

INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURIAL SUCCESS: THE CASE OF LAGOS STATE SELECTED SMALL & MEDIUM ENTERPRISES SMEs

¹OLAYEMI, Olufemi Olabode (PhD),

²OSOBUN, Olufemi Ebenezer, & ³EZEBUIRO Kelechukwu

^{1, 2 & 3}Department of Business Administration

Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Lagos, Akoka-Yaba, Lagos State.

Corresponding email: oolayemi@unilag.edu.ng.

Abstract

This study examines innovation and entrepreneurial success with special reference to selected SMEs in Lagos State. The rationale for the study is to investigate how various types of innovations (product, process, marketing and administrative innovation respectively) influence entrepreneurial success. To this effect, this study adopts a descriptive research design which allows for the usage of questionnaire to collect information from 200 respondents which are purposively selected. Data obtained are analyzed via correlation and multiple regression analysis. Result from the study shows that, product, process and marketing innovation respectively, significantly influenced the entrepreneurial success of the selected firms. Conversely, administrative innovation did not enhance entrepreneurial success. In view of this outcome, this study recommends that, SMEs managers to establish a formidable firm structure and human resource management so as to overcome the menace of lack of administrative innovation. More so, SMEs owners and managers must be abreast of changes in technological trends while adopting modern techniques to enhance every aspect of innovation activities. To this effect, this study suggested that, futuristic studies can examine other forms of innovation like business model innovation to further establish the relationship between innovation and entrepreneurial success.

Keywords: Innovation. Process Innovation, Product Innovation Entrepreneurial Success, SMEs

1 Introduction

Innovation is often regarded as the engine room of entrepreneurial activities. Without constant innovation, many firms will become obsolete in the face of a highly competitive and dynamic business environment. To this effect, what differentiates successful entrepreneurs from others is their ability to come up with new ideas and convert them to productive ventures. Meanwhile, most innovative

moves carried out by entrepreneurs are often catalyzed by technological advancement (AIContentfy team, 2024). To this effect, Hisrich and Kearney (2014) states that technological advancement and immense global competition has created an urgent need for SMEs and other large corporations to become more innovative so as to enhance firm growth. More so, other notable global changes such as: unclear market boundaries, reduction in product life cycle time, high level of change in consumer taste and

preference, wide range of choices and demand by consumers, just to mention a few, are also part of the contributing factors to the need for innovation amongst SMEs (Hisrich & Kearney, 2014).

Based on this development, there is a wide range of opportunities attributed to global changes especially in form of technological advancement and this include: invention of new products, existing product development, quick respond to market demand, accurate forecast of futuristic market changes, etc.. Therefore, this development necessitated that, there is need firms to be more adaptable to environmental changes while maximizing various emerging opportunities at their disposal. In brevity, innovation is essential for firm survival and performance in the face of the sinusoidal global changes (Lumpkin & Dess, 2010).

Furthermore, despite the importance of innovation to the development and performance of SMEs in a developing country like Nigeria there is still lack of adequate future projections regarding technological advancement in the country. The Government has not paid adequate attention to job creation and innovation. There is still lingering capacity underutilization, acute unemployment and insecurity nationwide. There is lack of implementation strategies for funding and commercialization of innovative ideas and information dearth on the availability of local research and innovative capabilities in our universities and research institutes. Trainings are inadequate especially on equipment, operations and maintenance.

Furthermore, WATHI, (2022), gave a vivid description of the Nigerian entrepreneurs.

Most entrepreneurs operating businesses in Nigeria operates at Micro scale level, employing at most 9 employees. Meanwhile, most of these businesses (possess innovative and disruptive business model) are within 0-10 years of their establishment and they are owned by young people. Similarly, the Nigerian business Startup owned mostly by entrepreneurs are fast gaining prominence in the global scene as result of creation of business opportunities and the significant growth of businesses in the technology space.

Conversely, the success of these entrepreneurs is often limited by several factors which often impede their productivity and expansion. These factors include: infrastructure deficit, inconsistent policy and regulations, lack of technological inclined employees, access to capital, erratic power supply, volatile, complex and ambiguous business environment, just to mention a few (WATHI, 2021). Supporting this view, Ibidunni, Kolawole, Aanuoluwa, Olokundun, and Ogberi (2020), argue that most SMEs owners (entrepreneurs) in Nigeria are not too much involved or consistent in innovating compared with their counterpart in other part of the globe as a result lack of funds. Meanwhile, this predicament is traceable to the fact, that most SMEs lack the required human capital and machines to invest in such form of innovation and even when they invest in such innovation, they might not be able to have return on investment. Similarly, other SMEs lack proper firm structures that can promote their success in administrative innovation (Rosli and Sidek, 2013).

Based foregoing discussion, it can be infer that, SMEs owners (entrepreneurs) will only survive and perform successfully if only if they are innovative because innovation plays a crucial role in entrepreneurship success. To this effect, this study seeks to examine the effect of innovation on entrepreneurial success with special reference to SMEs situated in Lagos State.

Literature Review

Conceptual Framework

2.1 The Concept of Innovation

Innovation involves new approaches, techniques and inventions in the various strata of management (Wahyu, Hana, Troena, Nimran & Rahayu 2013). Similarly, it also involves the transformation of ideas into a tangible or intangible products or services which are capable of meeting consumers' needs. Further still, Lumpkin and Dess (2010) posit that innovation starts from the application of novel ideas in the extraction of substantial values from available or useful resources at one's disposal. In essence, innovation is basically the conversion of idea to useful products. There are various types of innovations, but the few only four of them that are related to entrepreneurship success is examined in the course of this study and these include: process, product, marketing and organizational/ administrative innovation respectively (Tavassoli & Karlsson, 2016).

2.2 The Concept of Entrepreneurial Success

Ojo, Petrescu, and Bilican, (2017), describe entrepreneurial success as the life blood of businesses in most part of the world. This

view is buttressed by the fact that entrepreneurs are saddled with the responsibility of creating new: products, processes, production methods, market, respectively (Schumpeter, 1949). By extension, entrepreneurial successes in existing literatures have been attributed to entrepreneurs' ability to identify opportunities, personality features, creativity, and social network, just to mention a few (Ardichvili, Cardozo, & Sourav, 2003). In addition to this, innovation and entrepreneurship happened to be a core part of most organization's strategy (Lumpkin & Dess, 2010). In view of this fact, Andrew (2018), measures entrepreneurial success in terms of: customer satisfaction, market expansion, employee satisfaction, company growth and market position. However, the extent to which entrepreneurial success is being linked with innovation (product, process, marketing and administrative innovation respectively), has not been excessively dealt with especially in small and medium enterprises.

2.3.1 Innovation and Entrepreneurial Success

Small and medium Enterprises (SMEs) are vital instrument of promoting economic growth and development in the world economies. Buttressing this view, Joseph et al (2023), posit that SMEs are also known to contribute towards innovation which often spurs economic growth and development of a nation. In view of this development, SMEDAN, (2017), proposes that SMEs often boost technology and entrepreneurship capability of certain segment of the economy. This development is what makes

SMEs the contributor of 85% of the total job creation and 49% contribution to the Nigerian GDP.

Meanwhile, in spite of the dynamic and highly competitive business environment, the ability of firm to innovate consistently remains the hallmark of business success. More so, knowledge is also a good foundation for innovation and sustainable wealth. In view of this fact, more professional are now active players in promoting innovation and this is a result of the fact that they are now acting as entrepreneurs (Keursten, 2007).

However, innovation involves implementation of effective solutions geared towards meeting the anticipated need of individuals or markets by providing quality products and services that are readily available to the markets (Frankelius, 2009). On the other hand, entrepreneurial success is an exceptional business quality required for making profit in business which is mostly contingent on special abilities (such as ; commitment to task, competence, stress management, etc) of the entrepreneur (Gupta and Mirchandani, 2018). However, by way of operationalization, this study measures entrepreneurial success as: company growth, competitive edge, market position and customer satisfaction.

2.3.2 Product innovation

Product innovation by way of description takes various forms: introduction of new products, product adjustment or product modification which might include the addition or removal of certain features (Hakannson, 2015; Chen, 2017).

Meanwhile, whatever form product innovation takes, the essence of conducting a product innovation task is to; create awareness, increase the utilization of a particular existing product, increase sales and improve firm's profitability (Mahmutaj, 2014; Sussanto (2017). Furthermore, Joe and Montgomery (2003), opine that product innovation serves as leverage for firms that engage frequently in it because it makes them market leaders and helps them to sustain competitive edge above other competing firms in the industry where they are situated.

However, despite several merits attributed to firm engaging in product innovation, most SMEs are reluctant in carrying out this function. This act is attributed to the fact that, investing in product innovation requires a large sum of capital which they might not be able to recoup within the period of investment (Garcia and Calantone , 2002; Sussanto, 2017). Against this backdrop, some researchers (Chen, 2017; Hussein and Hassan, 2017; and Sussanto, 2017), established a positive relationship exist between product innovation and SMEs performance. Others researchers, (Forooz, et al., 2013; Muparangi and Makudza, 2020; Majekodunmi and Oginni, 2022) affirmed the fact that product innovation influences customer satisfaction and loyalty, strengthens market positioning of products, and enhances firm competitive advantage which ultimately leads to entrepreneurial success . To this effect, this study hypothesized that:

H₁: There is no significant relationship between product innovation and entrepreneurial success

.

2.3.3 Process Innovation

Process innovation speaks volume about new approach to service delivery or new technique by which firm manufactures its products (Rosli & Sidek, 2013; Sussanto, 2017). By extension, process innovation is advantageous to firms that engage in it because of its role in reducing cost of production, enhancing customer satisfaction, improving decision making, just to mention a few (Godswill, 2015). Just like product innovation, it is almost difficult for most SMEs to engage in frequent process innovation owing to the fact that process innovation requires large investment in human capital and machines (Rosli and Sidek, 2013). This lapse makes it difficult for SMEs to jettison traditional technique used for process innovation for the modern ones and this often result into a decline in performance (Thompson et al., 2010).

However, Ar and Baki (2011), and Demeter, Losonci and kereszly, (2021) opine that process innovation significantly influence business performance. Meanwhile, there is a dearth of literatures that are linking process innovation to entrepreneurial success especially in developing countries like Nigeria. To this effect, the study put forward the second hypothesis.

H₂: There is no significant relationship between process innovation and entrepreneurial success

.

2.3.4 Marketing Innovation

Marketing innovation involves marketing strategies that are capable of giving a firm competitive edge in a highly competitive market (Muparangi and Makudza, 2020). The resultant effect of a good marketing innovation revolve round the 4p's of marketing and this include: exclusive product design, well-crafted pricing and promotional strategies coupled with a superb packaging (Hussein and Hassan, 2017). Highlighting the importance of marketing innovation, Sussanto (2017) stated that firm that often engage in marketing innovation have a greater tendency of meeting customers need and producing a high level of brand loyalty which would eventually lead to enhanced performance and sustainable competitive edge Sussanto (2017). Based on the foregoing discussion, it implies that firm survival and performance is contingent on its ability to engage in marketing innovation. Meanwhile, Dzogbenuku & Keelson, (2019) show that marketing innovation leads to entrepreneurial success. More so, other researchers (Bergek et al. 2008; Hussein and Hassan, 2017; Sussanto, 2017), also affirm the fact that marketing innovation result into SMEs business success.

Meanwhile, Dzogbenuku and Keelson, (2019), conclude that application of innovative marketing principles result into an outstanding entrepreneurial success. Supportively, the array of researchers (Bergek, Jacobsson, Carlsson, Lindmark and Rickne, 2008; Hussein & Hassan, 2017; Sussanto, 2017; Muparangi and Makudza, 2020), equally assert that a positive relationship exist between marketing

innovation and SMEs business success. Based on the foregoing discussion this study hypothesized that:

H₃: There is no significant relationship between market innovation and entrepreneurial success

2.4.5 Administrative Innovation

Administrative innovation is also referred to as organizational innovation. Just the way the name implies administrative innovation' is the new approach by which an organization is being managed (Muparangi and Makudza, 2020). This form of innovation consist of new changes in an organization and this include: human resource development and management, creation of new business practice, creation of rapid respond mechanism that can respond to various forms of environmental changes, etc (Gnyawali & Park, 2011; Godswill et al., 2017).

Relating on the various advantages of administrative innovation, Mahmutaj (2014), proposes that administrative innovation is capable of reducing cost attributed to management of a firm while Godswill et al., (2017), state that administrative innovation promotes human resource efficiency which often result into an efficient service delivery. Furthermore, Stokes (2011), opine that administrative innovation can lead to entrepreneurial success by improving their sales performance and business stability. Conversely, Rosli and Sidek, (2013), opine that most SMEs lack proper firm structure that can propel administrative innovation. In view of this fact, Rosli and Sidek, conclude

that SMEs pay less attention to administrative innovation and this negative affect their performance. Based on this scenario, the study puts forward the fourth hypothesis:

H₄: There is no significant relationship between administrative innovation and entrepreneurial success

2.4 Empirical Literature

Juliana, Hui, Clement, Solomon, and Elvis (2021), examine the influence of creativity and innovation on Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria. The study uses a survey design to elicit information from 257 respondents. Findings from the study show that, technological advancement spurs innovation and creativity in most of the investigated firms but does not guarantee entrepreneurial development. Similarly, Ojo, Petrescu and Bilican (2017), investigate innovation and entrepreneurial success with special reference to developing country like Nigeria. The study made use a structured questionnaire to sample one hundred and sixty respondents. Result from the study shows that, a positive association was established between innovation and entrepreneurship success. The study concluded that, the extent or the level of innovativeness of individual entrepreneur will determine the height of entrepreneurship success.

In addition to this, Dabic and Potocan (2012) examine innovation and entrepreneurship with special reference to firms in Europe. The study shows that global competition had spur many firms in the European region to invest more in research and development as well as

technology. Meanwhile, the study logical conclusion was that, firm performance is contingent on their ability to build business network that will further enhance innovation culture among entrepreneurs. On the other hand, Olugbor (2015) examine the impact of innovation on firm performance with special reference to SMEs in Nigeria. Adopting a survey design method, Olugbor uses a structured survey to collect information from two hundred respondents that were selected from twenty SMEs that were situated at the Ibadan metropolis of Nigeria. The study reveals that, both marketing and technological innovation significantly influenced the performance of the selected SMEs. Conversely, administrative innovation did not improve the performance of the selected firms.

On a final note, Joseph et al., (2023) examine the effect of Innovation on Entrepreneurial Success of Manufacturing SMEs in North-Central Nigeria. The study adopts a cross-sectional research design, while the population consists of 393 Manufacturing SMEs business owners/managers that are operating within the six (6) state capitals of North Central Nigeria. To this effect, census sampling procedure was used to select the participants while a closed ended questionnaire is *use to collect information from the respondents*. The study concludes that, product, process, marketing and management innovations respectively, improved the entrepreneurial success of the investigated firms.

2.5 Research Conceptual Framework




Fig 1. Source: Researchers (2023)

The model above which was designed by the researchers captures the different variables of innovation namely: process, product, market and administrative innovations respectively and their relationships with entrepreneurial success.

Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The approach adopted in the execution of the study was a survey research design. This design allows for the usage of survey as the main means of gathering data. Therefore, some of the reasons for adopting this research design is that, survey research design allows researchers use surveys as a tool to better understand individual or group

perspectives on a specific concept or topic of interest. Furthermore, surveys are easy to administer, cost effective, provide room for collection of broad range of data and it is capable of gathering data from a large number of respondents (Creswell, 2008).

3.2 Population of the Study and Sample size

The population for this research work comprises of the entire registered SMEs based in Lagos which currently is approximately 12,000 (SMEDAN, 2022). Meanwhile, in the determination of the sample size, applying Yammne (1967) formula:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

To this effect, the expected population size is 387 but this study is only able to capture 200 respondents which represent approximately 52% usable responses. Meanwhile, a multi stage sampling technique (random and purposive sampling technique) is used to select the 200 respondents. Firstly, a random sampling technique was used to select the targeted firms, while the purposive sampling technique is used to select the respondents which are majorly owners and managers of small businesses. The rationale for this is that, the selected respondents will be able to respond to the questions stated in the survey by the virtue of their positions.

3.3 Data collection and research instrument

The primary data for the study is collected from the field survey while the relevant journal articles and bulletin constitute the major part of the secondary source of data collection for this study. However, a structured questionnaire is used for eliciting information from the respondents was divided into five sections (A- E). Section A. measures the demographic attributes of the respondents while section B measures process innovation. In the same vein, section C measures product innovation and section D measures marketing innovation. The final

part of the survey focuses on administrative innovation

3.4 Reliability and validity

In order to determine the reliability of the of the research instrument a Cronbach alpha test is carried out. Individual construct in the survey produces α value: product (0.712), process (0.912), marketing (0.832) and marketing (0.718). All the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the investigated variables in the course of this study is above 0.70 as stipulated Nunnally and Bernstein (1974). Meanwhile, the questionnaire is subjected to scrutiny by allowing expert in the field of innovation to securitize the survey so as to establish face validity of the research instrument

3.6 Data analysis

The study uses multiple regression analysis to confirm the extent of the relationship between innovation and entrepreneurship success. This tool aid in determining the specific contribution of each of the independent variables towards explaining the variations in the dependent variable (entrepreneurship success).. By extension, the earlier stated hypotheses are validated through the multiple regression statistical tool. However, all data analysis is performed using IBM Statistics SPSS (25.0).

Results and Discussion

Table 4.1. Pearson correlation coefficient

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
PI	1				
PRI	0.321	1			
MI	0.482	0.582**	1		
AI	0.11	0.305	0.124	1	
ES	0.643*	0.501*	0.483*	0.174	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) Product Innovation (PI), Process innovation (PRI), Marketing Innovation (MI), Administrative Innovation (AI), Entrepreneurial Success (ES).

Table 4.1 (Pearson correlation coefficient) shows that there is a mild positive relationship between product innovation ($r=0.643$) process innovation ($r = 0.501$) and entrepreneurial success. Conversely, marketing innovation ($r=0.483$) had a low

but significant relationship with entrepreneurial success. Finally, administrative innovation ($r= 0.174$) has a low and statistically insignificant relationship with entrepreneurial success. The implication of this outcome is that, most of the investigated predictors are capable of enhancing entrepreneurial success.

Table 4.2 Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Standard Error of estimate
1	0.702	0.492	0.481	1.6582

Source: Research Output (2023)

Table 4.2 (model summary) provides the key statistical indicators to assess the goodness of fit and the reliability of the regression model. The R value (coefficient of correlation) 0.702 shows that there is strong positive relationship between the investigated variables. Similarly, the R^2 (coefficient of determination) value 0.492 (49.2%) shows that approximately 50% of the variances/ changes in Entrepreneurial

Success can be explained by independent variable (Innovation). More so, the adjusted R^2 this adjusts for predictors that are insignificant in the regression model. Since the adjusted R^2 (0.481) value is greater 0 and a closely related to the R^2 value, it implies that the model has predictive value. Finally, the standard error estimate measures the average deviations of the errors of the regression model. Standard error estimate

value of 1.65 on average, entrepreneurial success is 1.65 points away from the

regression model based on the investigated independent variables.

Table 4.3 ANOVA

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	925.652	1	925.652	204.7	0.001
	Residual	896.480	198	4.527		
	Total	1822.132	199			

- a. Dependent: Entrepreneurship Success
- b. Predictors (constant)

Table 4.3 (ANOVA) which is a measure of variability in the dependent variable, therefore, comparing the ratio of the residual to the total sum of squares ($896.48/1822.132 = 0.492$), it implies that almost 50% of the

variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the regression model. More so, the significant value indicate that the model is significant at 95% confidence interval since the p-value ($0.001 < (0.005)$ level of significance

Table 4.4 Coefficient

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.652	.608		6.006	.000
	Product (PI)	.652	.195	.643	3.343	.000
	Process (PRI)	.521	.182	.501	2.864	.003
	Marketing (MI)	.495	.0261	.483	1.761	.001
	Administrative(AI)	.182	.082	.174	2.219	.053

Dependent variable: Entrepreneurship Success (ES).

Table 4.4 (coefficients) indicate the specific contribution of each of the independent variable to explaining the variances in the dependent variable. To this effect, a regression equation can be fitted

from the table as: $ES = 0.362 + (0.652) PI + (0.521) PRI + (0.495) MI + (0.182) AI$

The implication of the above model is that, irrespective of whether the investigated

SMEs engage in innovations mentioned in the course of this study or not, entrepreneurial success will improve by a factor of 0.362. Similarly, for every unit change in product innovation, entrepreneurship success will improve by a factor of 0.652. More so a unit change in process innovation and marketing innovation will result to 0.521 and 0.495 unit change in entrepreneurial success. In conclusion, administrative innovation makes the least contribution of 0.182 towards explaining the changes in entrepreneurial success.

Hypotheses Testing (Decision rule)

Reject null hypothesis when P value < 5 % (0.05) level of significance.

According to table 4.4 the beta t and sig, values derived for Product innovation ($b=0.521$, $t=2.864$ $p=0.03 < 0.05$). To this effect, null hypothesis one (there is no significant relationship between product innovation and entrepreneurial success) is rejected because p-value $0.03 < 0.05$ level of significance. Therefore, it concludes that, a significant relationship existing between product innovation and entrepreneurial success. Similarly, the beta, t and significant values derived from table 4.4 for process innovation ($b=0.652$, $t=3.343$, $p=0.000 < 0.05$) and marketing innovation (Marketing, $b=0.495$, $t=1.761$, $p=0.01 < 0.05$) means that it rejects hypothesis two (there is no significant relationship between process innovation and entrepreneurial success) and three (there is no significant relationship between process innovation and entrepreneurial success) since the p-value of both variables are lesser than 0.5. To

this effect, we conclude that both process and marketing innovation significantly improve entrepreneurial success. However, the null hypothesis four (there is no significant relationship between administrative innovation and entrepreneurial success) is accepted (Administrative innovation; $b=0.652$, $t=2.219$, $p=0.053 > 0.05$, since P value (0.053) > (0.05) level of significance. Therefore, it concludes that administrative innovation there is no significant relationship between administrative innovation and entrepreneurial success. It implies that, administrative innovation of the investigated firms did not improve entrepreneurial success.

4.0 Discussion of Findings

The findings shows that, product innovation had a significant relationship with entrepreneurship success. To this effect, this outcome coincides with findings of Majekodunmi and Oginni, (2022) affirmed the fact that product innovation positively influenced customer satisfaction in the Nigerian service industry. Similarly, Forooz, et al, (2013), establish that fact that product innovation places a significant role in customer satisfaction and loyalty. Other researchers (Chen, 2017; Hussein and Hassan, 2017; and Sussanto, 2017) also attest to the fact that product innovation enhances SMEs performance.

Similarly, this study affirms the fact that, process innovation significantly influenced entrepreneurial success of the selected firms. Synonymous to this, other related literatures (Nölke & Vliegenthart, 2009; Cheng et al., 2010; Ar & Baki, 2011; and

Demeter, et al., 2021) affirm the fact that process innovation improved business success of SMEs. By extension, process innovation significantly result into increase in sales and reduction in operating cost which eventually improves performance (Godswill et al., 2015; Sussanto, 2017; and Muparangi and Makudza, 2020).

More so, the findings show that marketing innovation enhanced entrepreneurial success. In the same vein, Dzogbenuku and Keelson (2019) conclude that application of innovative marketing principles such as; marketing intelligence, proper customer and competitor orientation, intelligence dissemination by entrepreneurs result into an outstanding entrepreneurial success. Supportively, the array of researchers (Bergek et al., 2008; Hussein & Hassan, 2017; Sussanto, 2017), equally assert that a positive relationship exist between marketing and SMEs business success.

On a final note, in spite of the numerous benefits of administrative innovation to SMEs, which include reduction in administrative cost, business stability, increase in sales, etc (Stokes, 2011, and Mahmutaj, 2014), this paper establishes the fact administrative innovation is not significantly related to entrepreneurial success of the investigated firms. However, this findings is further corroborated by Simbarashe and Forbes (2020) who investigates innovation as a key driving factor to SMEs performance concluded that administrative does not influence SMEs performance.

5. 1 Conclusion and Recommendations

This study concludes that product, process and marketing innovation respectively,

influenced entrepreneurial success of the selected firms. However, administrative innovation of the selected did not influence entrepreneurship success. This study recommends that, for SMEs to fully reap the benefit of product innovation, they must find a way of reducing cost attributed to product innovation. Furthermore, SMEs owners and managers must be abreast of changes in technological trend while adopting modern techniques to enhance their process innovation. Synonymously, there is a need for SMEs managers to develop more product concepts that will satisfy customers need at the same time engage in brand repositioning so to improve their marketing innovation.

References

- Andrew, G., (2018). How to measure entrepreneurial success. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 9(2): 413-431.
- AIContentfy Team, (2024) The role of innovation in entrepreneurship. *AIContentfy*.<https://aicontentfy.com/en/blog/role-of-innovation-in-entrepreneurship> January 23
- Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R., & Sourav, R. (2003) A Theory of Entrepreneurial Opportunity Identification and Development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 105-123
- Ar, I.M. & Baki, B. (2011), Antecedents and performance impact of product versus process innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 14(2), 172-206.

- Bergek, A., Jacobsson, S., Carlsson, B., Lindmark, S., & Rickne, A. (2008). Analyzing the functional dynamics of technological innovation systems: A scheme of analysis. *Research policy*, 37(3), 407-429.
- Chen, S. (2017). The relationship between innovation and firm performance: A literature review. *Advances in Computer Science Research*, 82(7), 23-35
- Cheng, CF; Lai, M.K. & Wu, W.Y. (2010), Exploring the impact of innovation strategy on R&D employees' job satisfaction: A mathematical model and empirical research, *Technovation Review*, 30(7-8), 459-470
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson
- Demeter, K., Losonci, D., Keresztély, T. , Keresztély, K. and Boer, H. (2021) The Impact of Process Innovation on Business Performance. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356873842>
- Dzogbenuku, R. K. & Keelson, S. A. (2019) Marketing and entrepreneurial success in emerging markets. Available at: Emerald Insight at: www.emeraldinsight.com/2398-7812.htm
- Forooz, P., Samira, D., Farzaneh, G., Nazanin, S. & Mahboobeh, A. (2013) The Impact of Product Innovation on Customer Satisfaction and Customer Loyalty. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. 2(5), 135-140.
- Gnyawali, D. R., & Park, B. J. R. (2011). Coopetition between giants: Collaboration with competitors for technological innovation. *Research Policy*, 40(5), 650-663.
- Godswill, M., Oyebisi, T., & Willie, W. (2015). Effects of innovation on performance of manufacturing SMEs in Nigeria: An empirical study. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 7(2), 123-134
- Gupta, N. & Mirchandani, A. (2018), "Investigating entrepreneurial success factors of women owned SMEs in UAE", *Management Decision*, 56(10), 219-232.
- Hitt, M., Ireland, R., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2014) *Strategic Management: competitiveness and Globalization* (11th ed.). USA: Cengage Learning.
- Ibidunni, A. S., Kolawole, A I., Aanuoluwa, I , Olokundun, M.A. & Ogberi, M. E. (2020). Knowledge transfer and innovation performance of small and medium enterprises (SMEs): An informal economy analysis. *Elsevier Journal*, 4,1-9.
- Joseph T. T., Umogbai, M.E ., Kwahar, N. & Adudu C. A. (2023) Effect of Innovation on Entrepreneurial Success of Manufacturing Small and Medium Firms in North-Central Nigeria. *International*

- Academy *Journal of Management, Marketing and Entrepreneurial Studies*, 10(1), 84-103 DOI: 2721425663711016
- Juliana, N. O., Hui, H. J., Clement, M., Solomon, E. N., & Elvis, O. K. (2021). The Impact of Creativity and Innovation on Entrepreneurship Development: Evidence from Nigeria. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 9, 1743-177
- Li, Y. & Ahlstrom, D. (2018), "Risk-taking in entrepreneurial decision-making: a dynamic model of venture decision", *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 10-15, 1-35.
- Majekodunm, B. O. & Oginni, S. A. (2022) Effect of product innovation on customer satisfaction: An overview of insight into Nigerian service market. Available at: www.napublisher.org
- Mahmutaj, L. (2014). The impact of innovation in SME's performance. *International Scientific Journal (special edition) Economics*, 10(12): 115-497.
- Muparangi, S., & Makudza, F. (2020). Innovation: The driving force for entrepreneurial performance among small informal businesses. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, 2(2)
- Hakansson, H. (2015). *Industrial Technological Development (Routledge Revivals): A Network Approach*. Routledge.
- Hussein, A., & Hassan, A. (2017). The impact of innovation on small and medium enterprises performance: Empirical evidence from Hargeisa, Somaliland. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(8): 22-69.
- Nölke, A., Vliegthart, A. (2009): Enlarging the varieties of capitalism: The emergence of dependent market economies in East Central Europe. *World Politics*, 61(4), 670-702
- Setiawan, H. & Erdogan, B. (2018), "Key factors for successful corporate entrepreneurship: a study of Indonesian contractors", *International Journal of Construction Management*, 4(2) 1-17.
- Schumpeter, J.A (1949). The theory of economic development. Cambridge. Harvard University Press
- Stokes, D. E. (2011). *Pasteur's quadrant: Basic science and technological innovation*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Sussanto, A. (2017). Improve performance of SMEs through innovation strategies in developing countries. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 6(10): 77-86.
- Tavassoli, S. & Karlsson, C. (2016) Innovation strategies and firm performance. Simple or complex strategies? *Economics of*

- Innovation and New Technology*, 25(7), 631-630.
- Thompson, F. E., Subar, A. F., Loria, C. M., Reedy, J. L., & Baranowski, T. (2010). Need for technological innovation in dietary assessment. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 110(1), 48-51.
- WATHI. (2022, October 28). *State of entrepreneurship in Nigeria*, The Fate Foundation, November 2021.
- WATHI.<https://www.wathi.org/state-of-entrepreneurship-in-nigeria-the-fate-foundation-november-2021/>