Effect of Marketing and Organisational Innovations on Performance of Telecommunication Companies in Nigeria

Bitrus Fulani Kwajaffa
Department of Marketing, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria

Abstract

Because of the dynamism and competition in today's business environment, firms that wish to compete and endure for a long time must adopt new techniques. The general population of Nigeria has the impression that the nation's telecommunications operating businesses are not only doing well, but also extremely profitable. However, a recent assessment by the industry watchdog, the Nigerian Communications Commission (NCC, 2020), revealed that despite the significant investment made by these telecom businesses, the overall sector performance has decreased. This served as the basis for this study, which looked at how organizational and marketing changes affected the success of telecom companies in Nigeria. Questionnaires were used as the tool of data collection in a survey design. Data were gathered from 213 employees at the six-person management cadre. Due to this, the report advises telecom operators to keep looking for new and effective ways to market their goods and services, while also making sure to set them apart from those of rival companies. Additionally, telecom businesses should use better methods for managing their interactions with important parties, particularly regulatory organizations, since doing so will likely result in fewer sanctions and other regulations that could endanger their business operations.
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1. Introduction

Due to its intense competition, the business climate in the twenty-first century has undergone significant change, especially in terms of technology development and consumer tastes and preferences. In order to outsmart their competitors and stay competitive, this has encouraged business owners to think and act outside of the box (Drucker, 2014). In order for an organization to be considered successful or high-performing, it must simultaneously produce triple bottom line profits in the form of economic, social, and environmental gain (Hart & Milstein, 2003). According to Rosenbush et al. (2011), innovation efforts are one of the primary drivers of long-term corporate success. This assertion that innovation is a crucial success factor has been stressed by various academics in the subject. Due to the increased degree of competition and shortened product life cycles, Artz et al. (2010) claim that a firm's capacity to embrace innovations may be more crucial than ever in enabling enterprises to improve performance and sustain competitive advantage.
Companies now risk losing the value added in their products and services due to rising global competition and rapidly evolving technologies; as a result, they must recognize and adopt innovation as one of the key components of growth strategies in order to enter new markets, increase market share in existing markets, and give the company a competitive edge (Gunday et al., 2011). Similar to this, innovative innovations have been emphasized as a criterion for enhanced performance and organizations' survival in the market due to fierce competition and a continually changing environment (Shaharoun, et al., 2010).

Studies have connected many forms of innovation to business performance. According to a study by Therrien et al. (2011) on the impact of innovation on organization performance in the service sector, in order to benefit from innovations and increase sales, a company must enter the market early and present new items with greater degrees of creativity. By performing empirical research of Turkish companies operating in several industries, Gunday et al. (2011) investigated the effects of marketing, process, product, and organization innovations on organizational performance, including accomplishments in finance, marketing, and production. The study discovered that organization performance in the manufacturing industry is positively impacted by marketing, product, and organizational innovations.

Innovative businesses should keep a supply of fresh concepts that can provide them a competitive edge (Adair, 2004). Researchers like Kosturiak and Cha (2008) and Tidd, et al. (2007) proposed a two-part model for the inventive process. The first part is inventive, which is connected to the creation of the unique idea, thought, or concept and depends on people's knowledge, skills, and experience (Moreira, et al., 2012). The second part is innovative, which occurs when such an invention is implemented and marketed and must be focused on customers and value addition (Pitra, 2006). The four dimensions of process innovation, product innovation, marketing innovation, and technology innovation were examined in a study by Seng et al. (2011). However, this research was limited to marketing. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2005, marketing innovation refers to a company's capacity to successfully adopt and implement new marketing techniques in relation to product price, service, positioning, and/or design and packaging (as well as other factors). It could take the form of updating the product/service design while maintaining the essential technical and functional elements, updating the distribution channels, updating general marketing management activities, updating the techniques used to promote the product/service, and updating the pricing strategies used for both existing and new products/services (Gunday et al., 2011). Studies like those by Biégas and Neto-Steiner (2015) showed a correlation between marketing innovation and both market performance (attracting and maintaining customers) and financial performance (profit).

On the other hand, organizational innovation is defined as the introduction of organizational methods that are deemed novel and intended to improve a firm's performance, specifically in areas like operational efficiency, employee satisfaction, or a firm's innovativeness, into its business practices, workplace organization, or external relations (OECD, 2007; Steiber, 2012). The processes by which such innovations are developed and maintained continue to be poorly managed and understood, despite the fact that organizational innovations contribute to technical innovations and create long-term competitive advantages (Birkinshaw & Mol, 2006;
Birkinshaw et al., 2008). Organizational innovations are designed to improve a company's performance by lowering overall expenses, boosting worker productivity, and acquiring access to non-imitable assets (knowledge) at lower supply costs (Steiber, 2012).

**Statement of the Problem**

Following the levels of activities such as political unrest, social reforms, technological advancement, globalization, and fierce competition from new entrants, the business environment in which mobile telecommunication companies operate has been very unpredictable (Swart & Robinson 2004). These activities have preoccupied the operating environment and impeded business growth. Due to this, it is crucial for firms to create and maintain a competitive edge that is unmatched by their current and future rivals and that is resistant to environmental changes (Porter, 2008).

Due to the fierce competition between these network service providers, enormous sums of money have been invested in technology, giving each network provider a respectable presence in both urban and rural portions of the nation. This technological achievement by network providers is thought to have the potential to put them in a better position, particularly in terms of market share, profit, quality and speed of service, as well as customer loyalty and happiness. However, a recent assessment by NCC (2020) showed a drop in the industry's overall performance and raised questions about the sustainability of the running companies and the industry as a whole. In light of this, the following specific goals were addressed in the research that was done.

i. to assess the impact of organizational innovation on the performance of telecom firms in Nigeria, and  
ii. the impact of marketing innovation on telecom company performance in Nigeria.

The study was guided by the following research hypotheses:

**Ho1**: Marketing innovation has no significant effect on the performance of telecommunication companies in Nigeria.  

**Ho2**: There is no significant effect of organizational innovation on the performance of telecommunication companies in Nigeria.

2. **Literature Review**

**Innovation**

The idea of innovation has been present in literature for a considerable amount of time. One of the earliest definitions of innovation was provided by German economist and political scientist Schumpeter (1934), who is sometimes credited as coining the term. He described innovation as the force that propels development. This innovation is said to have many different aspects, such as the creation of new products or improvements to existing ones in terms of quality, the adoption of new industrial processes, the attraction or development of new markets, the use of new raw material sources, new technologies, and new organizational structures for the industrial sector (Vyas, 2009). Schumpeter also defined innovation as "any change in a product, process, and organizational attributes that does not necessarily originate from new scientific
discoveries but may emanate from a combination of already existing technologies and their application in a different context" (Ilavsk, 2011). This definition is also supported by research.

The UK Department of Trade and Industry (2007) described innovation as the process of developing new ideas from thoughts and possibilities as well as putting those ideas into practice. Similar to this, Therrien et al. (2011) proposed that innovation is a compound process that is linked to modifications in production functions and processes in order for businesses to seek out, develop, and maintain their distinct technological competence (i.e., the set of resources a business owns as well as the means by which such resources are transformed through innovative capabilities). At the corporate level, it is defined as the organization's openness to and willingness to adopt new ideas that can support the creation and introduction of new goods (Rubera & Kirca, 2012).

Nofie (2011) defines innovation in the service industry as the appearance of a brand-new, improved service or a method that significantly lowers the price of providing services than is already the case. According to a different perspective, innovation is defined as the adoption, integration, and exploitation of novel and value-driven ideas in the economic and social spheres; the renewal and expansion of goods, services, and markets; the development of new production techniques; and the establishment of novel management systems (Crossan & Apaydin 2010). According to Durst et al. (2015), the definition of innovation in the service sector, also known as service innovation, is the introduction of new services and enhancements to currently offered services. Introducing a new or improved product, process, service, or new style of.

**Marketing Innovation**

One of the most popular definitions of this idea comes from the Oslo manual, which defined it as "the creation or implementation of new or significantly improved changes in the key elements of a product or service with the underlying intention of improving customers' needs, opening up new markets, or positioning a firm's latest product in the market" (OECD Oslo manual, 2005). According to Ungerman et al. (2018), marketing innovation is defined as the search for innovative and creative answers to issues and needs that have been highlighted as requirements for firms to increase their competitiveness and performance.

According to Mohd and Syamsuriana (2013) and Rodriguez-Cano et al. (2004), marketing innovation has to do with the market mix and market selection to match customers' expectations, which is crucial for meeting market requirements and seizing market chances. Marketing innovation, according to Gunday et al. (2011), involves introducing better solutions to meet customer wants, finding and entering a new market, or strategically positioning a firm's product in the market to boost sales.

According to Johne (1999), the definition of marketing innovation is "investigating and exploiting new businesses through improvements in marketing activities, particularly as it relates to market mix and market selection to meet a customer's buying preference." The ever-evolving business environment, particularly the emergence of technologies like the internet, has made it very simple for rivals to reach potential customers across the globe at a light speed,
necessitating continuous marketing innovation on the part of a company as a survival strategy (Johne, 1999).

Organizational Innovation

According to the OECD Oslo manual from 2005, organizational innovation is the application of new or improved organizational methods in business practices, workplace organization, or external practices that have the potential to improve firms' performance by lowering administrative and transaction costs, supply costs, raising labor productivity, and gaining access to non-tradable knowledge. According to Angel et al. (2013), it has also been described as creating new procedures within the company, the sector, and even in her interactions with external parties. It is seen as a crucial result for organizations and business models including outsourcing, partnerships, subcontracting, and lean management, which are recognized as the cornerstones of value creation (Thakur et al., 2012).

According to some academics, organizational innovation includes knowledge management in the context of the industry or organization, as well as an improvement or full shift in the firm's processes (Haneda, et al., 2014). Organizational innovation is sometimes described as a new organizational strategy that is expected to enhance a company's performance in its external relations, workplace organization, or business processes (Steiber, 2012).

Jurado, et al. (2009) claim that businesses involved in organizational innovation or creativity aim to raise the value of the company, boost profit, and improve overall performance while also maintaining the lowest cost. Additionally, they aim to raise employee productivity, enhance workplace satisfaction, create or acquire unique and rare intangible assets like a piece of uncodified information, and reduce the cost of raw materials or other supplies (Jurado et al., 2009). They also focus on market-related issues like product quality and the ability to keep up with organizational changes (Tejada & Moreno, 2013).

Performance

Simply put, a firm's performance can be described as the difference between its actual output and expected output, which are typically expressed as goals and objectives (Short, et al., 2007). According to Cascio (2015), performance is the accomplishment of the stated goals and objectives through time. Al-Tit (2017) claimed the same thing, stating that performance is the overall intended result that gauges the anticipated to the precise target accomplished in the organization over time. Specific measurements of performance have frequently been made using monetary, commonly referred to as the objectives, and non-monetary or subjective measures. Furthermore, non-financial measures, also known as subjective measures, involve the use of indicators such as quality, client satisfaction, innovations, and market share which frequently reveal the financial position of a company and opportunity for growth. Financial measures, also known as the objective measure, often involve the use of financial ratios such as profit, equity on shares, stock value, and return on assets (Al-Tit, 2017).

Different firms use different methodologies to evaluate their performance depending on the organizational goals. Both financial and non-financial metrics can be used to evaluate this performance indicator (Darroch, 2005; Bagorogoza & Waal, 2010; Bakar & Ahmad, 2010). To
gauge their performance, however, the majority of businesses choose to use financial indicators (Hoskin, 1990). The most often utilized financial or accounting metrics by businesses are return on assets (ROA) (Zahra, 2008), average yearly occupancy rate, net profit after tax, and return on investment (ROI) (Tavitiyaman et al., 2012). To be responsive to changes in internal and external settings, Krager and Parnell (1996) asserted that financial elements must be combined with non-financial measurement. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) is one of the performance measuring frameworks that uses this combination (Kaplan & Norton 1996). It offers four ways to measure performance: financially, for customers, internally through internal processes, and in terms of learning and growth. However, this study's performance metric was limited to the financial-based dimension.

**Empirical Review**

**Marketing Innovation and Performance**

Ungerman et al. (2018) looked at how marketing innovation affects businesses' ability to compete in the Czech Republic's industry 4.0 environment. A pilot study was conducted among 50 businesses who advertise utilizing Industry 4.0. A content analysis evaluation was used to generate a list of the 15 fundamental marketing innovation tools. The study revealed eleven key effects of marketing innovation that respondents thought were significant. These effects were stated, then assessed using descriptive statistical techniques, and their significance was then empirically confirmed. Businesses ranked improving the corporate culture, boosting employee productivity, and making the organization more competitive as their three most significant impacts. The study's top ranked impact, the increase in enterprise competitiveness, has been experimentally proven by businesses to be the innovative marketing strategy's largest impact in the context of Industry 4.0. The study was carried out in the manufacturing sector, thus if it were to be repeated in the service sector, the results might be different. Koffi, et al. (2020) used information gathered through structured questionnaires from a sample of 250 SMEs operating in Cote d'Ivoire to study the effects of innovation types on the performance and competitiveness of Ivorian SMEs. The hypothesis was tested using PLS-SEM, and the findings showed that marketing innovation had a positive and significant impact on SMEs' performance across the nation. The findings of this study, however, cannot be applied to the telecommunications sector because it did not differentiate between the sectors of the SMEs.

**Organizational Innovation and Performance**

The performance of organizations and workplace innovation in the hospitality sector were studied by Stoffers et al. in 2021. In this study, Dutch three- and four-star hotels were used as a comparison to other sectors. The Dutch Network of Social Innovation's (NSI) survey on workplace innovation was administered to two samples. The initial study involved the hospitality sector, and the results from that study were compared to a sample of data from other businesses. The results show that four organizational performance variables are positively impacted by workplace innovation. Additionally, Hana (2013) used 109 Czech companies to study how competitive advantage is attained through innovation and knowledge. A questionnaire survey was used to collect primary data from organizations in the Czech Republic. These data were then examined using descriptive statistical techniques as well as the
comparison, induction, deduction, and synthesis approaches. One of the article's conclusions is that organizations must innovate and foster an innovative culture if they want to survive. Since knowledge is both an important input and an important output of the transformation process, it has been discovered to be extremely vital in the innovation process.

Suhag, et al. (2017) looked at the connection between organizational performance and innovation in the Pakistani telecommunications industry. Process innovation, product innovation, and organizational innovation were used to measure innovation in their study; however, organizational culture was added to temper the link. In order to ensure a fair response, 200 employees in Islamabad and Rawalpindi who are interested in the innovation in the telecom business were given questionnaires. Regression analysis was used to examine the data, and the study discovered that marketing innovation has a favorable impact on performance. In a similar vein, organizational culture was found to have moderating effects on both marketing innovation and organizational performance. It is crucial that a similar study be carried out here in Nigeria due to the country's unique geography and socioeconomic situation.

Resource Based View Theory

According to Wernerfelt's (1984) resource-based perspective theory, a firm's ability to preserve, allocate, and deploy essential, rare, and irreplaceable resources effectively and efficiently determines its competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). According to Barney et al. (2011), the RBV provides crucial elements that are required to identify and forecast competitive advantage and how it affects a firm's performance. Wernerfelt (1984) made his main contribution by noting that firms can use their resources to compete with other organizations for resources, which can help them obtain an advantage when adopting product market strategies (Barney, 2001). Resources in this context refer to all elements made available to implementers of innovative tasks by an organization (Amabile, 1997), which are sufficient for employees to be creative and which include appropriate access to funds, materials, facilities, knowledge, and information, as well as time and training options.

Four characteristics of the RBV show how a resource could produce a lasting competitive advantage. These include organization (VRIO) and valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable (VRRI). The ability to design and implement ideas that can lower costs or boost business value is what makes a resource valuable. Rare in the sense that few rival companies control the available resources. Imperfectly imitable denotes a resource's lack of duplication-ability. Organizations that make the best use of their resources (Barney & Hesterly, 2012). This theory is pertinent to this study because it offers an alternative perspective on innovation and analyzes how resources might be used to gain a competitive edge through unique growth-promoting techniques. These resources and competencies are the key factors to take into account when formulating a company's strategy since they allow them to develop a distinctive identity and a strategy that will lead to prosperity (Barney, 2001).

3. Methodology

The study used a five-point Likert scale questionnaire that was derived from works by Günay (2007) as part of its survey research design to assess organizational and marketing innovations. In the study conducted by Karabulut (2015), this questionnaire was evaluated, and it received
high marks for both validity and reliability. While a twelve-item questionnaire created by Karabulut (2015) was modified and utilized to gauge performance in the study. However, only the financial dimension, which consists of three (3) items, was the subject of this study. The scale includes the following metrics: "increase in market share over the past three years," "increase in sales revenues of all goods and services over the past three years," and "increase in return on investment (ROI) over the past three years." All of the management staff of the six (6) functioning Unified Access Service Licensees (UASL) in Nigeria- MTN, Globacom, 9Mobile, Airtel, Smile, and Entel-constituted the study's population. According to data from the human resources departments of the six telecom businesses (MTN-57, Airtel-43, Globacom-47, 9Mobile-36, Smile-18, Entel-12), the total population consisted of 213 employees. Due to the small size of the population, the study used a census sampling technique to choose a representative sample size of the entire population, which resulted in a sample size of 213. Respondents received the questionnaire electronically by email platforms after it was created using an electronic form (Google forms). The data gathered from the respondents was analyzed using ordinary least squares multiple regression. The model for the regression is specified thus:

$$\text{PRF} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{MKI} + \beta_2 \text{OGI} + e$$

Where: \(\text{PRF} = \text{Performance, MKI = Marketing Innovation, OGI = Organizational Process Innovation, e = Error term (5\% = 0.05), } \beta_0 = \text{Intercept, } \beta_1 \beta_2 = \text{Coefficient of independent variables.}$$

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKI</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>-1.673</td>
<td>5.438</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGI</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPSS Output, 2021

The behavior of all the factors under consideration is shown in the table above. The maximum and minimum values for marketing innovation (MKI) were 5 and 1, respectively, while the average score was 4.31, suggesting that the majority of responses fell between agree and strongly agree. Additionally, the skewness value of -1.673, which is less than 1.96, shows that the variable is regularly distributed. Additionally, organizational innovation (OGI) showed a minimum and maximum of 1 and 5, respectively, while the mean value was 1.96 and the variable showed a normal distribution with a skewness value of -.049, as well. Last but not
least, performance (PRF) had an average value of 3.10 and a skewness value of, with minimum and maximum values of 1 and 5 respectively.

Table 2: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MKI</th>
<th>OGI</th>
<th>PRF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKI</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.244**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGI</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: SPSS Output, 2021

Organizational innovation (OGI), which stood at 0.244 and is significant at the 5% level of significance, demonstrated a positive but sluggish association with marketing innovation (MKI). MKI had a marginally significant (PRF = 0.100, 5% level of significance) positive connection with performance. Additionally, OGI demonstrated a 0.006 weakly positive association between performance and OGI. All the variables in the study meet the multicollinearity requirement even if there is no significant correlation between any of the independent variables.

Table 3: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.714a</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), OGI, MKI
b. Dependent Variable: PRF

Table 4: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>161.021</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.642</td>
<td>31.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>154.707</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315.728</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PRF
b. Predictors: (Constant), OGI, MKI
Table 5: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKI</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGI</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PRF

Source: SPSS Output, 2021

The results, as displayed in the tables above, showed an R-square value of 0.510, indicating that the two independent variables under study—marketing and organizational innovation—could together account for 51% of the variation in performance (PRF). Other factors or variables not covered in this study could account for the remaining 49% difference. The f-statistics was 31.103, and it was also determined that the probability of the f-statistics was significant at the 5% level of significance (p 0.0000.05), proving that the model is appropriate for determining the relationship between the variables under consideration.

According to the regression line PRF = 2.425 + 0.172MKI, product innovation has a positive impact on performance, suggesting that increasing marketing innovation will also boost performance. The study lacked sufficient evidence to accept the null hypothesis, which led to the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis that marketing innovation has a significant impact on the performance of telecom companies in Nigeria. The probability of t-statistics stood at 0.000, which is less than 0.05 level of significance, indicating that the effect is significant.

According to the regression line PRF = 2.425 - 0.019OGI, organizational innovation has a negative impact on performance, suggesting that increasing organizational innovation has resulted in a decline in performance. The study accepts the null hypothesis, which states that organizational innovation has no significant effect on the performance of telecom companies in Nigeria, because the probability of the t-statistics stood at 0.787, which is greater than the threshold of significance of 0.05, indicating that the effect is insignificant.

5. Discussion of Findings

This study investigated how marketing and organizational innovation affected telecom company performance in Nigeria and evaluated two additional hypotheses, the findings of which are discussed below;

First, the study discovered a favorable and significant impact of marketing innovation on the performance of telecom companies in Nigeria, suggesting that adjustments made by the telecom companies in relation to the provision of customer-focused services have resulted in an improvement in their performance. This conclusion is in line with those of Karabulut (2015) and Biégas (2018), who both found that marketing innovations had a beneficial impact on performance. The results of the second hypothesis, on the other hand, showed that organizational innovation has a marginally negative impact on telecom company performance in Nigeria. This suggests that the telecom companies’ organizational innovation improvements,
particularly those affecting their relationships with external stakeholders like regulatory agencies, have only resulted in a drop in performance. The results of Koffi et al. (2020) and Suhag et al. (2017), who found that organizational innovation had a favorable effect on performance, are at odds with this finding.

6. Conclusions and Recommendation

According to the study's findings, marketing innovation has a positive impact on telecom companies' performance and has significantly contributed to the level of their overall financial performance, while organizational innovation, on the other hand, has had a negative impact on the telecom companies' overall performance. The study therefore draws the conclusion that telecom companies' implementation of organizational innovation, particularly as it relates to upholding positive external relations with a focus on regulatory bodies and other stakeholders, has been flawed or poorly done, which is why it has had a negative impact on their performance. Considering the aforementioned, the study suggests;

i. Telecom companies should keep looking for new and innovative ways to market and position their goods and services in order to give customers more value and set them apart from those of rival companies.

ii. That in order to minimize fines and other regulations that could endanger their business operations, telecom businesses should use better methods of managing interactions with relevant stakeholders, particularly regulatory authorities.
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