implement practices that promote knowledge sharing help sales professionals recognize incremental changes and capitalize on them during customer meetings (Bendak et al., 2020; Kremer et al., 2019). Thanks to this fact, incremental innovation becomes a learning experience for the selling team which helps them communicate and justify the improvements in a product or service.

Radical innovation and sales force performance

Within an organizational setting, radical innovations bring in significant changes that affect the products, markets, and selling process, thus affecting the nature of sales force activity and its performance. For radical innovations to be properly explained to customers, sales representatives need to learn new ways of doing things as they learn new knowledge and skills to convince their clients of the benefits of the innovation (Abiodun, 2017; Johnston & Marshall, 2020). These changes may temporarily interfere with the performance of sales force as they try to cope with uncertainty surrounding customer adoption, product performance, and the response from competitors. Some studies show that, in the absence of learning-oriented practices on the part of organizations, salespersons may fail to adequately communicate innovative offers, causing sales cycle to elongate and negatively impact sales performance (Cake et al., 2020). On the other hand, the right organizational practices may motivate salespeople to sell the new innovations (Mohammed et al., 2020).

In such environments, it has been found that the impact of radical innovation on the sales force performance depends significantly on organization culture and knowledge process within organizations. Research reveals that organizations with a strong innovative culture foster innovation, creativity, knowledge sharing, and cross-functional cooperation that allows sales personnel to address the challenges related to radical innovation (Bendak et al., 2020; Kremer et al., 2019). This ensures that innovation can be turned into useful solutions for the clients, helping improve their consultative selling skills and client relations. Weaknesses in innovation management systems may contribute to increasing resistance from clients and sales staff, leading to lower performance results (Anuradha & Vijai, 2011). There is also empirical evidence that radical innovation contributes to higher sales force performance when used in conjunction with sales capability and managed properly, as it helps place sales personnel in positions of advisory experts in emerging markets (Abd Aziz & Samad, 2016; Cake et al., 2020).

Materials and Methods

This study used the descriptive survey design. This design strategy was chosen because it aids in the collection of data that is utilized to answer a variety of 'what, when, and how' questions about the population. The population for this study comprises the management personnel (including executive and non-executive directors) of 12 enterprises listed on the Nigeria Exchange Group (NEG). The 12 enterprises were drawn from six states in the South South (Edo, Delta, Rivers, Cross River, Akwa-Ibom, and Bayelsa). The sample size for this study was obtained using the Taro Yamane method for calculating sample size. The sample size was 175. The Bowley proportional allocation formula was used. The study adopted stratified random sampling. This method was chosen because it provides rather precise estimates for all subgroups associated with the research topics. The primary data-gathering instrument was the questionnaire. A questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents and help solve research problems. The content validity test was performed to determine if the content of the questionnaire used for this study truly addressed what it was designed to assess. A test is dependable if it consistently measures whatever it measures. As a result, the Cronbach's alpha-based test was performed to determine the reliability coefficient.

Table 1. Reliability Check

Constructs	Reliability
Incremental Innovation	.712
Radical Innovation	.744
Competitive edge	.726
Customer satisfaction	.718
Customer retention	.702
Motivation	.816
Adaptive selling behaviors	.784

Source: Pre-Field Survey, 2025

The reliability coefficients of 0.702 and above are acceptable (see Table 1). The data collected for the study was categorized and tallied. The study employed statistical techniques for data analysis, such as descriptive statistics and regression analysis. We analyzed the data using the EView software version 12. The models are specified as:

Equation (1) translates into equation 2-6 thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{SFP} &= a + \beta_1 \text{IST} + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots 1 \\
 \text{COE} &= a + \beta_1 \text{IIN} + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots 2 \\
 \text{CUS} &= a + \beta_1 \text{IIN} + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots 3 \\
 \text{CUR} &= a + \beta_1 \text{IIN} + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots 4 \\
 \text{MOT} &= a + \beta_1 \text{RIN} + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots 5 \\
 \text{ASB} &= a + \beta_1 \text{RIN} + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots 6
 \end{aligned}$$

Where,

- a = Constant
- β_1 = regression coefficients
- ε = residual or stochastic term
- IST= Innovation strategies
- IIN= Incremental innovation
- RIN= Radical innovation
- SFP= Sales force performance
- COE= Competitive edge
- CUS= Customer satisfaction
- CUR= Customer retention
- MOT= Motivation
- ASB= Adaptive selling behaviors

1. Data Analyses and Results

Table 2. Analysis of the Field Survey

Focused audience	No of administered Questionnaire	No of returned Questionnaire	Percentage of Questionnaire used
Employees of selected firms	175	169	97%

Source: Distributed Questionnaire (2022).

Out of the 175 copies of the questionnaire administered, 169 copies were useable, 6 copies were not properly filled. Therefore, the analysis in this chapter was based on the usable sample size of 97% response rate.

Table 3. Respondents Profile

S/N	Question	Response	Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	Gender	Male	126	74.6
		Female	43	25.4
		Total	169	100
2	Age	Below 25 years	13	7.7
		26-45years	80	47.3
		Above 45years	76	45.0
		Total	169	100
3	Marital Status	Married	138	81.7
		Single	31	18.3
		Total	169	100
4	Educational Level	SSCE/NECO	10	5.9
		HND/First Degree	85	50.3
		OTHERS	74	43.8
		Total	169	100
5.	Department	Production	27	16.0
		Purchasing	39	23.1
		Marketing	48	28.4
		Store	35	20.7
		Maintenance	20	11.8
		Total	169	100
6.	Years of Work Experience	1-3 Years	7	4.1
		4-6 Years	13	7.7
		7-10 Years	77	45.6
		Above 10 Years	72	42.6
		Total	169	100

Source; Field Survey (2025)

A total of six (6) questions with regard to the personal information of the respondents were asked in the demographic section of the questionnaire. The questions were meant to determine the gender, age, marital status, educational level, department, and years of working in the firm. Table 3 above shows that

74.6% (126) of the respondents were male and 25.4% (43) were female. Most of the respondents' ages were between 26 and 45 years of age, which represents 47.3% or a frequency of 80. 176 respondents (45.0%) fell into the 45 years and above age bracket. There were 13 respondents (7.7%) within the age bracket of 25 years and below.

Furthermore, the table shows that 81.7% (138) of the respondents are married while 18.3% (31) are singles. The highest qualifications amongst the respondents are HND/B.Sc with 85 respondents (50.3%), followed by other forms of qualifications with 74 respondents (43.8%) while ten respondents (5.9%) have SSCE/NECO qualifications. The data obtained from this survey shows that 40% of the respondents have experience between 16 and 20 years whilst 23 respondents (17%) have experiences above 21 years. The departmental make up features 27 respondents (16%) in the production department; 39 respondents (23.1%) in the purchasing department; 48 respondents (28.4%) in marketing; whilst there are 35 and 20 within store and maintenance departments with frequencies 20.7% and 11.8% respectively. These are followed by 77 respondents (45.6%) who have been with the firm for between 7 and 10 years; 72 respondents (42.6%) who have been with the firm for 10 years or above whilst 13 respondents (7.7%) have worked with the firm for between 4 and 6 years; the last grouping being 7 respondents (4.1%) for 1-3 years.

Table 4 Regression result on incremental innovation and sales force performance

IIN	COE	CUS	CUR
Coefficient (P-value <0.05)	0.924411 (0.01)	0.894079 (0.01)	0.956715 (0.01)
R-squared	0.865890	0.824186	0.925965
Adjusted R-squared	0.865087	0.823134	0.925522
S.E. of regression	0.513726	0.583119	0.382007
Sum squared resid	44.07363	56.78466	24.37016
Log likelihood	-126.2295	-147.6422	-76.16305
F-statistic	1078.251	782.8699	2088.695
Mean dependent var	3.597633	3.639053	3.579882

S.D. dependent var	1.398637	1.386547	1.399770
Akaike info criterion	1.517509	1.770913	0.925007
Schwarz criterion	1.554549	1.807953	0.962047
Hannan-Quinn criter	1.532540	1.785945	0.940038
Durbin-Watson stat	1.637087	2.102959	2.025510

Source; Field Survey (2025)

As shown in Table 4 below, there is a very strong and statistically significant positive correlation between incremental innovation and competitive advantage. With regard to the regression analysis results, it can be seen that the coefficient of incremental innovation ($\beta = 0.924$), meaning that increases in incremental innovation contributed to a very significant improvement in competitive advantage and this was found to be highly significant at 1% (p -value < 0.01). In addition, the R-squared value is also very high (R-squared = 0.866) which means that the incremental innovation variable explained about 87% of changes in competitive advantage among the companies in the sample.

The regression result indicates a strong and positive effect of incremental innovation upon customer satisfaction. The coefficient for incremental innovation is positive and highly significant ($\beta = 0.894$, p -value < 0.01). The constant term is also found to be significantly positive - implying a baseline level of customer satisfaction even without incremental innovation. The high R-squared value (0.824) indicates that around 82% of customer satisfaction can indeed be explained by this element of incremental innovation - a robust finding. The significance of the F-statistic confirms the model's goodness of fit, while the Durbin-Watson statistic suggests no serious problem with autocorrelation.

The result shows that incremental innovation has a very strong and positive influence upon customer retention. The coefficient for incremental innovation is both positive and statistically significant at the 1% level ($\beta = 0.957$), indicating that improvements to products, services or processes have a great enhancement upon customer retention ability. While the constant term is only marginally significant, the model does show excellent explanatory power - with an R-squared value of close to 0.926 (meaning around 93% of customer retention can be explained by incremental innovation). The highly significant F statistic confirms the robustness of this model, while the Durbin-Watson statistic suggests there is no autocorrelation.

Table 5 Regression result on radical innovation and sales force performance

IIN	MOT	ASB
Coefficient (P-value <0.05)	0.855618 (0.01)	0.958157 (0.01)
R-squared	0.786958	0.896508
Adjusted R-squared	0.785682	0.895889
S.E. of regression	0.620877	0.454026
Sum squared resid	64.37649	34.42537
Log likelihood	-158.2454	-105.3522
F-statistic	616.8831	1446.657
Mean dependent var	3.479290	3.402367
S.D. dependent var	1.341147	1.407123
Akaike info criterion	1.896396	1.270441
Schwarz criterion	1.933436	1.307481
Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.911427	1.285472
Durbin-Watson stat	1.928775	1.970477

Source; Field Survey (2025)

According to the findings in Table 5, there exists a significant and positive correlation between radical innovation and the motivation level of the sales force. This means that as variable radical innovation increases, the motivation of the sales force will be positively influenced. In other words, the presence of innovative changes in the organization will significantly motivate the sales force. An examination of the R-Squared value indicates that 78.7% of the variations in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable, hence the coefficient of determination (R-squared) being 0.787. An evaluation of the F-value indicates that the ratio of variance between groups compared with that of variance within groups is exceedingly high (616.8831). There is also no indication of autocorrelation since the Durbin Watson statistic value is 1.93.

The regression analysis has revealed an extremely strong influence of radical innovation on adaptive selling behavior. A high positive value of the regression coefficient for radical innovation ($\beta = 0.958$), being statistically significant at the $p = 0.000$ level, demonstrates that

increasing the level of radical innovation is accompanied by considerable growth in the ability of salespeople to change their selling strategies according to the situation. This means that introducing a breakthrough idea, product, or process within the organization, sales representatives demonstrate flexibility, responsiveness, and innovation in their work with clients. With an R-square value equaling 0.897, it can be stated that almost 90% of variance in adaptive selling behavior is determined by radical innovation. The regression model is well-fitted. Furthermore, the Durbin-Watson statistic value of 1.97 proves absence of serious autocorrelation issue.

Discussion

Findings show that incremental innovation has a significant positive effect on competitive edge. The finding aligns with the findings of other researchers that also identify the relationship between incremental innovation and enhanced performance of firms. For instance, researchers Abd Aziz and Samad (2016) found that incremental innovations in small and medium enterprises are associated with the development of a competitive advantage for these firms. Abiodun (2017) discovered a similar relationship between incremental innovation and firm performance, whereby incremental innovation acts as a mediator between the relationship between firm innovation capabilities and their firm performance. Anuradha and Vijai (2011) also discovered that implementing incremental innovation practices into the firms can enhance the business performance of those firms. Furthermore, researchers Freixanet and Rialp (2022) found that implementing incremental innovation into a firm's products or services allows those firms to adapt to the needs of their customers while maintaining a competitive advantage. Overall, these findings indicate that incremental innovation processes allow firms to gain a competitive advantage due to their flexibility, efficiency, and ability to adapt to their customers' needs.

Finding reveals that incremental innovation has a significant positive effect on customer satisfaction. Researchers Mahmoud et al. (2018) determined that implementing innovations in the services that are provided by firms can lead to an increase in the level of satisfaction of the customers of those firms. Abd Aziz and Samad (2016) also found that by implementing incremental innovations in their existing products and services, firms can increase the level of satisfaction of their customers. Abiodun (2017) discovered the same relationship between customer satisfaction and incremental innovation, especially within the relationship between innovation and firm performance. Furthermore, Mohammed et al. (2020) also found that by implementing innovations in the sales processes of firms, those firms experienced an increase in the satisfaction of their

customers. These findings indicate that by implementing incremental innovation practices into the services or products that a firm offers to its customers, those customers are more likely to be satisfied with the experiences that they have with those firms.

Findings show that incremental innovation has a significant positive effect on customer retention. Authors Abd Aziz and Samad (2016) discovered that by implementing incremental innovations into their products and services, firms will experience an increase in the number of customers that are satisfied with the customers with those firms, leading to an increase in customer retention. Abiodun (2017) also identified incremental innovation as a factor that contributes to an increase in customer retention for the firms that implement such innovations. Authors Mahmoud et al. (2018) also determined that by implementing innovations in the services that are offered by firms, they will develop a stronger relationship with their customers, which inherently leads to customer retention. Furthermore, Mohammed et al. (2020) also discovered that by implementing innovations into the sales processes of firms, they will experience an increase in the number of customers who are satisfied with those firms and who continue to use their products or services. These authors all indicate that incremental innovation leads to improvements in customer retention for firms.

Finding reveals that radical innovation has a significant positive effect on motivation of sales workforce. Authors Kennedy, Whiteman, and van den Ende (2017) studied the relationship between radical innovation in the markets that were served by firms, and the motivation of the sales workforce to interact with the customers of those firms. The authors discovered that radical innovation for the sales workforce can motivate them to be more active in their sales efforts. Additionally, researchers Kremer, Villamor, and Aguinis (2019) also discovered that implementing innovation and innovation leadership within the sales workforce can encourage employees to take initiative and be motivated in their sales efforts. Authors Cake et al. (2020) also discovered that if a firm implements radical innovations and sales processes are successful, the sales workforce becomes more motivated to achieve these sales. Furthermore, researchers Freixanet and Rialp (2022) determined that incorporating radical innovations into the sales efforts of firms will lead to adaptive selling behaviors within the sales workforce. Overall, these sales workforce motivation findings support the idea that radical innovation can motivate the sales workforce to perform their sales efforts more effectively and efficiently.

Findings show that radical innovation has a significant positive effect on adaptive selling behaviors of sales workforce. Authors Abiodun (2017) determined that radical innovations require the sales forces to exhibit adaptive behaviors when they interact with the customers of those firms. Furthermore, researchers Sharma, Rangarajan, and Paesbrugge (2020) also found that firms must incorporate an adaptive salesforce to effectively compete in the markets with other firms that undertake disruptive innovations. Authors Cake et al. (2020) also determined that the sales forces of firms must exhibit adaptive behaviors following the radical innovations that those firms implement and launch successfully. Additionally, authors Johnston and Marshall (2020) determined that sales workforce adaptability increases in the organizations that implement groundbreaking products and services for their customers and clients. These findings all support the idea that adaptive selling behaviors by the sales workforce are increased as a result of the implementation of radical innovations by those firms.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Innovation strategies have the potential to enhance the sales performance of an organization by focusing on both incremental and radical innovations that will enhance different aspects of the organization. Incremental innovations enhance the competitive advantage and customer satisfaction as well as improve the retention of customers. Radical innovations, on the other hand, enhance the sales workforce by encouraging them to use innovative methods to increase their sales. Moreover, the strategic use of these innovations enhances the motivation as well as the adaptive selling behaviors of the sales workforce in the organization.

To enhance its sales performance, a company should implement both incremental and radical innovation strategies in their sales and operational processes. The company could enhance its sales by focusing on both improving the products and services it offers to strengthen customer retention as well as introducing innovative products into the market to enhance the motivation and adaptive selling behaviors of its sales workforce. Additionally, the company should invest in training its employees to enhance their innovation capabilities. Finally, by aligning innovation with the company's sales and operational goals, the sales and operational processes of a company will be enhanced.

References

- Abd Aziz, N.N. & Samad, S., (2016). Innovation and competitive advantage: Moderating effects of firm age in foods manufacturing SMEs in Malaysia. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 256-266. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(16)00032-0.
- Abiodun, T. S. (2017). An examination of the relationships between different types of innovation and firm performance and the mediating effect of radical and incremental Innovations on these relationships. *International journal of innovation and economic development*, 3(5), 38-58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18775/ijied.1849-7551-7020.2015.35.2003>
- Anuradha, I and Vijai, R (2011). Innovation management practices, strategic adaptation, and business results: Evidence from the Electronics Industry, *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 6(2), 1-26.
- Babkin, A.V., Lipatnikov, V.S., Muraveva, S.V. (2015) Assessing the impact of innovation strategies and R&D costs on the performance of IT companies. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci* 207:749-758. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.153>
- Bendak, S., Shikhli, A. M., & Abdel-Razek, R. H. (2020). How changing organizational culture can enhance innovation: Development of the innovative culture enhancement framework. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1712125.
- Bicen, P., & Johnson, W. H. A. (2014). How do firms innovate with limited resources in turbulent markets? *Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice*, 16, 430-444.
- Boon, J., Wynen, J., & Callens, C. (2023). A stakeholder perspective on public sector innovation: Linking the target groups of innovations to the inclusion of stakeholder ideas. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 89(2), 330-345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523211043704>
- Brones, F., Monteiro de Carvalho M (2015) From 50 to 1: integrating literature toward a systemic ecodesign model. *J. Clean Prod.*, 96, 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.07.036>
- Cake, D. A., Agrawal, V., Gresham, G., Johansen, D., & Di Benedetto, A. (2020). Strategic orientations, marketing capabilities and radical innovation launch success. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 35(10), 1527-1537. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-02-2019-0068>

-
- Chen, Y & Jaw, T. (2009). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34 (4), 39-48.
- Chesbrough, H. & Bogers, M. (2014). Explicating open innovation: clarifying an emerging paradigm for understanding innovation, Forthcoming, in Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W. and West, J. (Eds), *New Frontiers in Open Innovation*, Oxford University Press, pp.3-28. <https://ssrn.com/abstract52427233>.
- Edeh, J.N., Obodoechi, D.N. & Ramos-Hidalgo, E., (2020). Effects of innovation strategies on export performance: New empirical evidence from developing market firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* [e-journal], 158,120167. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120167.
- Ferlito, R., & Faraci, R. (2022). Business model innovation for sustainability: a new framework. *Innovation & Management Review*, 19(3), 222-236. <https://doi.org/10.1108/INMR-07-2021-0125>
- Fox, S., & Vahala, P. (2022). Start-ups as adaptable stable systems based on synchronous business models. *Systems*, 10(3), 81. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems10030081>
- Freixanet, J., & Rialp, J. (2022). Disentangling the relationship between internationalization, incremental and radical innovation, and firm performance. *Global Strategy Journal*, 12(1), 57-81.
- Gutmann, T. (2019). Harmonizing corporate venturing modes: an integrative review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, 69(2), 121-157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-018-0148-4>
- Hanifah, H., Abdul Halim, H., Ahmad, N. H., & Vafaei-Zadeh, A. (2019). Emanating the key factors of innovation performance: leveraging on the innovation culture among SMEs in Malaysia. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 13(4), 559-587. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-04-2018-0130>
- Johnston, M. W., & Marshall, G. W. (2020). *Sales force management: Leadership, innovation, technology*. Routledge.
- Johnston, M. W., & Marshall, G. W. (2020). *Sales force management: Leadership, innovation, technology*. Routledge.
- Johnston, M. W., & Marshall, G. W. (2020). *Sales force management: Leadership, innovation, technology*. Routledge.
- Kennedy, S., Whiteman, G., & van den Ende, J. (2017). Radical innovation for sustainability: The power of strategy and open innovation. *Long range planning*, 50(6), 712-725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2016.05.004>

- Kremer, H., Villamor, I., & Aguinis, H. (2019). Innovation leadership: Best-practice recommendations for promoting employee creativity, voice, and knowledge sharing. *Business horizons*, 62(1), 65-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.08.010>
- Lee, P., Wu, M., Kuo, C., & Li, C. S. (2016). How to deploy multiunit organizations' dynamic capabilities? *Management Decision*, 54(4), 965-980. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-05-2015-0160>.
- Loch, C. H. (2017). Creativity and risk taking aren't rational: Behavioral operations in MOT. *Production and Operations Management*, 26(4), 591-604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.12666>
- Madhani, P. M. (2017). Six sigma deployment in sales and marketing: enhancing competitive advantages. *IUP Journal of Business Strategy*, 14(2).
- Mahmoud, M. A., Hinson, R. E., & Anim, P. A. (2018). Service innovation and customer satisfaction: the role of customer value creation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 21(3), 402-422. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-09-2017-0117>
- Mofam, R. E., Nafiu, A. T., Asuquo, P., & Igwe, A. (2023). The Impact of International Technology Transfer on Technology Gap in the Context of Developing Countries. *Innovare Journal of Education*, 11(4), 1-20.
- Mohammed, S. A. Rushami, Y. & Hassan, A-D.(2020). The effect of innovation and strategic planning on enhancing sales force performance of Dubai Police. *Innovation & Management Review*, 17(1), 2-24. DOI 10.1108/INMR-06-2018-0039
- Nafiu, A. T., Aduku, D. J., & Abah, N. U. (2022). Innovativeness and competitive advantage of small and medium-size enterprises in Kogi State, Nigeria. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 17(1), 63-77.
- Nagano M, Stefanovitz JP, Vick TE (2014) Innovation management processes, their internal organizational elements and contextual factors: an investigation in Brazil. *J Eng Tech Manag* 33:63-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengt ecman .2014.02.004>
- O'Connor GC, Rice MPR (2013) New market creation for breakthrough innovations: enabling and constraining mechanisms. *J Prod Innov Manag* 30:209-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2012.00996.x>
- O'Regan, N. & Ghobadian, A.(2005). Strategic planning – A comparison of high and low technology manufacturing small firms. *Technovation*, 25, 1107-1117.

- Ogbadu, E. E., Nafiu, A. T., & Aduku, D. J. (2018). Sales leadership and salespeople's performance in Kogi state: an investigation of herbal mixture marketing managers. *Facta Universitatis, Series: Economics and Organization*, 231-244.
- Oladeinde, M., Hassan, A. O., Farayola, O. A., Akindote, O. J., & Adegbite, A. O. (2023). Review of it innovations, data analytics, and governance in nigerian enterprises. *Computer Science & IT Research Journal*, 4(3), 300-326.
- Panagopoulos, N. G., Rapp, A. A., & Ogilvie, J. L. (2017). Salesperson solution involvement and sales performance: The contingent role of supplier firm and customer-supplier relationship characteristics. *Journal of Marketing*, 81(4), 144-164.
- Panizzon M, Milan GS, Toni DD (2013) Internacionalização, criatividade organizacional e as capacidades dinâmicas baseadas em conhecimento como determinantes da inovação. *RAI Revista de Administração e Inovação* 10:253-282. <https://doi.org/10.5773/rai.v10i4.1183>
- Proctor T (2013) Collaboration and networking in the process of innovation: the path to precision time keeping. *J Manag Stud* 19:167-188. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17511341311307372>
- Schoemaker, P. J., Heaton, S., & Teece, D. (2018). Innovation, dynamic capabilities, and leadership. *California management review*, 61(1), 15-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125618790246>
- Sharma, A., Rangarajan, D., & Paesbrugge, B. (2020). Increasing resilience by creating an adaptive salesforce. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 88, 238-246.
- Svahn, F., Mathiassen, L., & Lindgren, R. (2017). Embracing digital innovation in incumbent firms. *MIS quarterly*, 41(1), 239-254.
- Tidd J, Thuriaux-Alemán B (2016) Innovation management practices: cross-sectorial adoption, variation, and effectiveness. *R&D Manag* 46:1024-1043. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12199>
- Ungureanu, P., Cochis, C., Bertolotti, F., Mattarelli, E., & Scapolan, A. C. (2021). Multiplex boundary work in innovation projects: the role of collaborative spaces for cross-functional and open innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(3), 984-1010. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-11-2019-0338>
- Youssef, H. A., El-Hofy, H. A., & Ahmed, M. H. (2023). *Manufacturing technology: materials, processes, and equipment*. Crc Press.

-
- Yusof, N. A., Kamal, E. M., Lou, E. C., & Kamaruddeen, A. M. (2023). Effects of innovation capability on radical and incremental innovations and business performance relationships. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 67, 101726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengtecman.2022.101726>
- Zaman, U., Nawaz, S., & Nadeem, R. D. (2020). Navigating innovation success through projects. Role of CEO transformational leadership, project management best practices, and project management technology quotient. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(4), 168. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6040168>