

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Innovation Management and Sustainable Competitive Advantage in the Nigerian Deposit Money Banks

Sogolo Oghenefejiro Gabriella

Post Graduate Student, Department of Business Administration and Marketing,
Delta State University, Asaba Campus, Nigeria

Olannye A. P.

Professor, Department of Business Administration and Marketing,
Delta State University, Asaba Campus, Nigeria

Abstract:

The major objective of the study is to examine the effect of innovation management on sustainable competitive advantage. The cross-sectional survey research design method was adopted for the study. The study adopted the simple random and stratified random sampling technique. The study used structured questionnaire as instrument of data collection. To establish the reliability of the instrument, a test-retest method was employed. The descriptive statistics, correlation and multiple regression analysis was used. Findings showed that 48% of the change in sustainable competitive advantage is brought about by innovation management in the Nigerian deposit money banks. Findings indicated that innovative capability, innovation strategy, and innovation culture have significant positive relationship with sustainable competitive advantage. This study determined that innovation management has influence on sustainable competitive advantage in the Nigerian deposit money banks. The study recommended that for innovation management process to be successful, it is essential that the company support an innovation culture and make employees feel valued.

Keywords: Innovation management, innovative capability, innovation strategy, innovation culture

1. Introduction

As today's business environment becomes ever more competitive, companies are becoming more antagonistic and energetic in identifying competitive strategies that will guarantee profitable existence. In today's highly dynamic and competitive business environment, companies are exposed to severe challenges with meeting the ever-increasing market and customer needs and expectations, coping with sophisticated regulations and requirements, and facing technological obsolescence. In this view, the concept of innovation is gaining major significance as a means of sustaining growth and performance. Joseph and Mark (2013) assert that in order to achieve and sustain competitive advantage and improve organization performance, managers should examine factors affecting the implementation of competitive strategies. They note that an organization should align its strategies with structure, provide strategic leadership, establish a corporate culture and monitor the implementation of the strategies. These measures are particularly important in the banking industry considering the market volatility marked by stiff competition for the masses by commercial banks (Hicks and Niehans, 2012).

In the 21st century innovation has been one of the basic aspects of economic and industrial development policies in diverse countries. The political agenda in most highly developed economies always consists of programs that focus on improve innovation capabilities of companies in order to produce diverse products and services (Alba, Alejandro, Xavier and Jaume, 2011). Innovativeness is a popular tool to capture the growth strategy (Li and Atuagene-Gima, 2011) and a vital part of the corporate strategies (Hitt, Ireland, Camp and Sexton, 2011).

Innovations have become the main source of competitive advantage in modern business environment. Proactive firms seize market opportunities and make innovations which give them a competitive advantage that makes them remain market leaders. Innovation entails new sources of supply, new products, new processes of production, new markets and new ways in which the businesses carry out their activities (Osuga, 2016). Hajar (2015) stated that the capability to innovate is accepted today as one of the major sources of competitive advantage among companies.

Innovation is an essential factor of a firm's strategy mostly because it constitutes one of the major avenue through which it can create new business opportunities. Despite the uncertainty and risk involved, successful innovation management can have a sizeable impact on firms' financial results and economic performance. Innovations gives companies the strategic orientation to gain the competitive advantage (Kuratko, Ireland, Covin and Hornsby, 2015). Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2015) explained different kinds of innovation. The need for innovation management is obvious and crucial for deposit money banks operating in a continuous uncertain and competitive environment. Most importantly, to survive and succeed in the current competitive global financial environment, banks need to be innovative by producing a regular stream of innovations so as to gain competitive advantage. Many banks have at some time done

some form of incremental innovative initiatives. Some of these banks consider that the collective benefits in efficiency are much superior overtime than those, which come from intermittent radical changes. Nevertheless, many of these short-and medium term gains are rapidly eroded and engrossed into the industry standard and therefore cannot be depended upon as a precondition for growth and survival.

A company's competitiveness globally, depends heavily on innovation to meet the changing needs of customers. In addition to goods and services designed to meet their needs, today's demanding consumers expect the latest technology which is of high quality, dependable and has competitive prices. At the firm level, intense competition under the global economic framework requires firms to reconsider their competitive position vis-à-vis their rivals, amongst others, through innovation (Rosli and Sidek, 2013). This supports why innovation, in the last few years, becomes a centre stage in business reports and government policy. Little concern, however, has been given to the possible effects of the dimensions (for instance, innovative capability, innovation strategy, innovation culture and employee creativity) of innovation management strategy on sustainable competitive advantage. Enriching the literature, this study examines the effects of innovation management on sustainable competitive advantage in the Nigerian Deposit Money Banks.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

A lot of organizations always strive to create a culture of innovation, one that will give confidence to workers to take risks that lead to products breakthrough. But how to create this type of culture most times eludes managers by frightening the success of their innovation initiatives. However, it may be that their focus on culture is what is negatively affecting them. They are viewing the big picture, instead of establishing the changes that would in fact enable that picture to exist. Technological changes have resulted to short product life cycle making it difficult for companies to maintain a sustained competitive advantage.

However, firms that are constantly innovating have a higher chance of survival. Innovation initiatives often fail, and successful innovators have a difficult time maintaining their performance. For organizations pursuing excellence in this age of hyper competition, lowering costs, restructuring and improving product or service quality are no longer enough. Firms must be able to build and commercialize a range of new products and processes that extend the technology border line, while at the same time keeping a step ahead of their competitors. Consequently, every firm needs this essential core – innovation – to apply more productive processes, look for positive reputation in customers' perception, perform better in the market and as a result, achieve sustainable competitive advantage. Preferably, employee performance has been on the rise as a result of enhancement and usage of change management by most companies.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

The objectives are as follows:

- Determine the consequence of innovative ability on sustainable competitive advantage.
- Regulate the impact of innovation approach on sustainable competitive advantage.
- Assess the result of innovation philosophy on sustainable competitive advantage.

1.3. Research Hypotheses

- H₁: There is a significant association between innovative capability and sustainable competitive advantage
- H₂: There is a significant connection between innovation strategy and sustainable competitive advantage
- H₃: Innovation culture has a significant association with sustainable competitive advantage

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1. Concept of Innovation Management

From 21st century the focus has been given to create the innovation-driven organizations (Tidd and Bessant, 2007 in Mile, 2010). Mainstream actions produce organizational functioning (Lawson and Samson, 2001 as cited in Mile, 2010). Innovation management is the way to utilize the scarce resources to produce value (Mile, 2010). Hansen and Birkinshaw (2007) emphasized that innovation management immensely helpful for organizations to make them lively and conscious (Aykut, 2011). Firms need to have the capacity to recognize the external pressures/drivers that force them to adopt innovation. This can enhance a company's attitudes, commitment and willingness to stimulate/initiate innovations (Birgit, Mike and Chung-Shing, 2018). The key drivers for innovation are the pull factors of customer demand and the push factors of science and technology. Weng, Chen and Chen (2015) identified these drivers for innovation in detail as pressure from competitors, pressure from the government, pressure from suppliers, pressure from customers, and employee conduct that forces firms to innovate. The more the firms recognize these drivers for innovation, the more they will be influenced, forced, concentrated and accelerated to create networks with the external sources of knowledge to acquire knowledge. The importance of management in organizations today has increased multifold.

Strategic outcomes rely on ways of management in companies, therefore crucial management functions that comprise of learning to delegate, motivating employees, organizing, planning, communicating clearly, adapting to change and constantly generating innovative ideas are essential (Wanza and Nkuraru, 2016). Change is inevitable in organizations today and is of paramount importance to study how change factors affect employees' performance. Change is what pushes us out of our comfort area and it is unavoidable (Sidikova, 2011). Kitur (2015) opined that change comes in a company in many forms: merger, new leadership, technology implementation, acquisition, joint venture, organizational restructuring, and change in products or regulatory compliance. The change may be planned years in advance or may be forced upon a

company because of a change in the environment. Organizational change can be drastic and alter the way a company operates, or it may be incremental and gradually change the way things are done (Wanza and Nkuraru, 2016). For change management to be successful and its effect positive, supervisors or managers in the company need to understand what motivates their team and enroll workers involvement.

In reality separating managers from leadership in terms of style is hard because every manager needs to have leadership skills to get activities executed and every leader should have managerial skills to encourage employees to change directions. In the world market economy, aging boomer population, technology introductions, and less than honest world competition have all had an influence of change management (Wanza and Nkuraru, 2016). With the rapid financial distress in late 2008, many company owners rushed to downsize their company to capture possible profits. In today's business environment, it has become clear that nothing remains still (Olubayo, 2014). The rate of change which companies face has continued to increase in the last five years.

The leader in charge or as a change agent can manage a company or the process of organizational change more successfully and effectively if he/she is competent and capable (Asgar, 2010). Rapid technological advancements, ever changing market situations and high expectations of customers have compelled companies to continually reevaluate how they work and to understand, employ and implement changes in their business model in response of changing trends. Human resource has become a strategic resource to attain sustainable competitive advantage in this era of globalization (Kute and Upadhyay, 2014). Human resource is the most vital aspect, indeed the spine of every company and it is also the major resource of the company.

Ndahiro, Shukla and Oduor (2015) opined that companies today have increasingly become aware and value the relevance of change management practices. They added that real life experiences validate the assumption that no matter how modern and sophisticated the business activities of the company may become, it will be very complicated to sustain its effectiveness and growth unless there are strategies that match its operations. It is therefore fitting for banks like any other company operating in such an environment to examine the effect of change factors on its performance. Khosa, Rehman, Asad, Bilal and Hussain (2015) assert that employees have the feelings of nervousness, stress and lack of confidence when the company changes like downsizing, restructuring and as well as merging. It is a fact that change is a process and it is crucial to go in its direction, yet workers are unwilling to accept it willingly (Wanza and Nkuraru, 2016). Innovation management is the process of handling of all the activities required to introduce something novel, which in practice connotes things like coming up with prioritizing, ideas, developing and implementing them, as well as putting them into practice, for instance by introducing new internal processes or by launching new products. Innovation management is simply the process of coming up with and introducing new things and developing the business, one way or the other. Innovation management is a combination of the management of innovation processes, and change management. It refers to product, business process, marketing and organizational innovation. Innovation management involves a set of instruments that allow managers and employees to cooperate with a common understanding of goals and processes.

The product lifecycle of products or services is getting shorter because of increased competition. (Wanza and Nkuraru, 2016). The amalgamation of data processing, communications and the advances of software allows firms to gain a competitive advantage, improve performance and develop new businesses from various areas (Wanza and Nkuraru, 2016).

2.2. Sustainable Competitive Advantage

Sustainable competitive advantages are company assets, abilities or attributes that are hard to exceed or duplicate; and provide a favorable or superior long term position over competitors. An organization has a sustainable competitive advantage when it acquires some attributes or qualities which are dissimilar from other competitors in the market and which makes it exceptional in the market. When the favourable competitive advantages last for a lot of years, then they are referred to as sustainable competitive advantages. In today's competitive environment it is very vital to have a sustainable competitive advantage to maintain It can be measured by looking at the profits of the company with the advantage which should be more than its competitors in the market.

To establish or improve sustainable competitive advantage, it is imperative to explore new routines (He, Fang, Ji and Fang, 2017; Yang and Dong, 2017). The paradox between acquiring knowledge sources and inter organizational trust is vital for improving sustainable competitive advantage (Afuah, 2013). On the one hand, external knowledge sources could bring others' innovative ideas, (Zhou and Li, 2012). However, when the focal company strives to gain high knowledge sources (Perry-Smith, 2006 as cited in Haifeng, Pengfei and Weishu, 2018).

The concept of sustainable competitive advantage (SCA) was introduced in 1984 when Day was explaining the competitive advantage maintenance strategies. The term sustainable competitive advantage was developed in 1985 by Porter and in terms of a variety of competitive strategies (cost leadership, differentiation, and focus) to attain long-term competitive advantage (Mohammad and Masoud, 2015).

2.3. Innovative Capability

Innovative capability is an umbrella term used to cover the different abilities and resources the organization has for creating and managing innovation. The capabilities aspect revolves mainly around workers, as innovation depends greatly on the abilities of both individuals and teams collectively. It refers first and foremost to the abilities, unique insights, know-how and practical skills of the people working for the organization. However, it also covers areas, such as the information capital and tacit knowledge of the organization, as well as their other resources and available financial capital, all of which might be required to create innovation.

Nilsson, Regnell, Larsson and Ritzen (2010) asserted that innovation capability is the capacity of a company to create novel product attributes concepts which are successfully included in product development, creating important value for product stakeholders. Rahab, Sulistyandari and Sudjono (2011) posited that innovation capability is the capability to create new products or services or develop and modify existing products or services. Hogan, Soutar, Mccoll-Kennedy and Sweeney (2011) posited that innovation capability is a company's ability, relative to its competitors, to relate the collective skills, knowledge and resources to innovation activities linking new processes, products, services or management, marketing or work organization systems, in order to produce added value for the company or its stakeholders.

Sobanke, Adegbite, Ilori and Egbetokun (2013) explained the internal and external factors affecting the technological capability of companies in developing countries. However, the conceptual model they developed, presented the complex relationship among the recognized factors in a limited way. Mohammed, Sanuri and Rahim (2014) listed several factors of innovation capability; researching, leadership capabilities, technology acquisition and technology development capabilities through the use of R&D. In most of these studies, the concept of innovation capability has been associated with the capability to develop knowledge and ideas to products, processes and systems.

Zawislak, Alves, Tello-Gamarra, Barbieux and Reichert (2012) presented a framework for innovation capability which is constituted by 4 major capability factors, which are technology development capability, management capability, operations capability and transaction capability. However, their study does not give a great deal of information on how these capabilities can be built. Choudhury (2010) posited that innovation capability is the ability to develop novel and valuable knowledge based on prior knowledge. The views of innovation capability largely explain the relevance of knowledge acquisition and creation to improve the knowledge base and the knowledge application capabilities of companies. Innovation capability involves all the steps and efforts that companies should consider to get knowledge in order to develop successful products, organizational systems or processes. For example, the roles of need recognition for innovation and network creation, the relation between marketing investment and awareness creation and their impact on promoting product sales have not been emphasized in this framework.

The innovation capability is the comprehensive set of characteristics of an organization that facilitate and support innovation strategies. The view considering that an innovation capability is a higher order integration capability: they have the ability to manage and mold diverse major organizational capabilities and resources that successfully encourage the innovation activities (Wu and Sivalogathan, 2013). The possible influence of a company's innovation capability on its competitive advantage has been extensively documented in the literatures.

Incremental innovations refine and reinforce exiting products, processes and services in general by exploiting the obtainable knowledge base of a company (Subramaniam and Youndt, 2005 as cited in Wu and Sivalogathan, 2013). Such innovations should be more rampant in subsidiaries compared to essential innovations that, key transformations of exiting services, processes, products and unless a subsidiary. According to the resource-based view of competitive advantage, a resource is valuable when it enables a firm to take advantage of opportunities or neutralize threats that exist in its environment. It connotes the capability to exploit acquired knowledge via finding out new, enhanced, and refined ways of doing things that increase operational efficiency or create organizational value (Zahra and George, 2002 as cited in Wu and Sivalogathan, 2013).

When a company is judging whether it's organizational marketing capabilities can shape its company's competitive advantages, it can conduct measurement from three performance indicators, in order to measure effectively whether its marketing capability possesses a competitive advantage, these three measuring factors must be established on the foundation compared against the organization's main competitors (Wu and Sivalogathan, 2013). However, the attributes and the content of these three measuring factors are: Market performance, Customer satisfaction and Expected or existing earning power.

2.4. Innovation Strategy

An innovation strategy is a plan to increase profits or grow market share via product and service innovation. When viewing innovation strategy through a jobs-to-be-done lens, we see that an effective strategy must correctly notify which job executor, segment and job to target to attain the highest growth, and which unsatisfied needs to target to assist customers to get the job done better (Mohammad, 2018). An innovation strategy is about producing winning products, which connotes products that are in an eye-catching market, target a profitable customer segment, resolve the right unsatisfied needs, and help customers get a job done better than any competing solution (Mohammad, 2018). To design an effective innovation strategy, a firm must know all its customers' needs, which needs are yet to be met, and what segments of customers exist with diverse unmet needs, Innovation creates an enormous role in how products are created. An innovation strategy is a plan employed by a firm to support advancements in technology or services, typically by investing money in research and development activities (Mohammad, 2018).

An innovation strategy should be consistent to mission, goals, vision and strategies of a firm. Companies should be keen to invest in research and development, produce innovative products and attain substantial performance to be competitive (Ahu, 2015). Recent proof however, indicated that a good portion of innovative companies chooses to integrate different kinds of innovation at the same time, i.e. complex innovation strategy (Tavassoli and Karlsson, 2015). Considering both complex and simple innovation strategies, this connotes that, in total, companies can select between 16 different innovation strategies. Innovation can, from a company standpoint, be seen as a complex process involving the transformation, development and application of new combinations of ideas, technologies, knowledge, capabilities and resources with the aim to develop a novel idea or behaviour with the prospective to (i) increase the profitability of a company, (ii) lessen its production and distribution costs, and/or (iii) increase the willingness of customers to buy their

products (Therrien, Doloreux and Chamberlain, 2011; Jiménez and Sanz-Valle, 2011). It is a main assumption in the resources-based view of the firm that only firms with certain resources, network links, and characteristics will achieve competitive advantages through innovation and, therefore achieve superior performance (Camisón and Villar-Lopéz, 2014).

Strategic adaptation can be seen as a process made up by a set of external responses (new ways of relationships with suppliers and customers, new products, vertical integration or disintegration, expansion or contraction of domestic markets, etc.) and internal responses (redefining the company's architecture, incorporating new knowledge, organizational chart, process reengineering, change in an organization's culture, and new incentive systems etc.) (Alba, Alejandro, Xavier and Jaume, 2011). The firms develop various strategies to grow their businesses. The company's' growth strategies result into increased profits, long-term outputs in the form of superior businesses, and increased number of employees as well as the expansion of business operations (Shehnaz and Sulaiman, 2016). Adaptation is the answer of the companies to environmental challenges. Companies basically either recognize or do not recognize (in time) the environmental changes. In case they recognize them, they either find an appropriate adaptation form, configuration to them or do not. Moreover some companies are capable of influence their operating environment actively.

2.5. Innovation Culture

For innovation management process to be successful, it is essential that the company support an innovation culture and make employees feel valued. This will encourage employees to generate quality ideas in return. If structures allow the effective use of capabilities, culture is what enables the organization to acquire the capabilities related to people. With the right kind of pro-innovation culture, the company is much more expected to be able to employ and keep the right employee in the firm. A suitable pro-innovation culture supports the right kind of behaviour and discourages the wrong kind. As the impacts speedily cumulate, culture can make an incredible difference for the innovativeness of a company. When it comes to creating the solution, an innovation strategy must also show whether product enhancement, breakthrough innovation technique is best or a disruptive product. Regrettably, most innovation strategies fail in this area, which is why innovation success rates are weak.

Innovation culture is the work environment that leaders create in order to foster unorthodox thinking and its application. Workplaces that promote a culture of innovation normally subscribe to the claim that innovation is not the province of top leadership but can come from anyone in the company. Innovation cultures are prized by companies that compete in markets defined by speedy change; maintaining the status quo is inadequate to compete effectively, thus making an innovation culture vital for success. Innovation cultures frequently measure workers based on metrics such as value creation and competitive differentiation, instead of traditional metrics such as revenue generation and on-time delivery. Organizations that support innovative thinking also support discovery and look for ways to reward time spent on the research required to create new ideas and products.

Uzkurt and Sen (2012) asserted that innovative culture is a kind of culture that has the creativity, dynamism properties and orientation. Evaluation of diverse skills in most efficient and effective way and spread of innovation idea in whole company bring innovative company culture to the agenda (Aksay, 2011). Innovative culture has a relevant role in opportunities resulted from creativity and newness. Innovative behaviours of employees are affected by current culture. Organizational innovation indicates new ways of organizing work in areas such as workforce management, employee empowerment, and new individuals' partnership (Jen Shieh and Wang, 2010).

Organizational innovation indicates new ways of organizing work in areas such as workforce management, employee empowerment, and new individuals' partnership (Jen Shieh and Wang, 2010). The findings in the literature indicate a significant relationship between culture and innovation (Büschgens, Bausch and Balkin, 2013; Cerne, Kase and Skerlavaj, 2016; Lin, McDonough, Lin and Lin, 2013). However, the application of innovation is not easy to embrace without having a culture that encourages the organization to innovate (Halim, Ahmad, Ramayah, Hanifah, Taghizadeh and Mohamad, 2015). Innovation occurs when companies motivate their workers to share their skills with the rest of the company (Valencia, Valle and Jimenez, 2010). As such, beliefs, values and behaviours are shared by company members in a way that builds an innovation culture (Ali and Park, 2016). A significant relationship between innovative culture and marketing innovation is expected.

2.6. Theoretical Review

2.6.1. Schumpeter Theory of Innovation

Schumpeter (1928) posited that entrepreneurs, who could be R&D engineers. Schumpeter (1934) focused the role of entrepreneurship. Innovation is a continuous gale of creative destruction that were vital forces fostering growth rates in a capitalist system. Schumpeter's thinking evolved over his lifetime to the extent that some scholars have differentiated his early thinking where innovation was largely dependent on exceptional individuals/entrepreneurs willing to take on exceptional hazards as an act of will. His later thinking recognized the role of large corporations in organizing and supporting innovation. This resulted in his emphasis on the role of oligopolies in innovation and which later was falsely viewed as the main contribution of his work (Freeman, 2012).

Schumpeter's brief discussions of historical episodes of innovations in the field of banking might appear to suggest a positive role for financial innovations in financing the entrepreneurial ventures that produce the primary wave growth spurts.

For all his insight on the role of innovation, Schumpeter still did not really describe the source of innovation. He was able to point to its relevance and its role in timing economic cycles but did not address its source. Schumpeter's

assertions have been supported by Porter (2010) that innovation is key for a country's long-run economic growth and competitive advantage. Porter (2010) contended that to compete successfully in international markets, a country's businesses must constantly upgrade and innovate their competitive advantages. Upgrading and innovation come from sustained investment in intangible as well as physical assets. Financial markets play vital roles in mobilizing savings, managing risk, evaluating projects, facilitating transactions and monitoring managers. Schumpeter's Theory of Innovation underpins the process innovation variable, in that, commercial banks have over the years, and to date continue to innovate the banking process with a view to increase the profit margin. Innovations such as the Real Time Gross Settlement system and Asset securitization are among the innovations with significant transaction fees and other charges that contribute to the banks' profits and the current pesalink innovation which is set to compete with mobile money.

2.6.2. Empirical Review

Kraśnicka, Głód and Wronka-Pośpiech (2016) examined management innovation and its measurement. Five components of management innovation are strategic dimension, employee motivation, structural dimension and development dimension, partnership dimension and inter organizational relations, and ICT dimension. Using survey data of 301 employees from several companies in Poland, the validation of the management innovation measurement instrument was conducted. Internal consistency analysis (Cronbach's alpha) and factor analysis, used to test the statistical reliability of the tool, yielded satisfactory results. The findings of this study contribute to advancing innovation research, particularly the state of knowledge on management innovation. Implications for both research and managerial practice are also presented.

Nham, Nguyen, Pham and Nguyen (2016) examined the effects of innovation on firm performance of supporting industries in Hanoi - Vietnam. This study uses primary data from questionnaire survey. This study centered on companies in supporting industries of mechanics, automobile, electronics and motorbike. The questionnaire survey was administered to directors and CEO of those firms. The sample size was 150 respondents. Analysis methodologies of reliability, regression and factor analysis are adopted. The result showed that there are positive effects of marketing, process and organizational innovations on company performance in supporting companies.

Muchemi and Moronge (2017) examined the effects of implementation of strategic innovation on the performance of commercial banks in Kenya. The target population for the study was the staff at the Equity bank group headquarters, with a population of 160 employees. The determined sample size was 115 respondents out of a target population of 160. The study used primary data which was largely quantitative and descriptive in nature. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were further conducted. Inferential statistics was done to show the nature and magnitude of relationships established between the independent and dependent variables using regression analysis to make inferences from the data collected to more generalized conditions. Findings revealed that Market innovation strategies and Product innovation strategies collectively explain variations in the Performance.

Dwi and Universitas (2018) examined the effect of business partnerships and innovation management on firm performance of Business Units of multi play provider in Indonesia. Observations using a scope (time horizon) of cross section/one shot, means any information or data obtained are the results of research conducted at one particular time, namely in 2017. The unit of analysis in this study is the Business Units of the multi-play provider in Indonesia with the observation unit is the head of each Business Unit. Processing data using statistical analysis tools PLS. The test results indicate that business partnership and innovation management effect on firm performance. The innovation management has a greater impact than the business partnership in improving the business performance of Business Units of the multi-provider in Indonesia.

Mohammad (2018) examined the effect of innovation strategies on the functional performance of SMEs in Hassan Industrial City. About 160 questionnaires were randomly distributed to managers in three management levels over (20) SMEs Industries. Laban and Deya (2019) examined the effect of strategic innovations on organizational performance of information communication technology sector companies in Nairobi County in terms of product innovation, process innovation, organizational innovation and market innovation. A descriptive survey design was used. The population of study was 14 ICT companies in the cellular data, mobile and internet service segments that control 96.4% of the market share. Data was collected from 98 respondents and a structured questionnaire with open and closed ended questions designed on a Likert scale was adopted for data collection. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis. Findings showed that; market innovation was the most common and the greatest predictor of organizational performance. The study recommended that ICT firms should invest more in research and development activities to support new products that are launched on time, ICT companies to continue investing more in market innovation strategies for higher performance.

Yongan, Umair, Seoyeon and Madiha (2019) examined the influence of management innovation and technological innovation on organization performance with the mediating role of sustainability. The study adopted structural equation modeling in the analysis of a moment structures on the empirical evidence gathered from 304 Pakistani CEOs and top managers. The results showed that technological innovation and management innovation positively influence sustainability and organization performance. The study recommended that top managers and CEOs should give due attention to technological innovation and management innovation to improve sustainability and survive in the long run.

3. Methodology

The cross-sectional survey research design method was adopted for the study because it aids the collection of data from the respondents at a particular point in time. The justification for this method is that cross-sectional survey design is very feasible for the time frame available for the completion of the study and also it is economical in nature.

This study covered five selected deposit money banks in Asaba, Delta State and Benin, Edo State. This research took the form of a field survey, and it is expedient to mention that the population of this study was restricted to the banking industry. Therefore, the employees of five banks in the industry constituted the population. Hence, the population consisted of four hundred and twenty-five (425) employees (as reported by the human resource management department of each bank) to whom the research was generalized.

The sample size of this research is a proportion of individuals drawn from the population in order to examine the effect of innovation management on sustainable competitive advantage in five banks in Asaba, Delta State and Benin, Edo State. From the population, a workable sample size of 206 was derived by using the Taro Yamen's formula. The sample size of 206 was used for the study.

The study adopted the simple random sampling technique in selecting the banks whose employees participated in the study. The simple random sampling method was adopted because it needs only a minimum knowledge of the study group of population in advance and it is also free from errors in classification. The stratified random sampling technique was then used to select the sample size. Stratified random sampling technique was adopted because it ensures that each subgroup within the population receives proper representation within the sample.

To establish the reliability of the instrument, a test-retest method was employed. Reliability refers to the dependability of something. Cronbach's Alpha based text was employed to text for the reliability coefficient. A reliability coefficient of 0.7 and above, are high and is acceptable while a reliability coefficient of 0.6 and below shows poor reliability (Sekaran, 2003).

	Variables	Alpha (α) Value
1	Innovative capability	0.721
2	Innovation strategy	0.723
3	Innovation culture	0.711
4	Sustainable competitive advantage	0.720

Table 1: Reliability test for all items in the Questionnaire

Since all coefficient values in table 1 were above 0.6, which are greater than the common threshold recommended by Seckaran (2003) this shows that the instrument was reliable.

Data were collected through primary sources. The instrument that was used for collection of data is validated structured questionnaire. The descriptive statistics, correlation and multiple regression analysis was used to establish the nature of relationship that exists between innovation management and sustainable competitive advantage. The descriptive statistics was used to describe and summarize the sampling parameter across the sample without making interest to the larger population under study. Correlation and multiple regression analysis were used for the prediction of outcome, to test the relationship that exists between the dimensions of the independent variable and the dependent variable. And also to determine the extent to which the dimensions of the independent variable affects the dependent variable. All analysis was done by using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software version 23.

4. Results of Data Analysis

Out of the 206 copies of questionnaire administered, 202 copies were returned, 4 copies were not properly filled, and 198 copies were useable. Therefore, the analysis in this chapter was based on the usable sample size of 96% response rate.

Results indicated that the gender composition of the respondents representing 49% of the sample were males while 51% were females. The age bracket of the respondents showed that 28% of the respondents were below 30 years of age; 44% of the respondents' falls within the age bracket of 31-40 years of age, while 28% of the respondents were above 41 years of age. The marital composition of the respondents showed that; 38% of the sample respondents were single, while 62% other respondents were married. On the educational background of the sample, it was indicated that 35% of the respondents were OND/NCE holders, similarly results shows that 46% of the respondents were HND/B.Sc. holders, while 19% of the other respondents were master degree holders.

Variable	1	2	3	4	M	SD
1. Innovative capability	1				18.39	1.452
2. Innovation strategy	.542**	1			18.58	1.499
3. Innovation culture	.521**	.409**	1		18.65	1.423
4. Sustainable competitive advantage	.635**	.475**	.556**	1	18.56	1.458

Table 2: Inter-Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.029	1.183		2.561	.011
	Innovative capability	.414	.067	.412	6.191	.000
	Innovation strategy	.132	.061	.135	2.174	.031
	Innovation culture	.293	.063	.286	4.660	.000

Table 3: Regression Analysis of Innovation Management Strategy and Sustainable Competitive Advantage
a. Dependent Variable: Sustainable competitive advantage

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.696 ^a	.485	.477	1.0546

Table 4: Model Summary

a. Predictors: (Constant), Innovation culture, Innovation Strategy, Innovative capability

5. Discussion of Results

Table 2 showed that innovative capability exhibited strong positive correlation coefficient with sustainable competitive advantage (0.635**, $p < 0.01$) which means that innovative capability is a good measure of innovation management. In table 3 it indicated that innovative capability has the highest positive effect on sustainable competitive advantage ($\beta = 0.412$, $P < 0.05$). Since the p-value critical in table 3 hypothesis test result was lesser than the calculated level of significance ($0.000 < 0.05$). H_{a1} implies that there is a significant relationship between innovative capability and sustainable competitive advantage. This finding is in agreement with Nilsson, Regnell, Larsson and Ritzen (2010) finding that innovation capability is the capacity of an organization to create new product attributes which are successfully incorporated in product development, creating significant value for product stakeholders. This agrees with Rahab, Sulistyandari and Sudjono (2011) findings that innovation capability is the capability to develop and modify existing products or services or to create novel products or services. This indicated that innovative capability is an umbrella term used to cover the different abilities and resources the organization has for creating and managing innovation.

Table 2 showed that innovation strategy showed a moderate positive correlation coefficient with sustainable competitive advantage (0.475**, $p < 0.01$) which implies that innovation strategy is a good measure of innovation management. In table 3 it was reported that innovation strategy has positive effect on sustainable competitive advantage ($\beta = 0.135$, $P < 0.05$). Table 3 indicated that the calculated level of significance is lesser than the p-value of 5% i.e. ($0.031 < 0.05$). H_{a2} implied that there is a significant relationship between innovation strategy and sustainable competitive advantage. This supports the findings of Mohammad (2018) that an innovation strategy is a plan employed by a firm to encourage advancements in technology, typically by investing money in research and development activities. Proofs, however, indicated that a good portion of innovative companies chooses to integrate different types of innovation at the same time, i.e. complex innovation strategy (Tavassoli and Karlsson, 2015). This implies that an innovation strategy is a plan to increase profits or market share via product and service innovation.

Table 2 indicated that innovation culture exhibited a strong positive correlation coefficient with sustainable competitive advantage (0.556**, $p < 0.01$) which means that it is a good measure of innovation management. Similarly in table 3 it was reported that innovation culture has positive effect on sustainable competitive advantage ($\beta = 0.286$, $P < 0.05$). The level of significance that was calculated in table 3 is lesser than the established p-value ($0.000 < 0.05$). H_{a3} indicated that innovation culture has a significant relationship with sustainable competitive advantage. This supports the findings of Halim, Ahmad, Ramayah, Hanifah, Taghizadeh and Mohamad (2015) that the application of innovation is not easy to embrace without having a culture that encourages the organization to innovate. Valencia, Valle and Jimenez, (2010) found that innovation occurs when companies motivate their workers to share their skills with the rest of the organization. This indicated that innovative behaviours of employees are affected by current culture.

6. Conclusion

This study concluded that innovation management has effect on sustainable competitive advantage in the Nigerian deposit money banks. Findings showed that 48% of the change in sustainable competitive advantage is brought about by innovation management. Findings indicated that innovative capability, innovation strategy and innovation culture have significant positive relationship with sustainable competitive advantage.

7. Recommendations

The study recommends as follows:

- For firms to overcome global antagonism, they have to possess innovation capability.
- Firms should support innovation culture for innovation management process to be successful.
- Firms should create new thoughts and novel ideas to protect their existence.
- To create an effective innovation strategy, the firm should find out all its customers' needs, which needs are unmet, and what segments of customers exist with diverse unmet needs.

- An innovation strategy should be consistent to mission, vision, goals and strategies of a firm.
- For innovation management process to be successful, it is essential that the company support an innovation culture and make employees feel valued.

8. References

- i. Afuah, A. (2013). Are network effects really all about size? The role of structure and conduct, *Strategy Management Journal*, 34: 257-273.
- ii. Ahu, T. K. (2015). Effects of innovation strategy on firm performance: A study conducted on manufacturing firms in Turkey, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 195: 1338 – 1347.
- iii. Aksay, K. (2011). Yenilikçilik Kültürünün Örgütsel Yenilikçilik Üzerine Etkisi: Konya İlinde Faaliyet Gösteren Özel Hastanelerde Bir Uygulama. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı
- iv. Ali, M. & Park, K. (2016). The mediating role of an innovative culture in the relationship between absorptive capacity and technical and non-technical innovation, *Journal of Business Research*, 6: 1669-1675.
- v. Asghar I., (2010). The role of leadership in organizational change: Relating the successful organizational change to visionary and innovative leadership. Master's thesis in Industrial Engineering and Management, Faculty of Engineering and Sustainable Development, University of Gavle.
- vi. Birgit, P., Mike, P., & Chung-Shing, C. (2018). Needs, drivers and barriers of innovation: The case of an alpine community model destination, *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25: 53-63.
- vii. Büschgens, T. Bausch, A. & Balkin, D.(2013). Organizational culture and innovation: A met analytic review, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30 (4): 1-19.
- viii. Cerne, M. Kase, R. & Skerlavaj, M. (2016). Non-technological innovation research: evaluating the intellectual structure and prospects of an emerging, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 3: 69-85.
- ix. Drucker, P.F. (2013). *Innovation and entrepreneurship*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- x. Dwi, S. P. & Universitas, P. (2018). The effect of business partnership and innovation management to business performance of business units of multiplay provider in Indonesia, *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(2): 1-12.
- xi. Dwi, S. P. Sucherly, P. Yuyus, S. S. & Diana, S. (2018). The effect of business partnership and innovation management to business performance of business units of multiplay provider in Indonesia, *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(2): 1-12.
- xii. Freeman, C. (2012). The diffusion of information and communication technology in the world economy in the 2013s, In R. Mansell (Ed.), *The Management of Information and Communication Technologies: Emerging Patterns of Control*, Aslib, London, 8-41.
- xiii. Haifeng, W. Pengfei, H. & Weishu, L. (2018). How to improve sustainable competitive advantage from the distributor and the supplier networks: Evidence from the Paper-Making Industry in China, *Sustainability*, 1-13.
- xiv. Hajar, I. (2015) The effect of business strategy on innovation and firm performance in the small industrial sector, *The International Journal of Engineering and Science*, 4 (2): 1-9.
- xv. Halim, H. A. Ahmad, N. H. Ramayah, T. Hanifah, H. Taghizadeh, S. K. & Mohamad, M. N. (2015). Towards an innovation culture: Enhancing innovative performance of Malaysian SMEs, *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4 (2): 85-93.
- xvi. He, Q. Fang, H. Ji, H. & Fang, S. (2017). Environmental inequality in China: A pyramid model and nationwide pilot analysis of prefectures with sources of industrial pollution, *Sustainability*, 9, 1871.
- xvii. Hicks, D. & Niehans J. (2012). Financial innovations, multinational banking and monetary policy, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 537- 551.
- xviii. Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., Camp, S.M., & Sexton, D.L. (2011). Guest editors' introduction to the special issue strategic entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial strategies for wealth creation, *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 479-491.
- xix. Hogan, S.J., Soutar, G.N., Mccoll-Kennedy, J.R. & Sweeney, J.C. (2011). Reconceptualizing professional service firm innovation capability: Scale development. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40 (8): 1264-1273.
- xx. Jen Shieh, C., & Wang, I. (2010). A Study of the relationships between corporate core competence, management innovation and corporate culture, *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 2: 395-411.
- xxi. Jimenez, J.D. & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation, organizational learning and performance *Journal of Business Research*, 64: 408-417.
- xxii. Johansson, B. & Lööf, H. (2010). Innovation strategy and firm performance, What is the long run impact of persistent R&D?, CESIS Working Paper No.240, Center of Excellence for Science and Innovation Studies, Stockholm
- xxiii. Johnson, G., Scholes, K. & Whittington, R. (2015). *Exploring corporate strategy*, 7th Edition, Prentice Hall, Harlow England.
- xxiv. Joseph, A. & Mark, K. (2013). Service quality in the banking sector: the impact of technology on service delivery, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 17(4): 182-91.
- xxv. Khosa, Z.M., Rehman, Z.U., Asad, A., Bilal, M.A., & Hussain, N., (2015). The impact of organizational change on the employee's performance in the Banking Sector of Pakistan, *Journal of Business and Management*, 17(3): 54-61.
- xxvi. Kitur, R.K., (2015). Strategic change and leadership at Madison Insurance Co. Ltd. A thesis for Master of Business Administration, School of Business, University of Nairobi.
- xxvii. Kraśnicka, T. Głód, W. & Wronka-Pośpiech, M.(2016). Management innovation and it measurement, *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 12(2): 95-122.

- xxviii. Kuratko, D.F., Ireland, R.D., Covin, J.G., & Hornsby, J.S. (2015). A model of middle-level managers' entrepreneurial behaviour, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 29 (6): 699-716.
- xxix. Laban, O. M., & Deya, J. (2019). Strategic innovations and the performance of information communication technology firms in Nairobi Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 8(2): 1-24.
- xxx. Li, H. & Atuagene-Gima, K. (2011). Product innovation strategy and the performance of new technology ventures in China, *Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (6), 1123-1134.
- xxxi. Lin, H. McDonough, E. Lin, S. & Lin, C. (2013). Managing the exploitation/exploration paradox: The role of learning, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(2), 262-278.
- xxxii. Mile, T. (2010). The relationship between innovation management practice and innovation performance in the mainstream and the new stream: An Empirical Study of Australian Organisations, *ANZAM*, 1-22.
- xxxiii. Mohammad, T. A.(2018). Effect of innovation strategies on the functional performance of SMEs organizations in (Hassan Industrial City), *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 7(5): 12-18.
- xxxiv. Mohammed, M., Sanuri, S., & Rahim, A. (2014). The effect of TQM practices on technological innovation capabilities: Applying on Malaysian manufacturing sector, *International Journal for Quality Research*, 8(2): 197-216.
- xxxv. Muchemi, C. & Moronge, M. (2017). Effects of implementation of strategic innovation on the performance of commercial banks in Kenya; A Case Study of Equity Bank, *Journal of Management*, 4(2): 605 - 630.
- xxxvi. Ndahiro, S., Shukla, J., & Oduor, J., (2015). Effect of change management on the performance of government institutions in Rwanda: A case of Rwanda revenue authority, *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(5): 94-107.
- xxxvii. Nham, T. Nguyen, N. Pham, G. & Nguyen, N. (2016). The effects of innovation on firm performance of supporting industries in Hanoi - Vietnam, *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 9(2): 413-431.
- xxxviii. Nilsson, F., Regnell, B., Larsson, T. & Ritzen, S. (2010). Measuring for innovation: a guide for innovative teams, <http://www.innovationmanagement.se/2011/10/10/measuring-forinnovation%E2%80%93a-guide-for-innovative-teams/>: Innovation Management.
- xxxix. Olubayo.O.T., (2014). Change management and its effects on organizational performance of Nigerian Telecoms Industries: Empirical Insight from Airtel Nigeria, *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education*, 1(11): 170-179.
- xl. Osuga, P. O. (2016). The effects of strategic innovation on the performance of SMEs in Nairobi County. Master's Thesis University of Nairobi.
- xli. Rahab, A. Sulistyandari, B. & Sudjono, C. (2011). The development of innovation capability of small medium enterprises through knowledge sharing process: an empirical study of Indonesian creative industry. *International Journal of Business & Social Science*, 2(21): 112-123.
- xlii. Schumpeter, J. A. (1928). The instability of capitalism. *The Economic Journal*, September 1928.
- xliii. Schumpeter, J. A. (1939). *Business cycles*, McGraw-Hill: New York. 217.
- xliv. Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (originally published in German in 1911; reprinted by Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey in 2013).
- xlv. Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research method for business (4th Ed.)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- xlvi. Shehnaz T. & Sulaiman, S. (2016). Impact of innovative practices on business growth under the moderating impacts of culture - a conceptual model, *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 5(2): 28-46.
- xlvii. Sidikova, M., (2011). The impact of change management on employee's motivation: A case of Cargotec Shared Service Centre, Bachelor Thesis. Turku University of Applied Sciences.
- xlviii. Silvestre, B.S., & Neto, R.S. (2014). Capability accumulation, innovation, and technology diffusion: Lessons from a base of the pyramid cluster, *Technovation*, 34: 270-283.
- xlix. Sobanke, V., Adegbite, S., Ilori, M., & Egbetokun, A. (2013). Determinants of technological capability of firms in a developing country, *Procedia Engineering*, 69: 991-1000.
- l. Subramaniam, M. & Youndt, M. A. (2005). The influence of intellectual capital on the types of innovative capabilities, *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3): 450-463.
- li. Tavassoli, S., & Karlsson, C. (2015). Firms' innovation strategies analyzed and explained, *CESIS Working Paper Series 396*, Royal Institute of Technology, CESIS - Centre of Excellence for Science and Innovation Studies.
- lii. Tett, R. P., Simonet, D. V., Walser, B., & Brown, C. (2013). Trait activation theory. *Handbook of personality at work*, 71-100.
- liii. Therrien, P., Doloreux, D. & Chamberlain, T. (2011). Innovation novelty and (commercial) performance in the service sector: A Canadian Firm-Level Analysis, *Technovation*, 31: 655-665.
- liv. Uzkurt, C. & Sen, R.(2012). Örgüt Kültürü ve Örgütsel Yeniliğin Pazarlama Yeniliğine Etkisi: Gazlı İçecek Sektöründe Bir Araştırma', *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(3): 27-50
- lv. Valencia, J.N.C. Valle, R.S.& Jimenez, D.(2010). Organizational culture as determinant of product innovation, *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 13 (4): 466-480.
- lvi. Wanza, L. & Nkuraru, J.K. (2016). Influence of change management on employee performance: A Case of University of Eldoret, Kenya, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 7(4): 190-199.
- lvii. Weng, H.H., Chen, J.S., & Chen, P.C. (2015). Effects of green innovation on environmental and corporate performance: A stakeholder perspective, *Sustainability*, 7: 4997-5026.

- lviii. Wu, X. & Sivalogathan, V. (2013). Innovation capability for better performance: intellectual capital and organization performance of the Apparel Industry in Sri Lanka, *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 1(3): 273-277.
- lix. Yang, L. & Dong, S. (2017). Sustainable product strategy in apparel industry with consumer behavior consideration, *Sustainability*, 9: 920.
- lx. Yongan, Z. Umair, K. Seoyeon, L. & Madiha, S. (2019). The influence of management innovation and technological innovation on organization performance, A mediating role of sustainability, *sustainability*, 11:1-21.
- lxi. Zhou, K.Z & Li, C.B. (2012). How knowledge affects radical innovation: Knowledge base, market knowledge acquisition, and internal knowledge sharing, *Strategy Management Journal*, 33: 1090-1102.