2019

# Strategies for New Product Development in an Emerging Market

Uloaku Kelechi Azigbo
*Walden University*

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Uloaku Azigbo

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Jill Murray, Committee Chairperson, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Carol-Anne Faint, Committee Member, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Kim Critchlow, University Reviewer, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2019

Abstract

Strategies for New Product Development in an Emerging Market

by

Uloaku Azigbo

MBA, Heriot-Watt University, 2014

BA, University of Portharcourt, 1992

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

April 2019

Abstract

Some organizational leaders in emerging markets lack strategies for successful development of new products. By 2025, emerging markets will account for 50% of global consumption and represent significant opportunities for organizational leaders to steer their organizations toward market dominance. The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore the strategies that organizational leaders used to successfully develop new products. The target population comprised leaders of 3 organizations in Nigeria who have successfully developed new products. The conceptual framework for this study was the disruptive innovation theory. Data were gathered from semistructured interviews with the organizational leaders and review of company documents. Data analysis involved the compilation of data, coding to organize the data, identification of themes that emerged, and linking those themes with the research. Triangulation and member checking were used to help ensure the trustworthiness of interpretations. Four themes emerged from data analyses relating to strategies used by organizational leaders to successfuly develop new products: leadership and business models, organizational structure and culture, target population and market needs, and affordability. The implications of this study for positive social change include the potential to improve the standard of living in Nigerian communities, which might enhance the participation of the rural people and local businesses in the global economy. Furthermore, the findings of the study may provide knowledge for organizations to become more profitable in emerging markets.

Strategies for New Product Development in an Emerging Market

by

Uloaku Azigbo

MBA, Heriot-Watt University, 2014

BA, University of Portharcourt, 1992

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

April 2019

## Dedication

This doctoral study is dedicated to the Almighty God, who gave me the grace for completion. I also appreciate my husband, my children and my mom for their support and willingness to help out with more than their fair share of house chores. My prayer is that my children will be inspired by my doctoral journey and seek to be the best in whatever they do.

Acknowledgments

I extend my appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Carol Faint and Dr. Ronald Jones, for working with me to ensure that this study met the academic requirements of the university. My heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Jill Murray for accepting to be my committee chair and mentor. Throughout this process, Dr. Murray was available for direction, support, and words of reassurance. It has been an honor and privilege to work with you all during this journey. Finally, I offer thanks to my dear sister and friend, Dr. Oge, who did a good job as my accountability “buddy” throughout this journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

# Section 1: Foundation of the Study

In emerging economies, organizational leaders struggle with high failure rates of new product development projects (Heirati & O'Cass, 2016). High failure rates of new product development projects negatively affect organizational profitability (Hang, Garnsey, & Ruan, 2015). Opportunities for profitability exist for organizational leaders who possess the right strategies to explore the potentials in emerging markets (Agnihotri, 2016). Through this qualitative case study, I explored the strategies to successfully develop new products by interviewing organizational leaders and analyzing company documents.

## Background of the Problem

An organization's ability to develop new products is critical to survival and success (Shahin, Barati, & Geramian, 2017). New product development is especially important for organizational success in emerging markets (Ernst, Kahle, Dubiel, Prabhu, & Subramaniam, 2015). However, 35% of new product developments fail globally (Webb, 2016). Given the high failure rates of new product development projects, organizational leaders are reluctant to invest the time and financial resources necessary for new product development, critical for success in emerging economies (Story, Boso, & Cadogan, 2015). Only 17% of the total revenues of leading organizations are derived from emerging markets despite the huge untapped opportunities that exist for expansion and growth away from the highly saturated markets in advanced economies (Ernst et al., 2015). Emerging market economies will constitute $30 trillion of global consumption by 2025, representing approximately half of total global consumption, and 36% of the global gross domestic product (Ernst et al., 2015). Existing research on new product development is in developed countries and may not be applicable to emerging markets due to the fundamental differences in conditions. A research focused on new product development in emerging markets has enormous implications for organizational growth and success.

## Problem Statement

Organizational leaders struggle with new product development, which is a necessary component of firms that successfully benefit from emerging market opportunities (Ernst et al., 2015). A significant problem for organizations is that 50% of new product development projects fail in emerging markets (Heirati & O'Cass, 2016). The general business problem is that the lack of new product development in emerging markets compromises successful participation by organizational leaders in the global economy. The specific business problem is that some organizational leaders lack the strategies to successfully develop new products.

## Purpose Statement

My purpose in this qualitative multiple case study was to explore strategies that organizational leaders use to successfully develop new products. The population for the study was organizational leaders in three organizations in Nigeria who have successfully developed new products. The implications for positive social change include the potential to improve the standard of living within Nigerian communities, which simultaneously enhances the participation of people within underdeveloped nations in the global economy.

## Nature of the Study

I used a qualitative methodology for this study. Qualitative research methods are especially suitable when there is little, or nothing, known about the research problem or the important variables to identify and explore (Park & Park, 2016). Using the qualitative methodology enables a researcher to use open-ended questions in an inductive process to obtain information regarding the research problem (Patton, 2015). A quantitative method is used when the intent of the researcher is to hypothesize the relationships or differences among preidentified variables using statistical data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013; Marshall & Rossman, 2014). The quantitative approach was inappropriate for my study because I did not identify relationships or differences among variables using statistical data. A mixed methodology involves combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in a single study and integrating results from both methods to achieve better results (Morse & Cheek, 2014). A mixed method was not suitable for my research because I did not use any statistical data analysis to test hypotheses about variables' relationships or differences.

I used a multiple case study design for this study. Case study designs are a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores one or more programs in organizations in depth by identifying key events or processes (Yin, 2014). Case studies are especially appropriate when there is a need to provide an in-depth, multilayered understanding of complex social and contemporary events through a variety of evidence, which can include interviews and direct observations of participants (Tsang, 2014). Using a multiple case study design, a researcher is able to make comparisons across settings

(Patton, 2015). I chose a multiple-case study design for this study because I sought to understand the complex and social phenomenon of the actions and views of organizational leaders who successfully developed new products for emerging markets. Other designs used for qualitative studies include (a) ethnographic design, (b) phenomenological design, (c) narrative design, and (d) grounded theories (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013). Ethnography is most useful for researches on culture (Kruth, 2015). An ethnographic design was not appropriate for my study as my focus was on strategies used to successfully develop new products and not on the culture of the participants. A phenomenological design is suitable when the researcher wishes to understand what, if anything, participants have in common as they experience a phenomenon (Berterö, 2015). My goal in this study was not to describe the experiences of the participants but to have an in-depth understanding of the strategies that organizational leaders use in emerging markets, so a phenomenological study was not appropriate. A researcher using the narrative design obtains and summarizes the life stories and experiences of one or more individuals (Denison, 2016). The narrative design involves the retelling of life stories and therefore not useful in the exploration of business strategies. A grounded theory design is used by researchers seeking to build or test a theory (Yin, 2014). Because my goal was not to build or test a theory, I did not use the grounded theory design for my study.

## Research Question

The overarching research question for the study was: What strategies do organizational leaders use to successfully develop new products?

## Interview Questions

1. What are your strategies for developing new products in an emerging market?
2. How do you assess the effectiveness of the strategies for developing new products in your organization?
3. What particular strategy do you consider most crucial for the successful development of new products?
4. Why do you consider the strategy as the most crucial for the successful development of new products?
5. What were the key barriers to implementing your strategies for new product development?
6. How did you address the key barriers to implementing your strategies for new product development?
7. What additional information would you like to share regarding the successful development of new products?

## Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study was Christensen's (1997) disruptive innovation theory (DIT), which refers to the creation of new products, services, or markets that are capable of displacing existing products, services, or markets. Disruptive innovations result in products that are less complex and offer more convenience, at a low cost (Gobble, 2016). With disruptive innovation, smaller firms are able to disrupt entire industries by developing new products and services that, initially, are not attractive to existing markets but valuable in serving emerging markets and an unserved customer base (Reinhardt & Gurtner, 2011). The alternative to displacement for big corporations is the development of new business models to cope with disruptive innovations that are capable of upsetting the balance of power in international trade (Meseko, 2014). According to Christensen (2011), organizational leaders should focus on searching for expansion opportunities through partnerships, and the creation of new business models. Disruptive innovation, if not accepted and acted upon, poses a substantial risk to the survival of organizations (Corsi & Di Minin, 2014). It is important for organizational leaders in emerging markets to develop strategies to increase the success rate of new product development projects. Understanding the conceptual framework of the DIT and the correlation to improved financial performance could be crucial to enhancing the organizational leader's ability to develop the best strategies.

## Operational Definitions

*Disruptive innovation*: A disruptive innovation is an innovation that helps create a new market and value network and eventually goes on to disrupt an existing market and value network, displacing an earlier technology (Hynes & Elwell, 2016).

*Emerging markets*: Emerging markets are characterized by institutional voids, the relative importance of informal compared to formal institutions, institutional pressures by local governments, as well as institutional change and transitions (Rottig, 2016).

*Frugal innovation*: Frugal innovation is the ability to create solutions, which are simple and effective without a big budget for research and development (Radjou & Euchner, 2016)

*New product development*: New product development is the task of collecting knowledge, combining the knowledge collected, and making it work with the objective of creating new things in a similar way to the approach followed by a scientific research team and is a source of innovation in an organization (Vila & Albiñana, 2016).

## Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

### Assumptions

I made three assumptions that shaped this study. Assumptions are principles accepted as being true based on logic or reasoning, which may not be verifiable or proven (Yin, 2014). For coherence and transparency in qualitative research, the researcher should state clearly her or his assumptions (Rios, 2017). First, I assumed that the results of this study will be valuable to business leaders, seeking to develop new products in emerging markets successfully. Second, I assumed that the participants chosen for the study made the decisions about new product development in their respective organizations and therefore had sufficient knowledge to adequately describe and assess the strategies they used for new product development. Third, I assumed that the participants were truthful when responding.

### Limitations

There are two limitations to this study. Yin (2014) described the limitations of a study as elements of research perceived as weaknesses or problematic in relation to the study. The first limitation of the study is that some business leaders may not want to share their strategies for new product development. The second limitation is that a case study of only three business leaders from three organizations could affect the transferability of the results. To mitigate these limitations, I selected as participants, business leaders who were willing to discuss their strategies for new product development. I assured the participants of absolute confidentiality in my handling and reporting of data collected. Through the use of open-ended questions, I allowed each participant to fully express their experiences, using their own words and construction. I continued to interview until I reached saturation to ensure I captured ample evidence to support my findings. Finally, I gave a rich description of the phenomenon under investigation so that readers can draw their conclusions and compare the results of the study with other organizational situations or cases.

### Delimitations

Delimitations are boundaries put in place by the researcher to narrow the scope of a study (Yin, 2014). This study had three delimitations: The study location, the sample size, and the type of interview structure used. The study location is Lagos, Nigeria. Data collection from a larger region would have enhanced the transferability of results. I interviewed only the business leaders of the three organizations selected for the study. Interviewing the marketing managers and heads of research and development in the organizations would have enhanced the quality of data collected. I also used only open-ended interview questions to elicit uninhibited responses that was not possible with structured interviews.

## Significance of the Study

It is the responsibility of organizational leaders to make profits for their investors while simultaneously delivering value to other stakeholders (Mishra & Nigam, 2015).

Organizational leaders can turn to emerging markets with innovative products to improve financial performance outcomes for their firms and meet the needs of a largely underserved market (Ernst et al., 2015). The results of the study could advance existing knowledge of the strategies for new product development, thereby providing needed guidance for organizational leaders who are increasingly aware of the new customer bases in emerging markets.

## Contribution to Business Practice

This study's findings may be significant to business practice by potentially providing organizational leaders with strategies for the successful development of new products in the Nigerian market. Such strategies can assist organizational leaders to avoid losses associated with failed new product development projects and benefit from the significant untapped opportunities that exist for expansion and growth away from the highly saturated markets in advanced economies.

## Implications for Social Change

The implications for positive social change include the potential to improve the standard of living within Nigerian communities through the development of new products, which help address the unmet basic needs of a largely poor population. Successful organizations are motivated to form new business relationships to sustain their operations in their host environment, thereby enhancing the economic participation of people in underdeveloped nations who are typically excluded from the benefits of a growing global economy.

## A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature

My purpose for undertaking this study was to explore the strategies that organizational leaders use to successfully develop new products. To gain a deeper understanding of the decision-making process of organizational leaders who have successfully developed new products in Nigeria, I reviewed 132 articles that I found using Google Scholar and the databases available through the Walden University Library. Among the articles I used for this study, 95% were peer reviewed, and 85% were published within 5 years of expected chief academic officer approval. A total of 93 peer-reviewed sources appear in the academic literature review. I started the literature review by discussing Christensen's (1997) DIT, which formed the conceptual framework of my study. I arranged subsequent portions of the literature review in a topical order as follows: (a) other theories of innovation, (b) new product development in emerging markets, (c) opportunities in emerging markets: BRICS and Nigeria, (d) role of firm's business models on new product development, and (e) the importance of partnerships and alliances for firms' new product development projects.

### The Disruptive Innovation Theory

The conceptual framework for this study was Christensen's (1997) DIT, which refers to the creation of new products, services, or markets that are capable of displacing existing products, services, or markets. Disruptive innovations result in products that are less complex and offer more convenience, at a low cost (Gobble, 2016). With disruptive innovation, smaller firms can disrupt entire industries by developing new products and services that initially are not attractive to existing markets but valuable in serving emerging markets and an unserved customer base (Reinhardt & Gurtner, 2011). The alternative to displacement for big corporations is the development of new business models to cope with disruptive innovations that are capable of upsetting the balance of power in international trade (Meseko, 2014). According to Christensen (2011), organizational leaders should focus on searching for expansion opportunities through partnerships, and the creation of new business models. Disruptive innovation, if not accepted or acted upon, poses a substantial risk to the survival of organizations (Corsi & Di Minin, 2014).

The concept of disruptive innovation continues to be a major topic of discussion especially as it relates to emerging markets. Gobble (2016) noted that the concept has evolved from an emphasis on technology to a current focus on how and to whom value is delivered to in the marketplace. Disruptive innovation according to Christensen (1997) is not so much about new technology but the business model especially when that disruption emanates from the low end of the market and results in the provision of products and services overlooked by incumbent organizations. Nagy, Schuessler, and Dubinsky (2016) opined that it is important for firms to identify a disruptive innovation before it occurs and created a three-step methodology to assist organizational leaders in this identification. First, organizational leaders must be able to identify the innovation and its characteristics regarding its functionality, technical standards, and forms of ownership. Second, the organizational leader must be able to determine where in an organization’s value chain the innovation is used or the value chain segment or segments that could use the technology. Third, organizational leaders should be able to compare the potentially disruptive innovation with technologies currently used in the organization for that value chain segment. Incumbent organizations that fail to identify or adopt a potentially disruptive innovation are at risk of failure.

*Sustaining innovation* refers to radical or incremental improvements to established products that are valued by conventional consumers in main markets (Nogami & Veloso, 2017). Product improvements can be incremental advances or breakthroughs, but they all enable firms to sell more products to their most profitable customers. Sustaining innovation involves continuous improvements, providing solutions to customers who require better performance, and is usually undertaken by incumbent organizations (King & Baatartogtokh, 2015). Incumbent organizations due to their large resources can fund research and development projects geared towards breakthrough innovations or radical innovations which are often confused with disruptive innovation in extant literature (Agarwal, Grottke, Mishra, & Brem, 2017; Christensen & Raynor, 2003). Radical innovations stem from the creation of new knowledge and the commercialization of completely new ideas or products aimed at existing customers and enable firms to sell sophisticated products with higher margins to the most profitable customer segments (Christensen, 2003). The opportunities for an incumbent organization developing radical innovations lie in its technological capabilities and the core competence of its human resources rather than the needs of the market (Zalan & Toufaily, 2017).

Disruptive innovation is not due to technological breakthroughs but often involves the provision of less sophisticated goods and services to an existing market where incremental improvements by incumbent organizations have led to complex products and services that no longer appeal to existing customers (Gobble, 2016). The disruptive innovators' focus on their business model rather than the product itself helps them target the mainstream customers successfully in the existing market ultimately eroding the incumbent organizations' market share and then their profitability (Bienenstock, 2016). In contrast, because incumbent organizational leaders focus on developing existing technologies, they do not easily capitalize on new market opportunities (Hang et al., 2015). For an innovation to be truly disruptive, it must appeal to a previously excluded market or constitute a lower-end alternative for consumers who are unable to access more sophisticated offerings (Gobble, 2016). Using the DIT in other contexts other than to describe lower cost, lower performing innovations that appeal to a low end of the market or new subset of users amounts to a misapplication of the theory (Weeks, 2015). Organizational leaders of incumbent firms often face the dilemma of whether to persist with their existing business models, which allow them to cater to their most profitable segments through sustaining innovations or pursue new opportunities in lower-end of the market or new subset of users through disruptive innovations (Christensen & Raynor, 2003).

With low-end disruptions, disruptors target customers who do not need the full performance valued by customers at the high end of the market. Low-end disruptions occur when existing products become too sophisticated and improve beyond a rate at which customers can adopt the new features (Gandhe, 2015). A disruptive innovation then enters the market and results in a product that is less sophisticated than existing products, but that exceeds the requirements of certain segments, thereby gaining a foothold in the market (Gobble, 2016). With low-end disruption, the disruptor focuses initially on serving the least profitable customer, who is satisfied with a good enough product and who is unwilling to pay a premium for the highly sophisticated products already existing in the market (Bienenstock, 2016). Once the disruptor has gained a foothold in this customer segment, the disruptor seeks to improve its profit margin. For the disruptor to obtain higher profit margins, the disruptor needs to enter the segment where the customer is willing to pay a little more for higher quality (Gandhe, 2015). The disruptor needs to innovate to ensure the quality of its product. The incumbent will not do much to retain its share in a not-so-profitable segment and will move up-market and focus on its more attractive customers, an action which ultimately drives the incumbent into smaller markets than it was previously serving (Gans, 2016). Then, finally, the disruptive innovation meets the demands of the most profitable segment and drives the incumbent out of the market (Vázquez Sampere, 2016).

New-market disruptions occur when customers target unserved segments by the established organizations in the industry. New-market disruptions typically involve new value networks with new performance measures and customers who had neither owned nor used the existing products or services (Christensen & Raynor, 2002). Incumbent organizations usually react by ignoring new-market disruptions (Gobble, 2017). Unlike low-end markets where risks are measurable, organizational leaders who are willing to experiment and forge the strategic direction needed to stimulate demand for their products and services explore latent and unexplored new markets (Hang et al., 2015).

While disruptors discover opportunities for disruptive innovations in low-end markets, they create them for new markets.

King and Baatartogtokh (2015) identified four key elements of the theory of disruptive innovation: (a) that incumbent organizations in a market are improving along a trajectory of sustaining innovation, (b) that these incumbent organizations deliver on customer needs, (c) that they possess the ability to respond to disruptive threats, and (d) that they end up struggling as a result of the disruption. Gandhe (2015) noted that organizations could achieve disruptive innovation through (a) the simplification of processes, (b) user-friendly technology, and (c) less expensive technology appealing to new or less sophisticated customer segments.

Existing customers, at first, typically consider disruptive innovations to be inferior and are unwilling to switch to the new offering merely because it is less expensive but wait until its quality rises enough to adopt the new product and happily accept its lower price (Vázquez Sampere, Bienenstock, & Zuckerman, 2016). The upset or threat to incumbent organizations becomes real as new entrants in the market begin to attract the incumbent organization's marginal customers and as the new offering improves the competition becomes intense with most incumbent organizations unable to respond swiftly or effectively (Gans, 2016). The fact that disruptive innovations take time and that incumbent organizational leaders focus mostly on their more profitable segments help to explain why they frequently overlook disrupters (Vázquez Sampere, 2016). Gans (2016), however, argued that disruptive innovations need not upset an incumbent that adopts any of these strategies: (a) attack by investing in the new disruptive technology, (b) cooperate with or acquire the market entrant, or (c) possess critical assets that entrants may lack. Incumbent organizations in a market could harness the underlying forces behind the disruption for growth in their organizations through the process of dual transformation, which entails repositioning their traditional core organization and taking advantage of the disruptive innovation by creating complementary products or services (Leavy, 2017). The integration of existing, new, and disruptive innovation could be systemically beneficial for whole industries (Durantin, Fanmuy, Miet, & Pegon, 2016).

The DIT is a weak predictive tool because disruption is not immediate but takes a long time (Tellis, 2006). However, some researchers have put forward guidelines for identifying innovations with disruptive potential. Dos Santos Paulino and Le Hir (2016) introduced the concept of potential disruption, which consists of five tenets to overcome the challenges of using DIT as a predictive tool. The tenets are (a) initial lower performance compared to the performance criteria valued by mainstream customers, (b) introduction of new performance criteria not valued by mainstream customers, (c) no attraction for existing mainstream customers when first introduced, (d) appeal to the low-end segment in the existing market or new market footholds, and (e) mainstream customers may adopt the new product when quality meets their standards. Organizational leaders can use ex post measures of disruptiveness in making ex ante predictions about the type of incumbent firms best positioned to develop disruptive innovations relative to others. Govindarajan and Kopalle (2006) suggested that incumbent organizations with customer-orientation capability and other capabilities, such as technology sensing and responding, were better positioned to develop disruptive innovations. Organizational leaders can use the DIT to identify and interpret disruptive developments and predict industry change. Anthony and Christensen (2005) described a three-part process that organizational leaders could use to predict disruptiveness. First, organizational leaders can look for signs indicative of firms poised to meet the needs of three different customer groups: overserved customers, underserved customers, and unserved customers. Second, analyze competitive battles to see which firms are likely to emerge triumphant by identifying each firm's strengths and weaknesses regarding their resources, their processes, and their values. Whereas resources are flexible, processes and values are inimitable and difficult to change and are the major determinants of innovativeness. Third, define the important strategic choices that can help determine the ultimate winners and losers. All of these measures and assessment tools for identifying potential disruptive innovations are indicative of the entrepreneurial process involved in opportunity discovery and opportunity creation. However, some incumbent organizations are still unable to respond effectively to disruptive threats. Pérez, Dos Santos Paulino, and Cambra-Fierro (2017) noted that though technology monitoring is a strong capability of incumbent organizations, their inability to keep up with market changes, and identify and respond to new customer needs makes them unable to quickly and effectively respond to disruptive threats. Disruptors displace industry leaders because incumbent organizations' organizational capabilities, resource allocation processes, and reward systems involve huge investments and sunk costs, which make it difficult to respond to new market opportunities (Christensen & Raynor, 2003).

**Managerial implications of disruptive innovation for businesses.** Nagy et al. (2016) asserted that disruptive innovation is a theory that has long affected the sustainability of businesses. Critical to the theory of disruptive innovation is that what is disruptive is not the technology, but the business model that enables the creation of value in the marketplace (Gobble, 2016). Through a focus on the business model, new entrants can introduce disruptive innovations which are capable of undermining or displacing the incumbent (Cortez, 2014). A disruptive innovator gradually gains acceptance in the market either by creating a low-end product that serves the needs of an unserved or underserved customer segment or entices clients for whom existing products or services are either too sophisticated or too expensive (Gobble, 2016).

Disruptive innovation is a suitable strategic framework that managers, entrepreneurs, and innovators can use to understand the market, identify possible opportunities and threats, and formulate a strategy (Gobble, 2015). The ability to predict disruptiveness of an innovation enables organizational leaders to avert outcomes that may be detrimental to their organizations (Nagy et al., 2016). The disadvantages of ignoring disruptive innovation include reduced market share, a decrease in status, bankruptcy, or total failure of an organization ((Durantin et al., 2016).

The DIT is a useful tool that organizational leaders can use to understand why businesses fail or succeed (Karimi & Walter, 2015). Organizational leaders use the DIT to respond appropriately to the needs of new market segments by providing products and services that are affordable, simple, and convenient (Powell, Olivier, & Yuan, 2015; Robinson, Morgan, & Reed, 2016). In time, as the performance of the new services or products undergo rapid improvement, they go beyond satisfying the requirements of the incumbent's low-end customers and attract the mainstream customers (Weeks, 2015). With disruptive innovations, organizational leaders can respond to the needs of the market with better and cheaper products without incurring additional costs for their organizations (Robinson et al., 2016). Disruptive innovations lead to lower costs of products and services without compromising value and performance (Nam, 2015).

Organizational leaders must not work with the assumption that disruptive innovations must lead to market upheavals (Nam, 2015). Leaders of incumbent organizations can avert displacement by disruptors by responding appropriately (Gans, 2016). Organizational leaders of large firms are so focused on meeting the needs of their most profitable customers that they ignore other opportunities to explore new markets (Bakhit, 2016) New entrants build a competitive advantage with a cost advantage, whereas existing companies react with time delay and more sophisticated and expensive products and services (Tomofumi & Junichi, 2015).

According to King and Baatartogtokh (2015), organizational leaders must compute the value of winning, find ways of leveraging present capabilities, and collaborate with other companies as a means of adapting to disruptive innovations. Organizational leaders can overcome the challenges posed by disruptive innovations through openness, networking, affirmation of complexity, and appropriate thoughts and actions (Friedrich, Freiling, & Matzler, 2015).The DIT as a conceptual framework on strategy has helped industry practitioners to identify the opportunities that radical change in the underlying business models can create in their respective industries (Estelami, 2017). Van Bochoven (2016) made the recommendation that organizational leaders can deal with disruptive innovations by forming new teams, developing cognitive capabilities, and taking an ecocentric view of the world. Organizational leaders can engage in the process of disruptive innovation as a survival strategy and knowledge gained from DIT can assist managers to comprehend the consequences of their strategic decision-making (Bakhit, 2016). Effective response by incumbent organizations includes the setting up of independent organizations or autonomous sub-units that develop without the cultural conflicts and resource battles that the firms potentially face (Powell et al., 2015). Setting up autonomous units is an effective way to preventing the bureaucracy at the parent organization from hindering fast and responsive decision making crucial for allocating the resources necessary for tackling disruptive innovations successfully (Powell et al., 2015). Vertakova, Rudakova, Shadrina, Kobersy, and Belova (2016) suggested that organizational leaders seeking to use disruptive innovation as a strategic tool to enter new markets must develop new value networks to stimulate demand in those markets. An innovative culture engenders knowledge exchange and expedites problem solving in organizations that span throughout the value chain (Van Bochoven, 2016).

The DIT, however, has its critics. The theory fails to explain the role of leadership and demand-side factors on disruptive innovations (Sandström, Berglund, & Magnusson, 2014). Researchers have also not been able to verify the validity and generalizability of the DIT in all managerial contexts (King & Baatartogtokh, 2015).

## Other Theories of Innovation

Researchers often compare Schumpeter’s theory of creative destruction with the DIT. Creative destruction is a process in which new technologies, new kinds of products, new methods of production and new means of distribution make old ones obsolete (Schumpter, 1934). Existing firms are challenged whether to adapt to a new environment or fail. Like the DIT, the innovation that emanates from the creative destruction serves the consumers who were underserved and later on, as the innovation progresses, the innovation disrupts the market, challenging existing companies who either quickly adapt to the new environment or fail. Christensen’s (1997) idea of market upheavals caused by disruptive innovations aligns closely with Schumpter’s thoughts on creative destruction. However, Christensen and Schumpeter differ in their idea of the role of firm size on innovation. While Schumpeter argued that large firms have an innovative advantage because of their monopolistic power, Christensen argued that new entrants have an advantage over incumbent organizations because innovation and disruption have come from entrants (Dolfsma & Velde, 2014).

Prahalad (2002) was the first to note that organizations can profitably serve markets he referred to as the base of the pyramid (BOP) through innovative products and services. Before Prahalad’s emphasis on profitability at the BOP, innovation was seen as a strong driving force behind capitalism’s entrepreneurial activities. The base of the pyramid may offer a unique opportunity for the development of disruptive technologies (Christensen et al., 2001; Hart & Christensen, 2002). Prahalad set four criteria for advancing business principles at the bottom of the pyramid: Dramatic increase in price -

performance relationship, scalability, environmental sustainability, and adapting advanced technologies for local conditions. While Prahalad strictly regarded the poor as consumers with distinctive conditions, later proponents of the BOP regard them as also producers and suppliers and partners in the co-creation of value (Agnihotri, 2012; Hart, Sharma, & Halme, 2016).

Blue ocean strategy is a theory of innovation developed by Kim and Mauborgne (2005) to introduce the idea that there are opportunities in each industry to move away from intense competition in saturated markets through the creation of new market space. Opportunities for profitability and growth exist within untapped market space for organizations through the provision of products or services that previously did not exist (Agnihotri, 2016). Competition in saturated markets is centered around low cost or product differentiation. Organizational leaders can choose to compete by either low cost or product differentiation but not on both (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005). For organizations using the blue ocean strategy, both low cost and differentiation are possible (Leavy, 2018). Using the blue ocean strategy organizations can focus on what customers within the new market space value (Agnihotri, 2016).

Kim and Mauborgne (2005) using the analogy of the vast deep oceans, differentiated between the red ocean conditions and the blue ocean conditions. In the traditional red ocean conditions, organizational leaders acknowledge the rules of competition, and the boundaries of an industry are perceived as clearly defined (Leavy, 2018). The focus in red ocean conditions is on outperforming competitors in either differentiation or low cost but not both (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005). Intense competition creates the scenario that could be likened to bloodied waters as the market space becomes increasingly competitive, diminishing the opportunities for growth and for earning high profits (Leavy, 2018). Red ocean strategies define most industries and most organizations often ending in a competition that weakens the ability of firms within an industry to make a profit (Ardian & Syairudin, 2018).

The lack of pre-established rules or boundaries for blue ocean strategizing makes it highly risky (Leavy, 2018). Despite the high risks associated with blue ocean strategies, most successful businesses and industries in the global economy are those that created a blue ocean strategy based upon innovation and creativity, establishing products and services that appealed to new customers and redefined their entire industries (Denning, 2017). Organizational leaders can achieve a blue ocean strategy by various innovative approaches ranging from radical innovation to focused differentiation (Agnihotri, 2016).

Although blue ocean strategy is similar to the DIT regarding creating new market space, the DIT extends beyond the blue ocean boundaries and competes within a red ocean context by introducing innovations that constantly improve, erode red ocean market space, eventually making current competitors irrelevant (Denning, 2017). The DIT and the blue ocean strategy enable organizational leaders to identify the importance of creating new customers by innovatively meeting the needs of those previously not using a product or service (Denning, 2017). Both theories also enable organizational leaders to understand the value of recognizing what potential customers are trying to achieve (Leavy, 2018). Organizational leaders that meet the needs of new customers assist the customers to reach their desired goals (Kim & Marborgne, 2017).

Organizational leaders shift from thinking of outputs of the organization to thinking of outcomes for the customer or end user (Denning, 2017).

**New Product Development in Emerging Markets**

There has been the wide and varied use of the term emerging markets in the extant literature. While the UNO (2013) classified economies by primarily considering their institutional development, WBDI (2013) classified emerging markets in terms of their levels of progress and financial dynamism. Govindarajan and Trimble (2012) used the term emerging market to describe poor economies, and Muldowney (2018) described emerging markets as countries with growing economies and a growing middle class but characterized by uncertainty stemming from political and social upheavals. Emerging markets compared to developed markets are more complex, dynamic, and diverse, and the poorer segments in emerging markets are often large (Fitroy, Stening, Yue Zhang, 2015). Emerging markets have also been described in terms of large unserved or underserved segments presenting huge untapped opportunities for organizations seeking growth away from saturated markets in developed countries (Sako, 2015).

Emerging markets usually do not have the level of market sophistication, efficiency and stringent standards in accounting and securities regulation compared with advanced economies (Cumming & Zhang, 2016). Emerging markets generally have the financial infrastructure, including banks, a stock exchange, and a unified currency. Organizational leaders seek out opportunities in emerging markets for the prospects of high returns as they often experience faster economic growth as measured by GDP (Fawcett & Waller, 2015). The economies of China and India are considered the largest emerging markets (Guégan, Hassani, & Zhao, 2014). A large population of the world's poorest people, otherwise known as those living at the base of the pyramid constitutes emerging markets (Prahalad, 2011). The BOP accounts for 50% of the world's population, holding \$9 trillion in assets, \$5 trillion in purchasing power (Fawcett & Waller, 2015; Nakata & Antalis, 2015; World Bank, 2017). Emerging markets have experienced a steady rise in the weight of the information technology sector, a key driver of performance (Muldowney, 2018). However, investments in emerging markets compared to developed markets come with much greater risk due to political instability, domestic infrastructure problems, currency volatility and limited equity opportunities, as many large companies may still be state-controlled or private (Cumming & Zhang, 2016). According to Muldowney (2018), the major risks for organizations operating in emerging markets are, (a) political and social risk, and (b) information and liquidity risk. Political and social changes taking place in emerging market countries create uncertainty. The Arab Spring, though resulting in beneficial change, creates uncertainty and volatility that may spread to other emerging markets. Although the quality of data available in emerging markets has vastly improved, obtaining good information can still be challenging. Currency control by states in most emerging market economies may also create liquidity problems.

To tap into the potential present in emerging markets, leaders of Western multinational corporations need to consider local product environment and innovate specifically for emerging markets, rather than to modify existing products through glocalization (Radojević, 2015). Gobble (2017) attributed the innovation in emerging markets to the innate resourcefulness of the poor often driven by institutional voids, lack, and absence of public amenities. Institutional voids have the effect of increasing cost of production and affordability of products in emerging markets. Institutional voids are namely: (a) voids in capital markets, which inhibit the ability of businesses to access capital; (b) labor market voids, which is the inability of organizations to access skilled labor; (c) public infrastructure voids, which refer to the inadequacy of infrastructure deployed by governments in developing countries; (d) product market voids; and (e) contractual voids (El Ebrashi & Aziz, 2017). Ajayi (2016) surveyed 235 small to medium-sized Nigerian agricultural firms and found that resource constraints, inadequate infrastructure, and lack of export assistance constituted barriers to successful market entry. Rask (2014) stated that barriers to market entry require creative strategizing, and an especially valuable skill is the ability to improvise in the face of scarcity in unfamiliar business environments. Local firms to overcome the weaknesses endemic in emerging markets, diversify, adopt network strategies, and internationalize to strengthen areas of perceived weaknesses (Hansen, Langevang, Rutashobya, & Urassa, 2017).

Due to institutional voids, consumers in emerging markets are in dire need of innovations that can spur prosperity in their regions. Products with high technology tend not to be the priority for low-income consumers except when the need for social recognition and status is highly valued by the individual (Nogami & Veloso, 2017). To successfully tap opportunities in emerging markets organizational leaders need to develop business models and capabilities for the resource-constrained environments of emerging markets (Winterhalter, Zeschky, & Gassman, 2016; Zeschky, Winterhalter, & Gassman, 2014a). According to Zeschky et al. (2014b), resource-constrained innovations are either low-cost alternatives of existing products re-designed and tailored to be particularly suited for resource-constrained customers in emerging markets, or new products and services that allow new applications specifically developed for these markets.

Frugal innovation is the most disruptive type of all resource-constrained innovations as it enables unprecedented applications specifically developed for resource-constrained environments in emerging markets (Wan, Williamson, & Yin, 2015). Frugal innovations are linked to successful product development in emerging markets (Gobble, 2017; Sako, 2015; Winterhalter, Zeschky, Neumann, & Gassmann, 2017). Frugal innovation involves substantial cost reduction, concentration on core functionalities, and increased performance levels. Frugal innovations also involve new engineering processes with emphasis on what is most important to the end user and the actual physical context of a product's use (Gobble, 2017). Frugal innovations are typically repairable, durable, efficient, and easy to use. The five attributes of frugal innovations are affordability, simplicity, sustainability, quality, and purpose (Gobble, 2017). Sako (2015) identified two major challenges that organizations are likely to face while operating in emerging markets. The first challenge of operating in an emerging market is cost. Organizational leaders need a profound understanding of local consumers' needs to eliminate unnecessary functionalities critical to low-cost innovations since frugal innovations involve a focus on product redesign and the invention of new models for production and not on technological breakthroughs (Gobble, 2017). The second challenge faced by organizational leaders while operating in an emerging market is dealing with host governments. Organizational leaders need a good understanding of how host governments grant permits and licenses. Organizational leaders also need to understand the issues surrounding the protection of intellectual property, and foreign direct investment (Sako, 2015). The knowledge that organizational leaders need to operate successfully in their host environments can be achieved through more decentralized structures such as subsidiaries or with local partnering firms (Sweeney, 2014).

Adapting existing products for use in emerging markets through incremental process innovations might not be the best strategy for business leaders (Nogami & Veloso, 2017; Sako, 2015). Sharma and Iyer (2012) introduced the concept of technology cobbling to refer to various improvised innovations in emerging markets. Technology cobbling involves assembling various existing technologies to develop new products and processes that can transform business models (Sears, & Hoetker, 2013). Emerging market firms' innovation development processes start with imitation and frugal products and then migrate to the acquisition of developed market firms with better innovation development processes and outcomes (Sharma & Jha, 2016). Though incremental process innovations are not enough for organizations to be successful in emerging markets, the challenges associated with engaging in low-cost innovations, low levels of institutional development and dealing with host governments in emerging markets are not easily overcome (Sako, 2015). A firm’s ability to improvise in resource-constrained conditions and the extent of its alliance with local partners are key antecedents of frugal or low-cost innovations in emerging markets (Ernst et al., 2015). A collaboration between the government and businesses in emerging markets is crucial to the promotion of more efficient allocation of scarce resources and removal of the major obstacles to growth (Charles, Jeppesen, Kamau, & Kragelund, 2016). The reality is that most governments in emerging markets cannot engage with the private sector due to structural adjustments and the endemic nature of the inefficiencies in the system (Sen, 2013). Central to driving down cost critical to frugal innovations is the concept of bootstrapping which involves borrowing a handful of experts from other business units within the local subsidiary or entering a revenue-sharing arrangement with external engineers to build a cutting-edge prototype (Jha, Parulkar, Krishnan, & Dhanaraj, 2016).

Multinationals have had little success with the home-based development of new products and services in emerging markets (Brem & Wolfram, 2014). Ernst et al. (2015) identified three antecedents of frugal innovations in emerging markets, which are (a) local embeddedness, (b) bricolage, and (c) standardization. Local embeddedness increases an organizations level of understanding of local market peculiarities, which in turn increases the likelihood of the firm's innovations being suited to local requirements and conditions (Goyal, Sergi, & Kapoor, 2014). Local embeddedness is useful where there is a lack of institutions such as formal distribution channels that are needed to successfully launch new products in emerging markets (Prahalad, 2012).

Using bricolage, new entrants who are often resource constrained can innovate and succeed where others fail (Senyard, Baker, Stephens, & Davidsson, 2014). Bricolage involves combining available resources in new ways to solve new problems. Researchers have largely applied the concept of bricolage to describe how small companies or social businesses operate. Bricolage can also result in the stimulation of higher levels of innovativeness in large organizations operating in resource-constrained environments such as those existing in emerging markets (Ernst et al., 2015). Despite the benefits of bricolage in resource-constrained environments, the disadvantages are (a) time inefficiencies, (b) substandard products and services, and (c) a value chain of incompetent suppliers and overly demanding customers (Senyard et al., 2014).

Standardization is the reduction of differences and the aggregation of demand to profit from economies of scale (Ernst et al., 2015). Standardization is a key part of the microeconomic infrastructure with the benefits of reduced costs and increased quality (Trajković & Milošević 2016). Gauch and Blind (2015) argued that it is not enough that organizations create a large number of new ideas. The results and processes of innovation must be successfully positioned in the market and widespread through the functioning of the standardization system to accomplish significant positive economic effects. Internal process standardization is the most beneficial to an organization’s financial performance (Trajković & Milošević, 2016). When stakeholders set the standards within an industry, participating firms though autonomous form alliances, share benefits, and control and contribute through a knowledge sharing economy towards mutual goals (Blind & Mangelsdorf, 2012). There is no consensus on the appropriate level of standardization needed within an industry. Scalability is a major feature of successful product development in the poorer segments found in emerging markets (Prahalad, 2012). However, scalability is achieved by standardization within and across industries (Trajković & Milošević, 2016). For emerging markets, Sheth (2011) argued that greater standardization across these markets is needed to realize efficiency gains across different emerging market segments, which though geographically dispersed share similarities in their social and economic contexts. Bruce, Daly, and Kahn, (2007) hold the opposing view that due to the heterogeneous nature of emerging markets, greater customization rather than standardization is key to successful new product development.

**Opportunities in Emerging Markets: BRICS and Nigeria**

Jim O’Neill of Goldman Sachs used the collective term BRICS in 2001 to refer to the emerging markets of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa (Sparks, 2014). Apart from the major world economies such as the United States and countries in the European Union (EU), the emerging markets of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa were major growth drivers during and after the global financial crises (Holtbrugge & Baron, 2013). The World Bank (2014) predicted that the combined BRICS GDP would represent the world’s largest economy by 2020. Nigeria, though not a member of BRICS is considered an emerging market and is the most populous country in Africa (United States Central Intelligence Agency, 2014). Despite high levels of corruption, poverty, and political instability, Nigeria continues to maintain its dominance and economic relevance within Sub-Saharan Africa because of her large population and the abundant natural resources (Urmson, 2012). The population of Nigeria was 177 million in 2014 (United States Central Intelligence Agency, 2014). Nigeria’s population will double to approximately 440.4 million people by 2050 (United Nations, 2013). A large population is a major attraction for organizational leaders seeking to expand away from saturated markets.

Most of the world's poor or those living at the base of the pyramid exist in emerging markets (Prahalad, 2005, 2014). Nigeria is an emerging market economy with an existing profitable BOP market based on population and purchasing power parity (PPP) of less than 1,500 dollars per year (UNICEF, 2013; World Resource Institute, International Finance Corporation & World Bank, 2007). Organizational leaders often neglect the poor in any market due to their low incomes. Prahalad (2005, 2014) argued that though the consumers' individual income is low, their aggregate buying power is substantial and should not be ignored.

Most of the revenue in Nigeria since 1970 is derived from three sectors: oil, agriculture, and services. In 2014, oil represented 43% of the total revenue in Nigeria; agriculture was next at 31% and services at 26% (United States Central Intelligence Agency, 2014). In April 2014, Nigeria had a GDP of $509.9 billion overtaking South Africa's GDP of $370.3 billion, making it the largest economy in Africa and the 26th largest in the world (Adibe, 2014; World Bank, 2014a). With a GDP of US$509 billion in 2014, Nigeria contributed 30% of the combined GDP of 47 economies in Sub-Saharan Africa (World Bank, 2014b). With growth predictions of 6% to 8% in the nonoil sectors including agriculture, telecommunications, and services, Nigeria's profile as an attractive investment destination continues to improve (United States Central Intelligence Agency, 2014).

**The Relationship between Firms' Business Model and Disruptive Innovations**

The alignment of an organization's business model with innovation efforts is vital to generating high venture performance (Bicen & Johnson, 2015). Business models allow organizational leaders to express their value propositions for their organizations and determine the value chain configuration necessary for the achievement of these value propositions (Scannella, 2015; Sharma & Ghosh, 2015). Organizational leaders can focus on identified market segments using business models and provide an estimation of the cost structure necessary to deliver on the value proposition and the profit potential of the identified market segment (Aghdaie & Alimardani, 2015). The deployment by large organizations an amount more than 10% of their total investment toward the development of new business models is instructive (Bereznoi, 2015).

Frugal innovations for emerging markets differ drastically from existing products in more advanced markets regarding product novelty and disruptiveness (Ernst et al., 2015; Prahalad, 2011). Frugal innovations are particularly difficult to achieve for organizations with business models designed to deliver highly advanced products for very sophisticated consumers in developed markets (Ernst et al., 2015). Organizational leaders often find that they need to alter the business models for their firms to succeed in emerging markets. These business models can be either low-cost replications of already established models used in developed markets or entirely new business models, which specifically create value in low-income environments (Chliova & Ringov, 2017). Low-cost replications are often used to expand market reach, which organizational leaders achieve by making internal processes more efficient. In contrast, new business models often involve collaborations with external, local partners as these have access to the target market which the local community accepts (Prahalad, 2011). Organizational leaders often need to create unique business models that are specifically tailored to overcome the challenges and constraints in the emerging market context (George et al., 2012; Winterhalter et al., 2016). Business models for emerging markets often entail a strong value proposition not only through cost reduction and consequently lower per-unit-prices for the customer but by offering solutions such as reusability that increase the customers' willingness to pay for them (Prahalad, 2011). Chilova and Ringov (2017) recommend that templates for new product development at the development phase must include resilience and robustness to tackle resource scarcity, institutional voids, and hybrid motivation which are endemic conditions across emerging markets.

Despite the many potential benefits, such as the prospect of reaching new customer segments, big organizations based in more developed markets lack the capabilities necessary to succeed in emerging markets due to huge disparities in the levels of institutional developments in both contexts (George et al., 2016; Simanis, 2012). Firm capabilities consist of complex coordinated patterns of skills and knowledge that are uniquely rooted in processes that are performed well, compared to the competition (Appiah-Adu, Okpattah, & Amoako, 2017). Capabilities are a complex set of skills and acquired knowledge exercised through organizational processes that allow a firm to organize its activities and make use of its assets to create and deliver customer value and performance (Weigel & Goffin, 2015). Kotler, Keller, Ancarani, and Costabile (2014) noted that competitive advantage typically does not rest on a particular core competency but upon a unified system of organizational capabilities which if exploited is fundamental to business success.

There have been conflicting literature regarding the relationship between firms' organizational capabilities and their capacity for disruptive innovations. While economies of scale are strongly linked to incremental and sustaining innovations, disruptive innovations have been traced to new entrants to a market (Isada & Isada, 2017; King & Baatartogtokh, 2015). Christensen and Raynor (2003) noted that research and development (R&D) investments in new product developments are more successful for small firms compared to large firms. Large organizations are affected by excess bureaucracy and large investment in older assets that they cannot easily put to new use (Senyard, Baker, Steffens, & Davidsson, 2014). Revilla and Fernández (2012) indicated that the relationship between disruptive innovations to the size of a firm is not constant but is influenced by management methods. Nica, Stancu, and Stancu (2017) observed that there is an insignificant relationship between an organization's size and its innovation activity. Consistent with the idea that management methods rather than firm size are important for disruptive innovation is Massa and Tucci (2014) argument that altering a business model and modifying business model components are a source of innovation in itself. Christensen (1997) noted that large organizations have a problem innovating but could overcome it by setting up autonomous organizations charged with building a new and independent business to handle disruptive innovations. Disruptive innovation for big organizations typically involves the creation of a completely separate company with a new business model that may or may not be related to the core business of the parent organization (Nica et al., 2017). Defensive evolution via business models or continuous innovations has been used by big organizations to effectively respond to challenges posed by disruptors (Denning, 2016).

A firm’s organizational culture, structure, innovation process, and senior leadership yield capabilities that are critical for disruptive innovation (Karimi & Walter, 2015). Culture is the collective programming of the human mind that distinguishes members of a human group from those of another (Hofstede, 1980; Minkov & Hofstede, 2014). Culture shapes how people think, what people do, what people produce, and society's norms, assumptions, and behavior (Minkov & Hofstede, 2014). Organizational culture is the pattern of shared beliefs that help individuals to understand the organizational functioning and thus provide them with the norms for behavior in the organization (Shafie, Siti-Nabiha, & Cheng Ling, 2014). Firms with flexible structures are more responsive to the need of the customers in the very dynamic emerging market context (Sweeney, 2014). Autonomous and decentralized structures are crucial for the exploration of new competitive landscapes and knowledge building for successful innovations in emerging market contexts (Hart et al., 2016).

Firm capabilities that lead to disruptive innovations are developed when the final consumer is the focal point of all activities in a firm causing organizational leaders to analyze and identify collaborations that they need to establish and internal organizational changes required to meet the needs of this final consumer (Pérez et al., , 2017; Story et al., 2015). Irrespective of the context, a market orientation helped firms to maximize their product innovativeness (Story et al., 2015). Business leaders need to ensure that product features such as pricing, distribution, and marketing strategies meet the expectations of the target customers and properly cater to their cultural norms and habits (Kivenzor, 2015). Simester (2015) has however argued that customers do not always know what they want. Organizational leaders need to focus on the customers' buying decision process to determine what product features will represent the most value. It is therefore not enough that companies create new products, but also that customers recognize this value. Top management of firm's introducing new products could assist their customers to recognize the value of their innovations to avoid failure.

Organizational leaders need the help of both internal and external stakeholders to develop products that deliver the most value to their target customers. The role of internal and external stakeholders in building the necessary capabilities for competitive advantage in a market has been explored extensively in the extant literature. Cross, Arena, Sims, and Uhl-Bien (2017) in their exploration of the role of employees in new product development found that network structures and the ability of organizations to create what they referred to as adaptive space for employees were critical to success. Adaptive space is the network and organizational context that allows people, ideas, information, and resources to flow across the organizations spurring emergent innovations that address customer needs and lead to growth. The three network roles critical for emergent innovation are brokers, connectors, and energizers. Brokers are persons within an organization that act as critical channels of information and ideas. Brokers have extensive access to diverse information, early access to new information, and control over the dissemination of the information. Connectors are crucial to the development and implementation process. Connectors are persons of authority within a cohesive group in the organization. Energizers are individuals in an organization who enthusiastically adopt an idea and promote it in such a way that others across the organization also adopt it and are eager to develop it. By understanding social networks and developing an adaptive space, even apparently bureaucratic organizations can facilitate the development of innovative products and services.

Optimizing collaborations with external stakeholders in the host environment is also key to generating a competitive advantage in the area of new product development and innovation (Tinoco & Ambrose, 2017). New ideas, information, and knowledge can be tapped and absorbed into the firm through external networks of collaborations, impacting the firm's need to grow its technical competence for new product development. The incorporation of indigenous knowledge along the value creation process is a major strategy used by the business leaders to deal with needs and resource-constraints for new product development in emerging markets (Winterhalter et al., 2017). According to Xie, Zeng, Zang, and Zou (2017), the collaboration could exist amongst a network of manufacturing firms in markets, through the sharing of ideas, knowledge, expertise, and opportunities. A network includes the entities and their respective value chain (Black & Gallan, 2015). Entities in a network can be individuals, groups, or organizations (Xie et al., 2017). Black and Gallan (2015), using a network perspective of value co-creation, opined that people and organizations are embedded in a complex system, and elements of this network may enable or inhibit collaboration and successful innovations.

The role of the customer in NPD projects has been explored in extant literature, and researchers have made distinctions between firms based on their customer orientation. Customer orientation refers to the degree to which the firm utilizes information from customers and develops a strategy to satisfy customer needs (Yang & Zhang, 2018). There is no consensus in the extant literature on the effect of customer orientation on the success of NPD projects. A customer-oriented firm may outperform its competitors and achieve a better NPD performance because it is more able to anticipate what their customers want and customize products accordingly (Story et al., 2015). Hart et al. (2016) argued that customers in emerging markets possess knowledge and information about their needs and preferences which can enhance NPD performance. Customer participation is instrumental in the ideation and launch stages of new products (Chang & Taylor, 2016). Customer orientation can improve the NPD effectiveness and accelerate the speed-to-market of new products (Feng, Sun, Zhu, & Sohal, 2012). Some researchers have a contrary opinion and have argued that customer involvement at the developmental stages of new product development could be wasteful and delay time to market (Ernst, Hoyer, Krafft, & Krieger, 2010). According to Chang and Taylor (2016) there are contingencies and limitations to the positive influences of a collaboration with a network of consumers and key suppliers on a firm's NPD project and noted that collaboration is particularly beneficial for small firms, technologically turbulent NPD projects, emerging markets, low-tech industries and business to business relationships. Yang and Zhang (2018) identified different dimensions of customer orientation that exert different influence on the performance of new products: (a) customer focus, (b) customer involvement, and (c) communication with customers. Through a customer focus, organizations gain first-hand knowledge of what customers want which results in an enhanced decision-making ability within the scope of the NPD process. A superior decision making, in turn, expedites the development of better designs for a new product. Greater involvement of customers during the design and production stages of the NPD enables more innovative products and effectively reduces the likelihood of poor product design. Firms which maintain an effective communication channel with their customers gain valuable outside information and knowledge which lead to a reduction in new product development time and cost.

Cocreation with customers and external stakeholders is fast becoming popular for organizations and their new product development initiatives. Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004) predicted that the role of consumers was changing because of their increased access to global information and ability to network and that consumers would demand access to design products and services through a transparent process. Optimal value co-creation is partially dependent upon customer participation, which Black and Gallan (2015) defined as the extent to which customers share information, provide suggestions, and engage in shared decision making.

Organizational leaders realize that encouraging customers to participate can be difficult, but crucial for new product development (McColl-Kennedy et al., 2012). Value co-creation through enhanced customer contributions requires conscious and deliberate attention for organizational leaders seeking a competitive advantage for their firms (Gummesson, 2006). Value co-creation is optimized when organizational leaders can synthesize personal knowledge from the customer and the technical knowledge existing within the organization (Black & Gallan, 2015).

Two models remain popular as methods for leveraging the knowledge of masses to come up with new ideas: crowdsourcing and open sourcing (Reardon, Wright, & Malone, 2017). Crowdsourcing, as conceptualized by Howe (2008), refers to companies soliciting ideas from external groups. Crowdsourcing is the leveraging of the internet and social media sites to tap an underexplored and diversified pool of knowledge possessed by a community of consumers and the general population for innovative ideas (Allen, Chandrasekaran, & Basuroy, 2018). As opposed to outsourcing, which relies on professional input from employees of other organizations, crowdsourcing depends on input from product users and nonusers from all over the world (Reardon et al., 2017) Crowdsourcing is a popular and growing trend amongst organizations and at its core are three concept design characteristics: perceived technical complexity, usability, and reliability (Allen et al., 2018). A firm is more likely to crowdsource if the perceived technical complexity of a product is high. A firm is also likely to crowdsource if the perceived usability of a product idea is low. User inputs help enhance the ease of use of a product. Perceived reliability relates to how well a product is likely to perform and encompasses the notions of durability and dependability. Organizational leaders are more likely to look to the crowd for ideas on enhancing reliability. Open sourcing like crowdsourcing allows organizations to obtain information from external sources, but unlike crowdsourcing, open sourcing allows access to company resources or proprietary information such as computer code (Reardon et al., 2017).

The incentives for companies to adopt crowdsourcing and open-sourcing include the potential of accessing highly useful ideas at little or no cost from a robust group of individuals with a deep and ongoing commitment to what they enjoy doing (Seong, Kim, & Szulanski, 2015). Despite the advantages of sourcing information from the general population for new product development, open sourcing and crowdsourcing also have their share of disadvantages. The disadvantages of working with the general public include the problems of synthesizing ideas from a very diverse group of users and nonusers and fears about issues of control and ownership (Reardon et al., 2017).

Kotabe, Jiang, and Murray (2017) emphasized the importance of political networking capability (PNC) in successful new product development projects, especially in emerging markets. Organizational leaders' ability to network with government officials and legislators to acquire critical external resources, including financial and marketing resources is key to successful innovations. A good relationship between top management and host government officials is crucial for firms to successfully overcome institutional voids and maintain their competitiveness in emerging markets.

A firm's dynamic capability is what enables it to acquire, absorb, and apply knowledge effectively from the external environment to develop products and services that yield competitive advantage at the marketplace (Joshi, Das & Mouri, 2015). Dynamic capability is a firm's competence in generating new products and processes and can be divided into three types: (a) capability to sense opportunities or threats and develop ideas, (b) capability to seize opportunities, and (c) capability to coordinate competitiveness through improvement, combination, protection, or reconfiguration of the firm's assets (Atsushi & Shumpei, 2015). Organizational leaders must focus on developing dynamic capabilities within their firms to achieve any form of innovation (Michailova & Zhan, 2015). A lack of dynamic capability inhibits the adoption of disruptive innovation (Pandit, Joshi, Sahay, & Gupta, 2018).

Leaders are instrumental in shaping an innovative culture in organizations. Leadership involves the process of influence (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Leaders, therefore, can change the behaviors of their followers and their organization through this process of influence. Leadership is among the most important factors affecting successful new product development in the twenty-first century (Mumford & Gibson, 2011). Leaders also play critical roles in helping employees cope with social and environmental problems that affect their work and guide their creative efforts towards innovation (Leach et al., 2012; Portugal & Yukl, 1994; Vinarski-Peretz & Carmeli, 2011). Leaders are most likely to influence innovation outcomes from the ideation to the developmental stages of the new product development process (Waite, 2014) Leaders have an indirect influence on creativity through role modeling, rewards and recognition, and hiring (Hunter & Cushenbery, 2011). Leaders play a key role in overseeing workforce development and the selection of team members (Waite, 2014). Individuals who are admired, respected, or known to take risks elicit creative behaviors in others. Leaders who reward and recognize ideas, or otherwise value creative works, also tend to influence the work ethics of employees (Khandelwal, 2007; Simmonds & Tsui, 2010). Hunter and Cushenbery (2011) suggested that leaders have a more direct influence on innovative outcomes as they determine the constitution of teams and possess discretional powers at the organizational level over what products or services to bring to the market.

Lately, there has been an interest in the role of transformational leadership in innovation. Transformational leaders are those leaders who transform followers' values, move them to higher levels of needs and aspirations, and raise the performance expectations of their followers (Bass, 1999; Jung et al., 2013). Transformational leadership has four components; charismatic role modeling, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. Using charisma, the leader teaches admiration, respect, and loyalty, and emphasizes the need of having a collective sense of mission. By individualized consideration, the leader develops a close relationship with his or her followers and understands and considers their differing needs, skills, and aspirations. Thus, transformational leaders meet the emotional needs of each employee (Bass, 1999). With inspirational motivation, the leader verbalizes an inspiring vision of the future, shows the followers the ways to achieve the goals, and reaffirms his or her belief that they can do it. Through intellectual stimulation, the leader broadens and raises the interests of his or her employees and stimulates followers to reconsider their old beliefs and think in new ways (Bass, 1999).

## Transition

In Section 1, I discussed the problem statement and purpose statement, as well as the nature of the study that justifies my choice of a qualitative multiple case study approach for the study. I listed the interview questions I used to explore the strategies business leaders in emerging markets used to develop new products successfully. I also discussed Christensen's (1997) DIT, which forms the conceptual framework for the study. Section 1 also included the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study and the significance of the study. I concluded Section 1 with a review of the professional and academic literature. In Section 2, I discuss the (a) purpose statement, (b) role of the researcher, (c) participants, (d) research method, (e) research design, (f) population and sampling, (g) ethical research, (h) data collection instruments and technique, (I) data organization, (j) data analysis, and (k) reliability and validity. In Section 3, I use the conceptual framework and central research questions as my guide to provide (a) the findings of the study, (b) application to professional practice, (c) implication for social change, (d) recommendations for actions, (e) recommendations for future research, and (f) the conclusion.

# Section 2: The Project

New product development is especially important for organizational success in emerging markets. Given the importance of new product development in emerging markets, a study of the strategies that organizational leaders use in developing new products is justified. My findings from this study may contribute to positive social change by providing strategies that could enhance the ability of organizational leaders to successfully develop new products critical for their firms' survival and socioeconomic development in emerging markets. This section includes the purpose statement, my role as the researcher, participants, and the research method that I used for the study. The section also includes the research design, population and sampling, and instrumentation for the research study. The section ends with information on data collection technique, data organization techniques, data analysis, and the reliability and validity of the research findings.

## Purpose Statement

My purpose in this qualitative multiple case study was to explore strategies that organizational leaders use to successfully develop new products. The population for the study was organizational leaders in three organizations in Nigeria who have successfully developed new products. The implications for positive social change include the potential to improve the standard of living within Nigerian communities, which simultaneously enhances the participation of people within underdeveloped nations in the global economy.

## Role of the Researcher

I was the researcher for this qualitative research. A human instrument is responsive and adaptive and is most suitable for collecting and analyzing data in qualitative research (Merriam, 2009). According to the Belmont Protocol Report, researchers must adhere strictly to ethical standards for the protection of research participants (Zucker, 2014). My role was to conduct ethical research by (a) interviewing participants from three companies, (b) collecting and analyze data, and (c) managing the course of the interview process.

According to the American Psychological Association (2010), three established principles in preparing ethical research are to (a) confirm the integrity of scientific information, (b) protect the rights and well-being of research participants, and (c) safeguard intellectual property entitlements. The Belmont Report also guides research using three ethical principles: respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. In adherence to these principles, I sought approval from Walden University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) before collecting and analyzing data for this research. I obtained a written informed consent from each participant. I have ensured that the names of the individuals and organizations who participated are kept confidential and not mentioned in any part of the study. I will also maintain the data in a safe place for 5 years before discarding all electronic and nonelectronic transcripts (National Institutes of Health Office of Extramural Research, 2014).

I was a business leader in the financial services sector in Nigeria from 2008 to 2016, and I marketed new products to banking services consumers in Nigeria and maintained a profit. I also reviewed the literature, case studies, and current trends pertinent to the topic to gain a better understanding. The human instrument has shortcomings and biases that may affect a study (Merriam, 2009). I have a bias based on my experience in marketing to consumers in Nigeria. To mitigate bias and avoid viewing data through a personal lens, I developed an interview protocol and relied on data collected rather than on my judgment. I made known my ideas or thoughts during the interviews or data collection. According to Yin (2014), the use of an interview protocol is important to ensure collected data will address the initial research question, and the interview protocol instrument in a case study should not only include open-ended questions but should also contain subquestions to enable the researcher to elicit more descriptive information.

## Participants

I used purposeful sampling to select three leaders from three organizations in the south of Nigeria. Kazadi, Lievens, and Mahr (2015) suggested that purposeful sampling for a limited number of cases facilitates the gathering of valuable knowledge and enhances the data identified in the literature review. Marshall, Cardon, Poddar, and Fontenot (2013) recommended at least three interviewees for case studies based on the principle of data saturation. Teeuw et al. (2014) emphasized the need to identify what strategies are effective and useful when researching. All the participants were leaders of organizations that had successfully developed new products in Nigeria. Yin (2017) suggested that an extensive screening of candidates can ensure a fit for the case study criteria. The screening process involved the self-report of individuals who met the criteria for the study. Participants who met the criteria and who signed an informed consent form were eligible to participate in interviews. Bernard and Bernard (2013) argued that case study participants should have experience with the research question. Purposeful selection allows the researcher to gather participants who have experience with the phenomenon studied (Palinkas et al., 2015). Merriam (2009) recommended the development of participant criteria to ensure participants have knowledge of the topic. All participants met the following criteria: (a) are part of the top management in their organizations and have worked extensively in Nigeria, and (b) have led their organizations in the development of successful new products.

I contacted three organizations operating within the southern part of Nigeria. I explained my purpose in the study to the business leaders of the organizations that I contacted to obtain their consent to participate in the study. I also offered to email my proposal summary if they desired additional information about the study. Maskara (2014) opined that researchers should explore at least two different ways of contacting prospective organizations, by email and contacting in person. By visiting prospective organizations and contacting them by email, researchers can provide the business leaders with sufficient information about the research to enable them to decide (Gand, 2015). Crowhurst (2013) explained that the decision maker must find interest in the research topic before agreeing that their business would participate in the study. I emailed each candidate the study information requesting his or her participation in the study. Yin (2017) encouraged interviewers to establish working relationships with participants by building trust; however, the interviewer must refrain from influencing the interviewee.

Seidman (2013) stated that interviewers must maintain professionalism and a degree of distance throughout the study process to allow interviewees to speak independently. Conversely, Maxwell (2013) argued that the interviewer and interviewee should collaborate during the interview process. The relationship between the researcher and the participant is a key element in the success of a study (Manning & Kunkel, 2014). To establish a working relationship with participants, I introduced myself, my purpose in the study, and the criteria to participate. I also assured the participants of confidentiality in handling information obtained during the study and also explained my expectations of the participants. Participants who met the criteria received an informed consent form through email. The informed consent form included the required disclosure information noted in the Belmont Report (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1979). It is important that scholars understand the consent processes, privacy protections, data storage requirements, and the scope of data sharing. Acquiring consent is the ethical and legal responsibility of the researchers to ensure that every participant has adequate information to make some informed decisions to participate in the study (Marrone, 2016). I built further rapport with participants through personal introductions and semistructured interviews. Wang (2015) explained that building a healthy rapport ensures an environment where subjects feel comfortable and can openly share their experiences.

## Research Method and Design

### Research Method

I used a qualitative methodology for this study. Qualitative research methods are especially suitable where there is little, or nothing, known about the research problem or the important variables to identify and explore (Creamer & Tendhar, 2016; Park & Park, 2016; Sarma, 2015). Using the qualitative methodology enables a researcher to obtain information regarding the research problem through an inductive process that involves the use of questionnaires and interviews (Khan, 2014; Patton, 2015; Sotiriadou, Brouwers, & Le, 2014). According to Marshall and Rossman (2014), qualitative research is realistic, interpretive, and grounded in people's experiences. A quantitative method is useful when the researcher intends to hypothesize the relationships or differences among preidentified variables using statistical data (Bambale, 2014; Hafford-Letchfield, 2014; Leedy & Ormrod, 2013). The quantitative approach was inappropriate for my study because I did not identify relationships or differences among variables using statistical data. A mixed methodology involves combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in a single study and integrating results from both methods to achieve better results (Kachouie & Sedighadeli, 2015; Morse & Cheek, 2014; Podmetina, Volchek, & Smirnova, 2015). A mixed method was not suitable for my research because I did not use any statistical data analysis to test hypotheses about variables' relationships or differences.

## Research Design

I used a multiple case study design for this study. Case study designs are a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores one or more organizations in-depth, programs, by identifying key events or processes (Dumez, 2015; Tetnowski, 2015; Yin, 2014). Case studies are especially appropriate when there is a need to provide an in-depth, multilayered understanding of complex social and contemporary events through a variety of evidence, which can include interviews and direct observations of participants (Dumez, 2015; Johnson, 2016; Tsang, 2014). Using a multiple case study design, a researcher can make comparisons across settings (Hott, Limberg, Ohrt, & Schmit, 2015; Patton, 2015; Yin, 2014). I chose a multiple-case study design for this study because I sought to understand the complex and social phenomenon of the actions and views of organizational leaders who successfully developed new products for emerging markets. Other designs used for qualitative studies include (a) ethnographic design, (b) phenomenological design, (c) narrative design, and (d) grounded theories (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013). Ethnography is most useful for researches on culture (Armstrong, 2015; Kruth, 2015; Vernon 2015). An ethnographic design was not appropriate for my study because my focus was on strategies used to develop new products successfully and not on the culture of the participants. A phenomenological design is suitable when the researcher wishes to understand what, if anything, participants have in common as they experience a phenomenon (Berterö, 2015; Sloan & Bowe, 2013; Yin, 2013). My goal in this study was not to describe the experiences of the participants but to have an in-depth understanding of the strategies that organizational leaders use in emerging markets, so a phenomenological study was not appropriate. A researcher using the narrative design obtains and summarizes the life stories and experiences of one or more individuals (Denison, 2016; Kuronen, 2014; Raeburn, Schmeid, Hungerford, & Cleary, 2015; Von Contzen & Alders, 2015).). The narrative design involves the retelling of life stories and therefore not useful in the exploration of business strategies. A grounded theory design is used by researchers seeking to build or test a theory (Barnsley, 2015; Smith, 2016; Yin, 2014). Because my goal was not to build or test a theory, I did not use the grounded theory design for my study.

## Population and Sampling

For this study, I used a nonprobability purposive sampling method. The purposive sample is dependent on the characteristics of a population and the objective of the study (Bungay, Oliffe, & Atchison, 2016). Researchers rely on purposive sampling technique using their judgment to choose members of the population to participate in answering interview questions with responses applicable to meeting data saturation (Patton, 2015). The population for this study consists of organizational leaders in the southern part of Nigeria who have worked extensively in Nigeria and have led their organizations in the development of successful new products. Purposeful sampling involves the selection of participants with relevant experience in the topic of research (Noble & Smith, 2015). Nonprobability purposive sampling is more convenient and less costly (Acharya, Prakash, Saxena, & Nigam, 2013; Bornstein, Jager, & Putrick, 2013; Raschke, Krishen, Kachroo, & Maheshwari, 2013). In nonprobability sampling methodology, the researchers choose the participants based on accessibility and their expert knowledge of the phenomenon of interest (Palinkas et al., 2015; Robinson, 2014). Nonprobability purposeful sampling is an effective sampling approach that adds to the credibility of the study due to the experience and expert knowledge of the chosen participants (Ajagbe, Isiavwe, Sholanke, & Oke, 2015). Researchers using nonprobability purposeful sampling use experience and practical knowledge as criteria for choosing participants (Shorten & Moorley, 2014). The implications of the subjective selection criteria are the researcher's bias or prejudice that affects his or her ability to measure or control the collected data (Emerson, 2015). The generalizability of results from the small sample size used in a nonprobability purposeful sampling is a major limitation (Raschke et al., 2013). Kaczynski, Salmona, and Smith (2014), however, suggested that using nonprobability purposeful sampling in case studies, even if selecting small samples, would substantially increase the credibility of the research results. In-depth understanding of complex and dynamic research problems facilitated by fast and accurate data collection is more valuable than forming experiential generalization (Palinkas et al., 2015). The qualitative researcher is less concerned with making generalizations regarding a larger population. A qualitative researcher relies on an inductive process using semistructured interviews aimed at creating and analyzing relationships between themes and categories to understand the experience of the participants (Patton, 2015).

Ensuring a conducive interview setting for participants in a study is a critical aspect for eliciting quality data. Johnson and Esterling (2015) noted that the researchers ought to provide surroundings that allow the participants to feel as comfortable and familiar as possible when answering the interview questions. Researchers should identify the most suitable interview space to ensure that they protect and keep confidential the responses from participants (Morse & Coulehan, 2015). Herring (2013) found that a conducive interview setting enables more truthful and richer descriptions from participants.

For case studies, there is no exact number in a sample necessary to accomplish data saturation (Roy, Zvonkovic, Goldberg, Sharp, & LaRossa, 2015). Yin (2015) stated that the use of purposive sampling in multiple case study research requires a minimum of only one participant for each distinct case. In this study, the targeted population consisted of three leaders in three organizations in the southern part of Nigeria with relevant knowledge on how to develop new products. To ensure data saturation, I asked the participants to elaborate on any responses not fully expressed for a richer, in-depth description of a phenomenon. I continued to seek clarification until the participants provide no more new information. Data saturation depends on the nature of the data source and the research question (Morse, Lowery, & Steury, 2014). Qualitative researchers attain data saturation when responses from participants become repetitive and do not result in new data, themes, insights, or perspectives for further synthesis or coding (Fusch & Ness, 2015).

## Ethical Research

I began data collection upon receipt of IRB approval from Walden University. Researchers are recommended to start the data collection after receiving IRB approval (Fiske & Hauser, 2014). Researchers must seek the permission of prospective organizations and provide participants with a consent form before data collection (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014). Researchers should provide participants with an informed consent form, and adequate information to enable participants decide to be part of a study (Bailey, 2014; Mahnaz, Bahramnezhad, Fomani, Mahnaz, & Cheraghi, 2014; Yin, 2015). Researchers should also allow prospective participants to ask questions during the informed consent process so that their agreement to participate will be voluntary (Fusch & Ness, 2015). I also informed the participants of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalties and the procedure for withdrawal.

I did not offer any incentives for participation in this study. Bouter (2015) explained that researchers could offer incentives to participants, but the value of the incentives should not affect the quality or reliability of the data provided by participants. Upon completion of my study, I shared a summary of the findings with the study participants. According to the Belmont Report protocol, researchers should respect the participants and accord them due respect as practitioners throughout the study (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1979). Human participants could pose ethical issues in research (Mitchell & Wellings, 2013). I protected the identities of participants and maintained confidentiality in my handling of data collected during the research by using data encryption and securing data storage devices. I stored the raw data and research results, on an encrypted password protected computer flash drive in a fireproof safe for 5 years following the conclusion of the study. I coded all identifiable information by labeling the interviewees and the organizations. Yin (2015) noted that researchers must establish adequate measures to secure the collected data during the data collection, data analysis, and data storage process to protect the confidentiality of the participants. To further protect participants’ confidentiality, I requested permission from the top management of the organizations to conduct the interviews in areas of the business office that ensured privacy such as boardrooms and meeting rooms. I will destroy all the information relating to this study, including back up data, after 5 years. Researchers should enhance confidentiality and participants rights to privacy to mitigate potential harm to participants (Wall & Pentz, 2015).

## Data Collection Instruments

I was the primary data collection instrument in this study. In qualitative research, researchers are the primary data collection instrument (Cronin, 2014; McCusker & Gunaydin, 2015). The researcher is the interpreter of experiences with participants in the qualitative research (Marshall & Rossman, 2016; Yin, 2014). In qualitative studies, data collection might include the use of semistructured interviews, document review, archived data, observations, focus groups, or a combination of these approaches (Ozer & Douglas, 2015). Bernard (2013) recommended the use of semistructured interviews by researchers for a more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon studied. I used semistructured interviews to explore the strategies that some organizational leaders used in the successful development of new products for emerging markets. Each participant was interviewed individually in a boardroom or conducive office space to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of information gathered. As part of the interview process, I recorded the participant's responses by note-taking and the use of an audio tape recording device. In a case study research, the researcher obtains data from more than one source (Himmelheber, 2014).

I collected additional data through document analysis. Data collection from multiple sources ensures data saturation (Harvey, 2015; Morse, 2015). In case studies, triangulation involves the collection and analysis of more than one type of data or data from more than one source (Denzin, 2012). In a case study research, the researcher explores all avenues to gain a comprehensive understanding of the factors contributing to the problem (Keenan et al., 2017). In document analysis, the researcher reviews policies and procedures, reports or additional administrative documents to gather information on how best to address the overarching research question. Yin (2014) recommended researchers should review existing and archival materials from their businesses in the form of a secondary data source to collect information regarding the research question. I used appropriate business documents as a secondary source of data including charts, graphs, schedules, websites, and other internal business documents about strategies used by organizational leaders for the successful development of new products in emerging markets. The authorized business owners approved all documents for release by implementing the letter of collaboration. Methodological triangulation involves the use of multiple sources of evidence such as interviews, document review, and observations (Wahyuni, 2012; Yin, 2014). I used the triangulation method to improve the confirmability and dependability of the data from interviews and relevant business documents. To ensure confidentially, I used a distinctive label for each participant and organization (e.g., P1). Researchers should enhance confidentiality and participants rights to privacy to mitigate potential harm to participants (Wall & Pentz, 2015). I used an interview protocol script during the interview process which begins with introductions from both parties. I also used member checking throughout the face to face interview to verify the adequacy of the interview format used. In member checking, the researcher returns to the participant with their interpretation of the responses to ensure the accuracy of the meaning (Fusch, & Ness, 2016). By using member checking, the researchers may reduce the potential for including incorrect data (Roche, Vaterlaus, & Young, 2015). Member checking improves the validity and reliability of the collected data (Vance, 2015). Houghton, Casey, Shaw, and Murphy (2013) suggested that member checking provides credibility and improves the reliability and validity of the data collected in case studies. During the interview sessions, I documented personal notes while recording the participants' responses. I continued to conduct added interviews with participants until I was unable to find new information. Data saturation is the point at which no new evidence emerges from the data collection efforts (Siegle, Rubenstein, & Mitchell, 2014). I transcribed responses obtained during initial interviews and follow-up interviews. I used methodological triangulation to mitigate bias and to enhance credibility while strengthening the trustworthiness of the study. In methodological triangulation, a researcher uses various sources to gather information. Martin (2016) showed that researchers could use member checking and methodological triangulation to improve the validity of the findings. There are five forms of triangulation: (a) data triangulation, (b) investigator triangulation, (c) theory triangulation, (d) methodological triangulation, and (e) environmental triangulation (Guion, Diehl, & McDonald, 2011). I used methodological triangulation using interviews and documentation analysis to enhance the reliability and validity of the study.

## Data Collection Technique

The overarching research question for the study is: What strategies do organizational leaders use to develop new products successfully? Data collection constitutes the process of gathering and measuring information on topics of interest in a systematic method to enable a researcher to answer the stated research question (Grossoehme, 2014). The primary data collection techniques used in qualitative research include the following: (a) interviews, (b) surveys and questionnaires, (c) observations, (d) focus groups, and (e) analysis of documents and material (De Massis & Kotlar, 2014). I used semistructured interviews as the primary data collection technique to gain knowledge relating to the strategies that organizational leaders used to develop new products successfully. I collected other data and materials from the participants, including program documents or documents presenting the organization's culture and strategy, charts, graphs, schedules, websites, and other internal business documents. I found such information useful for triangulation purposes. Triangulation, according to Yin (2014), enhances the validity of the research finding. Interviews are essential sources of information for researchers and the most important type of data collected in case studies (Singh, 2014). Interviews are however time-consuming and are prone to bias as participants try to give socially acceptable responses (Doody & Noonan, 2013). Researchers may also influence the participants to respond in specific ways by projecting their worldviews during the interview (McIntosh & Morse, 2015). I ensured that I minimize bias during the interviews. Doody and Noonan (2013) recommended that researchers ensure that they conduct their interviews in a manner that assures confidentiality and encourages participants to be free and honest with information. I conducted the interviews at locations that are convenient and private based on the interview protocol (see Appendix A). I also sent an electronic copy of the interview questions via email to the participants before the interview (see Appendix B). Providing a copy of the questions to the participants before the interview allows ample time for preparation thereby enhancing the quality of responses (Savva, 2013). Rizo et al. (2015) noted that researchers improve their relationship with participants when they send interview questions in advance. Participants who receive interview questions in advance can understand the purpose of the study and respond with clarity during the actual interview (Cridland, Jones, Caputi, & Magee, 2015). I explained the background, purpose, and potential benefits of the study. I also told the participants about their rights and roles during the study. Researchers must ensure that the collection of data aligns with the research question and that the participants understand the purpose of the study, and the background of the study (Cridland et al., 2015). I also requested from the participants, who are organizational leaders to provide documents supporting the business strategies they used to successfully develop new products such as internal policies, websites, and other internal records.

Upon the conclusion of the formal interviews, I transcribed the interviews and provided each participant with a summary of their responses for member checking. In member checking, the researcher returns to the participant with their interpretation of the responses to ensure the accuracy of the meaning (Blomberg & Volpe, 2016; Fusch & Ness, 2016). By using member checking, the researchers may reduce the potential for including incorrect data (Roche, Vaterlaus, & Young, 2015). Member checking improves the validity and reliability of the collected data (Vance, 2015). Houghton et al. (2013) suggested that member checking provides credibility and enhances the reliability and validity of the data collected in case studies. In the member checking process, the researcher asks the participants to review and verify that their responses were accurately recorded (Blomberg & Volpe, 2016; Yin, 2014).

## Data Organization Technique

Data organization is critical to enable researchers to locate needed information in an efficient manner (Saunders, Kitzinger, & Kitzinger, 2014). I used a coding system to label and organize participants' data. Qualitative researchers use a coding system to ensure data saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015). I ensured that each participant in the research study has a designated electronic and paper folder for storing of notes generated during the interview. I labeled each participant interviews by a letter and a number distinctively (e.g., P1.) to protect the identity of participants and their organizations. I stored the raw data, and research results, on an encrypted password protected computer flash drive in a fireproof safe following the conclusion of the study to protect participants' confidentiality. I also stored backup data. Yin (2015) noted that researchers must establish adequate measures to secure the collected data during the data collection, data analysis, and data storage process to protect the rights and privacy of the participants. According to Check, Wolf, Dame, and Beskow (2014), researchers who have effective data organization system can manage data more successfully. I used NVivo for proper data management and storage and to improve the accessibility of the data. Data organization is critical to enable researchers to locate needed information in an efficient manner (Saunders et al., 2014). I will destroy all the information relating to this study which I will save for 5 years. Yin (2015) highlighted that destroying documents is a reliable way to ensure the safety of confidential information gathered during research.

## Data Analysis

Yin (2015) recommended a five steps process during the data analysis stage that includes compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpreting, and concluding. According to Yin, this process begins when researchers start gathering the notes, transcriptions, and other research data. I disassembled the collected data into more manageable fragments. The reassembling step includes creating codes and clusters. Researchers achieve data saturation when additional data collection does not result in new information, coding, or theme (Fusch & Ness, 2015). During the data interpretation stage, the researcher may choose to compile, disassemble, and reassemble the data again (Edwards-Jones, 2014). The researcher during the interpretation stage creates narratives from the sequences and groups and makes conclusions (Elo et al., 2014). I conducted in-depth interpretations of the interviews and documents on new product development from the partner organization and make conclusions.

I used methodological triangulation making use of data collected during the interviews and documentation analysis to enhance the reliability and validity of the study. Methodological triangulation is a data analysis tool that requires using two or more sources to validate research data (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2015). Martin (2016) showed that researchers could use methodological triangulation to improve the validity of the findings.

Researchers use data analysis software to reduce errors during the data analysis process. Sotiriadou et al. (2014) recommend that NVivo is a useful tool for identifying key themes, coding, and mind-mapping data. NVivo is a time-saving tool that reduces the human error common in the manual coding and theme selection process (Zamawe, 2015). I used NVivo and followed the five steps process of compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpreting, and concluding as recommended by Yin (2014). The NVivo software also has the word frequency feature, which enabled me to create a word cloud, a treemap, and a cluster analysis to improve the selection of themes and subthemes for the study. Following the five-stage process enabled me to manage the collected data effectively during the data analysis.

## Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are essential elements of research (Konradsen, Kirkevold, & Olson, 2013). A qualitative researcher should address issues of validity and reliability when planning the design of a study (Yin, 2014). To ensure reliability and validity, a researcher must address the dependability, credibility, confirmability, and transferability of qualitative studies (Morse, 2015).

### Reliability

Reliability is the extent of consistency of the results of qualitative research over time (Noble & Smith, 2015). Researchers must focus on the issue of dependability to increase reliability (Harvey, 2015). Dependability is achieved by ensuring transparency during data collection, coding, and analysis, to enable readers trace the results of the findings to the data collected (Wamba et al., 2015). Researchers can achieve the reliability of their findings through the process of member checking (Andraski, Chandler, Powell, Humes, & Wakefield, 2014; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). I used member checking to share my interpretation of the data with participants.

**Validity**

The validity of a study relates to the extent to which the research instrument accurately reflects the underlying issue or phenomenon intended to be measured (Long, 2015). Validity refers to the integrity of the tools, processes, and data collection methods used for research (Leung, 2015). The criteria for establishing validity include creditability, transferability, confirmability, and data saturation (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Researchers gain credibility when readers accept the results of their research (Anney, 2014). I used methodological triangulation to achieve the credibility of my findings. In methodological triangulation, a researcher uses various sources to gather information. The methodological triangulation of data involves the analysis of multiple data sources to obtain corroborating evidence in a research study (Onwuegbuzie, & Byers, 2014). I used member checking to enhance the credibility of my research findings. Martin (2016) showed that researchers could use member checking and methodological triangulation to improve the credibility of their findings.

Transferability refers to the extent to which the findings of the qualitative research will apply to other contexts (Soares, Bastos, Rodrigues, Pereira, & Baptista, 2015). As recommended by Marshall and Rossman (2016), researchers must provide a detailed description of the research context to enable readers to determine the transferability of findings to other contexts. I gave detailed descriptions of the data collection process, data analysis the context of the study and the research findings.

Confirmability refers to the ability of the researcher to demonstrate that the research data represents the participants' responses and not the researchers' biased perspectives (Hussein, 2015). The validity of research findings becomes doubtful when the results of a study are not verifiable (Cope, 2014). According to Childers (2014), researchers enhance confirmability when readers have access to the original report from where they can make conclusions. Member checking is a strategy researchers use to increase confirmability (Fusch, & Ness, 2015). I ensured confirmability by using member checking to validate the interview data for accuracy. I allowed each participant to confirm my interpretations of the interview responses for accuracy.

Data saturation is the point at which no new evidence emerges from the data collection efforts (Fusch & Ness., 2015; Siegle et al., 2014). I continued to conduct added interviews with participants until no more information emerges. Colombo, Froning, Garcia, & Vandelli (2016) noted that a researcher should strive to achieve data saturation when conducting qualitative research. The validity of the research findings is affected when data saturation is not evident (Gibbins, Bhatia, Forbes, & Reid, 2014). I collected data until no new themes emerge from additional interviews or analysis of documents related to the study.

## Transition and Summary

Section 1 included the (a) the background of the problem; (b) problem statement; (c) purpose statement; (d) nature of the study; (e) research question; (f) conceptual framework; (g) operational definitions; (h) assumptions, limitations, and delimitations; (i) significance of the study; and (j) the literature review. Section 2 included the (a) purpose statement, (b) role of the researcher, (c) participants, (d) research method, (e) research design, (f) population and sampling, (g) ethical research, (h) data collection instruments and technique, (i) data organization, (j) data analysis, and (k) reliability and validity. In Section 3, I use the conceptual framework and central research questions as my guide to provide (a) the findings of the study, (b) application to professional practice, (c) implication for social change, (d) recommendations for actions, (e) recommendations for future research, and (f) conclusion.

# Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change

## Introduction

My purpose in this qualitative multiple case study was to explore the strategies that organizational leaders use to successfully develop new products. I conducted three semistructured interviews with three organizational leaders in the south of Nigeria. These organizational leaders must (a) have leadership experience in a business organization, (b) have worked as an organizational leader in the south of Nigeria, and (c) have experience developing new products for their organizations. I collected data including interviews, company documents, observations from participants, and companies' websites using the data collection protocol approved by the Walden University with IRB approval number 11-15-18-0593265. The interviews took place in private meeting rooms at each company's facility.

I recorded the interviews and then transcribed them, and I then coded the results. I used NVivo 11 software to distinguish and analyze major themes from data sources received from participants' interviews. I triangulated the data using the interviews, personal observations, and company documents.

## Presentation of the Findings

The central research question was: What strategies do organizational leaders use in developing new products? Participants responded to interview questions based on their experiences of strategies for successfully developing new products in the south of Nigeria. Participants were organizational leaders in the south of Nigeria. My findings may help organizational leaders to formulate strategies for successfully developing new products for emerging markets. In the presentation of the findings, I labeled the study participants as P1, P2, and P3, and their businesses as B1, B2, and B3 to protect their identities. I used semistructured interviews consisting of seven questions to collect data from three organizational leaders. The average interview time was approximately 45 minutes. During each interview, the participants provided me with supporting company documents. After three interviews, I reached data saturation, where no new information emerged and no further interviews were needed. Once I completed the interviews, I arranged for a later date for member checking. Member checking is the process of letting participants review, confirm, or modify the interpretations made from the data collected in the interview process (Harvey, 2015). I hand transcribed the recordings and wrote summaries for each interview. I went back to the participants for member checking on each participant's approved date. I discussed with participants my interpretations of their responses to account for the member checking process, which could have led to uncovering new data. After reviewing each of the interview questions and participants' responses, I coded the data by using NVivo 11 software features for better clarity of each of the interview questions and answers. I followed the same process, using the NVivo software with the supporting documents and company websites to achieve methodological triangulation. The company documents I reviewed included information on the company vision and mission, meeting notes, and brochures. The themes were (a) leadership and business models, (b) organizational structure and culture, (c) target population and market needs, and (d) affordability.

**Theme 1: Leadership and Business Model**

The three participants each mentioned their professional experience and knowledge of the market as playing an important role in developing the business model that incorporated frugal strategies critical for the successful development of new products for their target markets. P1 and P2 emphasized that their involvement in new product development projects at early stages was critical in securing needed approvals and resources. P2 gave practical support to team members when they introduced new and improved production processes which fostered creativity and cooperation among the team. P1 used a leadership style that enhanced a frugal mindset amongst employees toward resource consumption and production. The findings indicated the importance of leadership and the right business model in new product development projects and are consistent with extant literature. Successful organizations put more emphasis on business model innovations than their peers (Guo, Su, & Ahlstrom, 2016). A leader's knowledge, creativity, and ability to recognize opportunity was critical to success in challenging business environments (Degen, 2018). New product development teams thrive on the visible commitment from the executive team (Demir, 2018).

Critical to the theory of disruptive innovation is that what is disruptive is not the technology, but the business model that enables the creation of value in the marketplace (Gobble, 2016). According to Lehner, Koldeway, and Gausemeier (2018), frugal innovation is not just the new or modified product or service but also the business models adapted to the needs of the poorer populations in developing and emerging countries. The disruptive innovators' focus on their business model rather than the product itself helps them target the mainstream customers successfully in the existing market ultimately eroding the incumbent organizations' market share and then their profitability (Bienenstock, 2016). Data collected from all three participants indicated that new business models were critical in enhancing their ability to develop new products successfully. P2 and P3 changed the selection process for their suppliers, whereas P1 outsourced the production of some components of the yam pounders to local welders. According to Hyypia and Khan (2018), frugal innovation is a creative approach to problem-solving that is user-oriented and requires a holistic rethinking of the underlying business model necessary to create goods and services in resource-constrained environments. Frugal innovation involves a redesign of entire production processes and business models, as well as innovation cycles (Knorringa, Persa, Leliveld & van Beers, 2016). Frugal innovation is a mindset, a process and an outcome in the form of the final products or services (Weyrauch & Herstatt, 2016).

Table 1

*Leadership and Business Model (Frequency)*

| Participants | Interview questions | Total number of references |
|---|---|---|
| P1 | 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 | 9 |
| P2 | 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 | 8 |
| P3 | 1, 2, 5, 6 | 7 |

**Theme 2: Organizational Structure and Culture**

According to Demir (2018), organizations should change their structures to align with their performance objectives. The findings of this study indicated that organizational structure could either be helpful or detrimental to the successful development of new products. All three participants used the term *decentralization* in their description of an ideal organizational structure. The participants also used flexibility, bureaucracy, culture, team, training, sharing, and support in their reference to organizational structure and culture. P1 noted that reducing “excessive bureaucracy’’ enabled creativity in his organization. According to P3, “Decentralized structure constitutes a support framework for employees and allows them to meet personal and organizational goals simultaneously.” P2 stated, “A decentralized organization enables a more dynamic workforce with an innovative lifestyle even during ordinary business.” Decentralization engenders organizational learning. Ability to learn is a vital characteristic of innovative organizations (Salehi & Naseri, 2018). Decentralization allows for a more aggressive strategy toward organizational learning and knowledge sharing across functional teams (Darvishmotevali, 2019). A decentralized structure allows employees a level of freedom for decision making and risk taking within an organization and fosters creativity (Darvishmotevali, 2019). Organizational leaders need to change the employees’ mindsets by changing the organization’s culture (Agnihotri, 2015).

The findings indicated that all three participants encouraged knowledge sharing across the organization and utilized information communication technology (ICT) to enable them to interact effectively and share new ideas and challenges more frequently. P2 noted that his team shared conditions prevalent in the rural communities through mobile apps that better appraised the gaps and opportunities present in the target markets. The project team at B2 often traveled to the rural communities for a first-hand assessment of the conditions and took ample pictures in the process. According to P2, “Whatever pictures they took of either existing products or environmental conditions they immediately shared through a mobile application. Thankfully most of the communities visited had adequate network coverage, and information sharing was made easier.”

Christensen and Raynor (2003) noted that excessive bureaucracy in large firms constituted barriers to disruptive innovations and made them susceptible to threats from new entrants with more flexible structures. Wan et al. (2015) recommended that large corporations wishing to promote disruptive innovation should attempt to foster flexibility by having smaller business units. Autonomous and decentralized structures are crucial for the exploration of new competitive landscapes and knowledge building for successful innovations in emerging market contexts (Hart et al., 2016). An organization’s culture, a core set of attitudes that are shared by members of an organization, is critical to creativity (Wan et al., 2015).

Table 2

*Organizational Structure and Culture (Frequency)*

| Participants | Interview questions | Total number of references |
|---|---|---|
| P1 | 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 | 7 |
| P2 | 1, 2, 3, 6 | 6 |
| P3 | 1, 2, 3, 7 | 6 |

**Theme 3: Target Population and Market Needs**

The three participants indicated that identifying the target population was critical to the success of new product development projects. All three participants said their strategies included targeting the rural areas with alternatives that were cheaper and with enough functionality to be compatible with the local environment. When the products succeeded, P1 and P3 were able to encroach the middle and upper-class segments. P1 stated, “Though we targeted the rural communities and low income slum dwellers in the cities, our products quickly gained popularity, and we gained brand acceptance amongst the richer segments. We now make yam pounders targeted at the rich.” P3 stated, “We are presently working with different state governments in Nigeria to distribute laptops to schools and libraries. Word got around.” P1, however, noted that the strategy was mostly successful with products used within the household. P1 and P3 attested that they targeted other segments based on the successes achieved at the rural areas or urban slums. Ashfaq, Ilyas and Shahid (2018) noted that the middle-class consumers in emerging markets, despite growing income, still have lesser purchasing power compared with Western counterparts and, therefore, seek solutions that are characterized by high value and low costs. The findings support existing knowledge on how frugal innovations ultimately disrupt entire markets. Disruptors move up-market and focus on more attractive customers, an action that ultimately drives the incumbent into smaller markets than it was previously serving (Gans, 2016). Then, finally, the disruptive innovation meets the demands of the most profitable segment and drives the incumbent out of the market (Vázquez Sampere, 2016).

According to Lehner et al. (2018), organizations seeking to succeed in emerging markets must identify customer needs through a thorough analysis and understanding of prevailing economic and infrastructural constraints. Frugal innovation is a creative approach that is user-oriented and provides contextually appropriate solutions (Hyppia & Khan, 2018). Findings indicated that the identification and understanding of the needs of a target market were critical for the successful development of new products for that market. According to P2,

> In our development sessions, we seek to discover technical possibilities that can solve the consumer's problem. We observe customers as they use existing products. We create products that help address the gaps identified. We observe customers again as they use our new creations before final product development.

P1 stated, "Ensuring that our products meet the requirement of our target market is central to success, therefore before a product goes to the market we test with as many consumers as possible." P1 further explained, "We thought reducing the cost of the product was the most important thing for our mostly poor customers. Reducing the features of existing products was the worst strategy. The locals perceived us as fakers with inferior substitutes." P3 established a collaboration system with local partners with a deeper knowledge of the market to ensure a better flow of information on market needs. The idea of engaging with the local customers resonates with Radjou and Euchner (2016) submission that a frugal innovation that is based on a firsthand understanding of the needs of the market is superior to that which is based on simple elimination of features from existing products to meet a cost target. Defeaturing, which might work with underserved segments in developed economies, is usually ineffective in emerging economies. The conditions in the rural areas in emerging economies are distinct from those of developed economies, and organizations need to tailor their products to meet the unique needs of the target population (Adegbile & Sarpong, 2018). Millar et al. (2018) stated that staying close to the customer is not only necessary for the right value creation but is also critical for anticipating their future needs.

Table 3

*Target Population and Market Needs (Frequency)*

| Participants | Interview questions | Total number of references |
|---|---|---|
| P1 | 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 | 7 |
| P2 | 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 | 7 |
| P3 | 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 | 8 |

**Theme 4: Affordability**

According to Mourtzis (2018), affordability was the most important attribute of products and services for emerging markets. The three participants opined that affordability was a major attribute of any successful product. The subthemes noted under affordability were cost, functionality, size, user friendliness, and compatibility with existing local infrastructure. By affordability, the sole aim is not cost minimization through fewer products features or cheaper components, but providing solutions that correctly meet the target customers' need in a particular locality at an acceptable cost (Radjou & Prabhu 2015). Through modularity, organizations can provide products and services that not only meet the customers' need, but are cheap and appropriate for the local conditions (Belkadi et al., 2018). Modules are independently designed subsystems that successfully function as a whole (Ravinshakar, 2016). Winterhalter et al. (2017) asserted that a focus on cost minimization in all value creation elements and a frugal business model architecture is crucial for success in emerging markets.

According to P2, "Our production process was broken down into modules to enable us to choose the most important feature for each target population within our market thereby reducing cost and design time." According to Ravinshakar (2016), an organization's capabilities to improvise and recombine resources within its locality enables it to handle new problems in difficult contexts, and modularity allows the use of original components for multiple projects. Frugal innovation is the intelligent use of resources to develop highly functional products that can be adjusted to meet specific requirements of different markets, which may have different purchasing abilities at an acceptable cost and quality per market (Mourtzis, 2018). P1 noted that through modularity they "eliminated costs associated with over sophistication." P1 also noted that "modularity also allowed us a level of customization. Nigeria is a culturally diverse place and we try as much as possible to recognize that in our product design." The participants also linked product size to affordability in emerging markets. According to P2, products in “economic” sizes and reusable packages enabled them to penetrate low-income earners who are not able to afford the regular sizes and who often found “alternative uses” for the packages. According to P3, “Though the cost was a major consideration for much of our rural customers, durability, ease of use, and reusability are also important for our mostly illiterate customers who typically have large households.”

The participants listed the endemic poverty, illiteracy, bad roads, limited access to financial services, low electrification rates, and high energy costs as the prevailing conditions, which influenced their frugal innovations. P2 developed a new cement that enabled builders to produce concrete blocks with high thermal insulation properties, thereby reducing airconditioning cost during the hot seasons. P1 developed a multipurpose manual food blender to meet the needs of households which struggled with high energy costs or irregular and inefficient power supply. P3 developed and marketed laptops that had high battery power and had its target markets as teachers all over Nigeria who could pay on installment basis through their professional unions. According to P3, “Our offerings are at interest rates lower than prevailing bank rates.” The strategies the three participants used align with Radjou and Prabhu (2015) explanation that a frugal innovation strategy will entail an organization doing more with less which significantly create more value while minimizing the use of scarce resources.

The three participants commented that adopting a frugal strategy in their processes and designs enabled them to dominate their markets with affordable products. The findings support claims in extant literature that the institutional voids in emerging markets constitute a major driver for innovation (Winterhalter et al., 2017). According to Millar, Groth, and Mahon (2018), innovation thrives in a world of volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA) when leaders create context-dependent products. Ashfaq et al. (2018) found that a frugal innovation's disruptiveness lies in significantly cheaper products that are good enough to fulfill basic needs of underserved customers.

The participants explained that though the institutional voids acted as major drivers of frugal innovations, they also constituted major barriers. P1 stated that though they had cheap labor they were often in dire need of qualified personnel. P1 developed a process of hiring the best graduates from the local universities and engaged in active training and retraining on the job to improve their skill level. P2 noted that the poor transportation infrastucture and institutional voids in the country led them to move their production closer to the source of raw material. According to P2 "We developed a distribution system which involved huge investments in haulage to get our supplies and also distribute the final products." In line with comments made by P1 and P2, P3 noted the difficulty in accessing bank credits as a major impediment to financing new product development initiatives. According to P3 "We did tons of paperwork each time we applied for credits, which was not only time consuming but costly for us. Interest rates were high at 14%." P3 noted that they also faced problems with obtaining approvals from standard boards as the procedures mimicked those of developed countries, but without the supporting structures. The statements by the three participants are consistent with extant literature which indicate that the major challenges encountered by organizations in the development of frugal innovations is that of cost and dealing with host governments (Gobble, 2017; Sako 2015).

To overcome challenges posed by institutional voids organizations often engage in bricolage (Ravishankar, 2016). Bricolage refers to organizational resilience and improvisation in the face of institutional voids (Guo et al., 2016). Organizations rely on networking and relationship-based strategies to tackle challenges such as the lack of intermediary and support services, regulatory voids, poor infrastructure and limited finance (Ravishankar, 2016). Collaborations involving bricolage can be mutually beneficial as it improves access to resources (Kwong, Tasavori, & Wun-mei Cheung, 2017). According to P3 “We held several symposia with different professional associations to create demand for our cheaper energy saving laptops. Soon most of them were willing to make initial down payments and basically financed our production.” Leliveld and Knorringa (2018) described frugal innovation as a process that involves not only the actions within an organization but also consumers and middlemen which act to transmit and operationalize the innovations, and effectively creating a demand for them within a society.

Table 4

*Affordability (Frequency)*

| Participants | Interview questions | Total number of references |
|---|---|---|
| P1 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 | 12 |
| P2 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 | 13 |
| P3 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 | 11 |

## Applications to Professional Practice

The findings suggest that nurturing a frugal mindset amongst the workforce, embracing flexibility, and dismantling rigid organizational structures will enable a creative environment within an organization. Organizational leaders can enable a creative environment within their organizations through a well-developed knowledge base fostered by extensive social interaction with the target market. Leaders can leverage the large mobile phone usage in emerging economies to gather information necessary to meet the needs of the highly dynamic emerging market in real time. According to Izogo (2017), mobile phone usage is 91% in Nigeria. Nigeria is an emerging market and has the largest mobile phone market and the fastest growing internet penetration rate in Africa (Dahunsi, 2017). Mobile phones are used in the most rural areas of Nigeria, significantly reducing the cost of information exchanges in real time with the effect of speeding up time to market of cheaper products. One of the biggest boosts to innovation in emerging economies is the fast spread of technologies such as mobile phones, and all the other tools to collect, store, analyze, and share information digitally (Leliveld & Knorringa, 2018). Approximately 70% of the poorest segments in developing countries own a mobile phone (World Bank 2016). Frugal innovations create not only new markets but also target low-end users in saturated markets who do not desire the full performance of existing products and services. Emerging markets characterized by institutional voids are becoming an important source of frugal innovations with the potentials of unlocking mass-market segments of customers with a high aggregate demand (Wan et al., 2015).

Frugal innovations diffuse quickly (Ashfaq et al., 2018). With a frugal business model and innovative collaborations, organizational leaders in emerging markets can turn the resource limitations in their location into significant cost advantages at the global level.

## Implications for Social Change

The successful development of new products is critical for an organization's survival in an emerging market. The findings of this study will help organizational leaders develop the right strategies for new product development. The findings of this study can help organizations with business models that not only allow them to design for the resource-constrained conditions in emerging markets, but also allow them to co-create with the local people. The close collaboration with the local people is expected to contribute to economic development by the increased supply of products and services that address the infrastructural constraints thereby providing the potential for economic activities to become more productive and inclusive.

## Recommendations for Action

The purpose of this study was to identify the strategies used by organizational leaders to successfully develop new products for emerging markets. Organizational leaders in emerging markets should focus on the following four actions: (a) creating a new business model that has frugal innovations at its core (b) developing a flexible organizational structure and an organizational culture that fosters learning and knowledge sharing (c) actively searching for opportunities created by the institutional voids, and (d) having purposeful social interactions with the local people.

The first recommendation for action is for organizational leaders to develop business models that enable frugal innovations in their organizations. Responses from the participants indicate that a business model that involved the rethinking of whole processes that had frugality at its core was a first step to developing successful new products in emerging markets. The participants identified the importance of frugal innovations in emerging markets which involves a rethinking of the business models to successfully develop new products that serve the needs of the target market. Business models for emerging markets entail a strong value proposition through cost reduction and solutions that increase the customer's willingness to pay for them (Winterhalter et al., 2017).

The second recommendation for action is for organizational leaders to foster an organizational structure devoid of bureaucracy and a culture of learning. The three participants shared the importance of flexibility and organizational learning for the successful development of new products. For businesses to make the most of the opportunities in their environment, there must be a fundamental shift in their organizational cultures (Throop & Mayberry, 2017).

The third recommendation for action for organizational leaders is to actively search for opportunities created by the institutional voids in emerging markets. The participants noted that the institutional voids in their operating environments also constituted major drivers for creativity amongst their teams. Organizational leaders can leverage the institutional voids in emerging markets to create potentially disruptive products and services (El Elbrashi & Aziz, 2017).

The fourth recommendation for action is for organizational leaders to actively socialize with the local people as a source of knowledge. The participants noted that they got valuable ideas from their teams' interaction with the target market. According to Angeli and Jaiswal (2016) organizations create the best solutions for emerging markets through active interaction with the local people. I will disseminate the results of this study at business conferences on emerging markets and new product development as well as through scholarly and business journals.

## Recommendations for Further Research

This study is a multiple case study of three organizations in the south of Nigeria. There is a limitation on the transferability of the findings to other contexts or industries, be it in emerging markets or developed countries. Readers should exercise caution in generalizing these findings, although the findings indicate that frugal innovations are best suited for emerging markets. Future researchers using larger data sets could focus on whether there is a trade-off between quality and cost in the production of new products for emerging markets. The findings also indicated that collaboration with the target market was a source of knowledge for the successful development of new products by organizations. Future researchers could explore how organizations could guide their target customers to recognize value in new products.

## Reflections

In my role as a business manager in Nigeria, I witnessed a lot of corporate failures and wondered if Nigeria and other emerging economies would ever live up to their billing as the future of the globalized economy. The DBA program allowed me access to different studies on innovation and most asserted that innovation was a major driver of success in today's dynamic world. The DBA experience proved to be a challenging journey for me as a busy executive, wife, mother, and citizen. However, the benefits of this journey have surpassed both my challenges and expectations. The DBA study provided me with the unique tools and knowledge needed to conduct professional research. In particular, I gained the knowledge to mitigate bias through the use of existing data in peer-reviewed journals. More importantly, I was privileged to conduct a research study on a phenomenon that is current and relevant to business leaders who are facing a business environment of intense competition and rapid changes. The research process and findings of this study strengthened my understanding of the strategies used for the successful development of new products in emerging markets.

## Conclusion

This study adds to the growing body of the scholarly literature which has examined strategies used by organizational leaders to successfully develop new products. The findings of the study indicate that a frugal innovation strategy is critical for the successful development of new products in emerging markets. The findings of the study also indicate that whole new business models which empower employees and focus on building a knowledge base of the local environment through active social interaction with the local people is important for the creation of products which have the potentials to be disruptive. The notion of frugality extends beyond resource-constrained emerging market conditions and could help explain the delivery of affordable and innovative products globally.

References

Acharya, A. S., Prakash, A., Saxena, P., & Nigam, A. (2013). Sampling: Why and how of it. *Indian Journal of Medical Specialties*, *4*, 330-333. doi:10.7713/ijms.2013.0032

Adibe, J. (2014). MINT, re-based GDP, and poverty: A commentary on the identity crisis in Africa's largest economy. *African Journal of Business & Economic Research, 9*, 119-134. Retrieved from http://adonisandabbey.com/

Agarwal, N., Grottke, M., Mishra, S., & Brem, A. (2017). A systematic literature review of constraint-based innovations: State of the art and future perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 64*(1), 3-15. doi:10.1109/tem.2016.2620562

Aghdaie, M. H., & Alimardani, M. (2015). Target market selection based on market segment evaluation: A multiple attribute decision making approach. *International Journal of Operational Research, 24*, 262-292. doi:10.1504/ijor.2015.072231

Agnihotri, A. (2012). Revisiting the debate over the bottom of the pyramid market. *Journal of Macromarketing, 32,* 417-423. doi:10.1177/0276146712451596

Agnihotri, A. (2015). Low-cost innovation in emerging markets. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 23*, 399-411. doi:10.1080/0965254X.2014.970215

Agnihotri, A. (2016). Extending boundaries of blue ocean strategy. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 24*, 519-528. doi:10.1080/0965254X.2015.1069882

Ajagbe, M. A., Isiavwe, D. T., Sholanke, A. B., & Oke, A. O. (2015). *Qualitative inquiry for social sciences*. Paper presented at the International Conference on African Development Issues (CU-ICADI) 2015: Social and Economic Models for

Development Track, 319-325. Retrieved from http://eprints.covenantuniversity.edu.ng

Ajayi, B. (2016). The impact of entrepreneurial orientation and networking capabilities on the export performance of Nigerian agricultural SMEs. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies, 2*(1), 1-23. doi:10.1177/2393957515619720

Appiah-Adu, K., Okpattah, B., & Amoako, G. K. (2017). Building capability for organizational success: An emerging market perspective. *Journal of African Business, 19*(1), 86-104. doi:10.1080/15228916.2017.1346335

Allen, B. J., Chandrasekaran, D., & Basuroy, S. (2018). Design crowdsourcing: The impact on new product performance of sourcing design solutions from the crowd. *Journal of Marketing*, *82*, 106-123. doi:10.1509/jm.15.0481

Andraski, M. P., Chandler, C., Powell, B., Humes, D., & Wakefield, S. (2014). Bridging the divide: HIV prevention research and black men who have sex with men. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*, 708-714. Retrieved from http://ajph.aphapublications.org/

Angeli, F., & Jaiswal, A. K. (2016). Business model innovation for inclusive health care delivery at the bottom of the pyramid. *Organization & Environment*, *29*, 486-507. doi:10.1177/1086026616647174

Anney, N. V. (2014). Ensuring the quality of the findings of qualitative research: Looking at trustworthiness criteria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 5,* 272-281. Retrieved from http://www.jeteraps.scholarlinkresearch.com/

Ardian, S., & Syairudin, B. (2018). Development strategy of culinary business employing the blue ocean strategy (BOS). *IPTEK Journal of Proceedings Series,* 153. doi:10.12962/j23546026.y2018i3.3722

Armstrong, J. (2015). Coordination, triangulation, and language use. *Inquiry, 59*(1), 80-112. doi:10.1080/0020174x.2015.1115270

Ashfaq, F., Ilyas, S., & Shahid, A. (2018). From frugal to reverse innovation: Is the great leap possible? An analysis of diffusion patterns of frugal innovations. *Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies, 8*(1), 22-32. Retrieved from https://gmjacs.bahria.edu.pk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Paper-2.pdf

Atsushi, A., & Shumpei, I. (2015). Criticisms on the innovator's dilemma being in a dilemma. *Annals of Business Administrative Science*, *14*, 231-246. doi:10.7880/abas.14.231

Bailey, L. F. (2014). The origin and success of qualitative research. *International Journal of Market Research, 56*, 167-184. doi:10.2501/ijmr-2014-013

Bakhit, W. (2016). Impact of disruptive innovations on mobile telecom industry in Lebanon. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science, 5*(3), 80-94. doi:10.20525/ijrbs.v5i3.437

Bambale, A. (2014). Research methodological techniques as a model for quantitative studies in Social Sciences. *British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade, 4,* 862-879. doi:10.9734/bjemt/2014/7665

Barnsley, J. (2015). Grounded theology: Adopting and adapting qualitative research methods for feminist theological enquiry. *Feminist Theology, 24*, 109-124. doi:10.1177/0966735015612175

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*, 9-32. doi:10.1080/135943299398410

Belkadi, F., Vlachou, E., Kumar-Gupta, R., Zogopoulos, V., Kaya, M., Bernard, A., … Tekin Bayrak, I. (2018). Modularity as a support for frugal product and supplier network co-definition under regional market constraints: A mirroring hypothesis application. *International Journal of Production Research, 56*, 6575–6590. doi:10.1080/00207543.2018.1481300

Belmont Report. (1979). The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research. Retrieved from http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.html

Bereznoi, A. (2015). Business model innovation in corporate competitive strategy. *Problems of Economic Transition*, *57*(8), 14-33. doi:10.1080/10611991.2014.1042313

Bernard, H. R., & Bernard, H. R. (2013). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication

Black, H. G., & Gallan, A. S. (2015). Transformative service networks: Cocreated value as well-being. *Service Industries Journal, 35*, 826-845. doi:10.1080/02642069.2015.1090978

Blomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2016). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road* *map from beginning to end* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bicen, P., & Johnson, W. H. A. (2015). Radical innovation with limited resources in high-turbulent markets: The role of lean innovation capability. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *24*, 278-299. doi:10.1111/caim.12120

Berterö, C. (2015). Developing qualitative methods-or same old wine in a new bottle. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, *10*(1), 1-2. doi:10.3402/qhw.v10.27679

Bienenstock, M. J. (2016). Did the critique of disruptive innovation apply the right test? *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *57*(3), 27-29. Retrieved from http://disruptiveinnovation.org

Bornstein, M. H., Jager, J., & Putnick, D. L. (2013). Sampling in developmental science: Situations, shortcomings, solutions, and standards. *Developmental Review*, *33*, 357-370. doi:10.1016/j.dr.2013.08.003

Brem, A., & Wolfram, P. (2014). Research and development from the bottom up - introduction of terminologies for new product development in emerging markets. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 3*(1), 9. doi:10.1186/2192-5372-3-9

Bruce, M., Daly, L., & Kahn, K. B. (2007). Delineating design factors that influence the global product launch process. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 24*, 456–470. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5885.2007.00263.x

Bungay, V., Oliffe, J., & Atchison, C. (2016). Addressing underrepresentation in sex work research reflections on designing a purposeful sampling strategy. *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*, 966-978. doi:10.1177/1049732315613042

Chang, W., & Taylor, S. A. (2016). The effectiveness of customer participation in new product development: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marketing, 80*(1), 47–64. doi:10.1509/jm.14.0057

Charles, G., Jeppesen, S., Kamau, P., & Kragelund, P. (2016). Firm-level perspectives on state–business relations in Africa: The food-processing sector in Kenya, Tanzania, and Zambia. *Forum for Development Studies, 44*, 109–131. doi:10.1080/08039410.2016.1252425

Check, D. K., Wolf, L. E., Dame, L. A., & Beskow, L. M. (2014). Certificates of confidentiality and informed consent: Perspectives of IRB chairs and institutionallegal counsel. *IRB: Ethics and Human Research, 36(1),* 1-8.doi:10.1038/gim.2014.102

Childers, S. M. (2014). Promiscuous analysis in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20,* 819-826. doi:10.1177/1077800414530266

Chliova, M., & Ringov, D. (2017). Scaling impact: Template development and replication at the base of the pyramid. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *31*(1), 44-62. doi:10.5465/amp.2015.0010

Christensen, C. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press. Retrieved from http://books.google.com

Christensen, C. M. (2003). *The innovator's dilemma*. New York, NY: Collins.

Christensen, C. M. (2011). *The innovator`s dilemma*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Colombo, T., Froning, H., Garcia, P. J., & Vandelli, W. (2016). Optimizing the data collection time of a large-scale data-acquisition system through a simulation framework. *The Journal of Supercomputing, 72*, 4546-4572. doi:10.1007/s11227-016-1764-1

Cope, D. G. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41*(1), 89-91. doi:10.1188/14.ONF.89-91

Corsi, S., & Di Minin, A. (2014). Disruptive innovation in reverse: Adding a geographical dimension to disruptive innovation theory. *Creativity & Innovation Management*, *23*, 76-90. doi:10.1111/caim.12043

Cortez, N. (2014). Regulating disruptive innovation. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 29,* 175-176. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2436065

Creamer, E. G., & Tendhar, C. (2016). Using inferences to evaluate the value added of mixed methods research: A content analysis. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, *9*(1), 57-72. doi:10.1080/18340806.2015.1129286

Cridland, E. K., Jones, S. C., Caputi, P., & Magee, C. A. (2015). Qualitative research with families living with autism spectrum disorder: Recommendations for conducting semistructured interviews. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, *40*(1), 78-91. doi:10.3109/13668250.2014.964191

Cross, R., Arena, M., Sims, J., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2017). How to catalyze innovation in your organization. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 58*(4), 39-47. Retrieved from http://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/how-to-catalyze-innovation-in-your-organization/

Crowhurst, I. (2013). The fallacy of the instrumental gate? Contextualising the process of gaining access through gatekeepers. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 16*, 463–475. doi:10.1080/13645579.2013.823282

Cumming, D., & Zhang, Y. (2016). Alternative investments in emerging markets: A review and new trends. *Emerging Markets Review, 29*, 1–23. doi:10.1016/j.ememar.2016.08.022

Darvishmotevali, M. (2019). Decentralization and innovative behavior: The moderating role of supervisor support. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership, 8*(1), 31. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/

De Massis, A., & Kotlar, J. (2014). The case study method in family business research: Guidelines for qualitative scholarship. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *5*(1), 15-29. doi:10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.01.007

Degen, R. J. (2018). Cognitive framework of high-growth entrepreneurs in Brazil and reasons why they are rare. *The ISM Journal of International Business, 2*(2), 3-14. Retrieved from https://www.ism.edu/images/ismdocs/ism-journal/ism-journal-2018.pdf

Demir, F. (2018). A strategic management maturity model for innovation. *Technology Innovation Management Review, 8*(11), 13–21. doi:10.22215/timreview/1196

Denison, J. (2016). Social theory and narrative research: A point of view. *Sport, Education and Society, 21*, 7–10. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1076385

Denning, S. (2016). Christensen updates disruption theory. *Strategy & Leadership*, *44*(2), 10-16. doi:10.1108/SL-01-2016-0005

Denning, S. (2017). Strategic agility: Using agile teams to explore opportunities for market-creating innovation. *Strategy & Leadership, 45*(3), 3–9. doi:10.1108/sl-04-2017-0032

Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 6*, 80-88. doi:10.1177?1558689812437186

Dixon, C. S. (2015). Interviewing adolescent females in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 20*, 2067-2077. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu

Dolfsma, W., & Velde, G. (2014). Industry innovativeness, firm size, and entrepreneurship: Schumpeter Mark III? *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, *24*, 713-736. doi:10.1007/s00191-014-0352-x

Doody, O., & Noonan, M. (2013). Preparing and conducting interviews to collect data. *Nurse Researcher*, *20*(5), 28-32. doi:10.7748/nr2013.05.20.5.28. e327

Dos Santos Paulino, V., & Le Hir, G. (2016). Industry structure and disruptive innovations: the satellite industry. *Journal of Innovation Economics, 20*(2), 37. doi:10.3917/jie.020.0037

Dumez, H. (2015). What is a case, and what is a case study? *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology, 127*(1), 43-57. doi:10.1177/0759106315582200

Durantin, A., Fanmuy, G., Miet, S., & Pegon, V. (2016). Disruptive innovation in complex systems. *Complex Systems Design & Management*, 41–56. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-49103-5_4

Edwards-Jones, A. (2014). Qualitative data analysis with NVivo. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 40,* 193-195. doi:10.1080/02607476.2013.866724

El Ebrashi, R., & Aziz, H. H. A. (2017). Strategies for tackling institutional voids at the bottom of the pyramid in Egypt. *African Journal of Business and Economic Research, 12*(2), 43-89. Retrieved from https://journals.co.za

Elo, S., Kaariainen, M., Kanste, O., Polkki, T., Utriainen, K., & Kyngas, H. (2014, January-March). Qualitative content analysis: A focus on trustworthiness. *Sage Open*, *4*(1), 1-10. doi:10.1177/2158244014522633

Emerson, R. W. (2015). Convenience sampling, random sampling, and snowball sampling: How does sampling affect the validity of research? *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, *109*(2), 164-168. Retrieved from http://www.afb.org

Ernst, H., Hoyer, W. D., Krafft, M., & Krieger, K. (2010). Customer relationship management and company performance—the mediating role of new product performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39*, 290–306. doi:10.1007/s11747-010-0194-5

Estelami, H. (2017). The pedagogical and institutional impact of disruptive innovations in distance business education. *American Journal of Business Education, 10*, 97-108. doi:10.19030/ajbe.v10i3.9981

Ernst, H., Kahle, H. N., Dubiel, A., Prabhu, J., & Subramaniam, M. (2015). The antecedents and consequences of affordable value innovations for emerging markets. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *32*, 65-79. doi:10.1111/jpim.12171

Fawcett, S. E., & Waller, M. A. (2015). Designing the supply chain for success at the bottom of the pyramid. *Journal of Business Logistics*. 233-239. doi:10.1111/jbl.12096.

Feng, T., Sun, L., Zhu, C., & Sohal, A. S. (2012). Customer orientation for decreasing time-to-market of new products: IT implementation as a complementary asset. *Industrial Marketing Management, 41*, 929–939. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2011.11.027

Friedrich von, D. E., Freiling, J., & Matzler, K. (2015). Why business model innovations fail. *The Journal of Business Strategy, 36*(6), 29-38. doi:10.1108/jbs-09-2014-0107

Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 20*, 1408-1416. Retrieved from www.http://tqr.nova.edu

Gans, J. S. (2016). Keep calm and manage disruption. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 57*, 83-90. Retrieved from http://sloanreview.mit.edu/

Gauch, S., & Blind, K. (2015). Technological convergence and the absorptive capacity of standardisation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 91*, 236–249. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2014.02.022

Gibbins, J., Bhatia, R., Forbes, K., & Reid, C. M. (2014). What do patients with advanced incurable cancer want from the management of their pain? A qualitative study. *Palliative Medicine, 28*, 71-78. doi:10.1177/0269216313486310

Gobble, M. M. (2016). Defining disruptive innovation. *Research Technology Management*, *59*(4), 66-71. doi:10.1080/08956308.2016.1185347

Gobble, M. M. (2017). Innovation at the bottom of the pyramid. *Research Technology Management, 60*(3), 62-64. doi:10.1080/08956308.2017.1301006

Goyal, S., Sergi, B. S., & Kapoor, A. (2014). Understanding the key characteristics of an embedded business model for the base of the pyramid markets. *Economics and Sociology*, *7*(4), 26-38. doi:10.14254/2071-789X.2014/7-4/2

Govindarajan, V., & Kopalle, P. K. (2006). The usefulness of measuring disruptiveness of innovations ex post in making ex ante predictions. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *23*(1), 12-18. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5885.2005.00176.x

Govindarajan, V., & Trimble, C. (2012). *Reverse innovation: Create far from home, win everywhere*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press Books.

Grossoehme, D. H. (2014). Research methodology. Overview of qualitative research. *Journal of Health Care Chaplaincy, 20*, 109-122. doi:10.1080/08854726.2014.925660

Guégan, D., Hassani, B. K., & Zhao, X. (2014). Emerging countries sovereign rating adjustment using market information: Impact on financial institutions' investment decisions. *Emerging Markets and the Global Economy,* 17–49. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-411549-1.00002-8

Guion, L., Diehl, D., McDonald, D. (2011). Triangulation: Establishing the validity of qualitative studies. *University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences Extension, Publication FCS6014.* Retrieved from http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu

Gummesson, E. (2006). Many-to-many marketing as grand theory. In R. F. Lusch & S. L. Vargo (Eds.), *The service-dominant logic of marketing: Dialog, debate, and directions*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Guo, H., Su, Z., & Ahlstrom, D. (2016). Business model innovation: The effects of exploratory orientation, opportunity recognition, and entrepreneurial bricolage in an emerging economy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 33*, 533–549. doi:10.1007/s10490-015-9428-x

Hafford-Letchfield, T. (2014). Doing a successful research project: Using qualitative and quantitative methods. *Social Work Education, 34*, 244-245. doi:10.1080/02615479.2014.941541

Hang, C. C., Garnsey, E., & Ruan, Y. (2015). Opportunities for disruption. *Technovation, 39*, 4083-4093. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2014.11.005

Hansen, M.W., Langevang, T., Rutashobya, L., & Urassa, G. (2017). Coping with the African business environment: Enterprise strategy in response to institutional uncertainty in Tanzania, *Journal of African Business, 19*(1), 1-26, doi:10.1080/15228916.2017.1330028

Harvey, L. (2015). Beyond member checking: A dialogic approach to the research interview. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 38, 23-38.* doi:10.1080/1743727X.2014.914487

Hart, S., Sharma, S., & Halme, M. (2016). Poverty, business strategy, and sustainable development. *Organization & Environment*, *29*, 401-415. doi:10.1177/1086026616677170

Heirati, N., & O'Cass, A. (2016). Supporting new product commercialization through managerial social ties and market knowledge development in an emerging economy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *33*, 411-433. doi:10.1007/s10490-015-9437-9

Herring, A. D. (2013). Oral history and dalit testimonies: From the ordeal to speak to the necessity to testify. *South Asia Research, 33*(1), 39-55. doi:10.1177/0262728013475542

Himmelheber, S. (2014). Examining the underlying values of food security programming: Implications for the social work profession. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 25*, 116-132. doi:10.1080/10428232.2014.898203

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, *10*, 15–41. doi:10.1080/00208825.1980.11656300

Holtbrugge, D., & Baron, A. (2013). Market entry strategies in emerging markets: An institutional study in the BRIC countries. *Thunderbird International Business Review, 55*, 237-252. doi:10.1002/tie.2154

Hott, B. L., Limberg, D., Ohrt, J. H., & Schmit, M. K. (2015). Reporting results of singlecase studies. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 93,* 412-417. doi:10.1002/jcad.12039

Houghton, C., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2013). Rigour in qualitative casestudy research. *Nurse Researcher*, *20*(4), 12-17. doi:10.7748/nr2013.03.20.4.12.e326

Howe, J. (2008). Crowdsourcing: Why the power of the crowd is driving the future of business. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 26*, 305–306. doi:10.1108/07363760910965918

Hunter, S. T., & Cushenbery, L. (2011). Leading for innovation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 13*, 248–265. doi:10.1177/1523422311424263

Hussein, A. (2015). The use of triangulation in social sciences research: Can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined? *Journal of Comparative Social Work, 4*(1), 1-12. Retrieved from http://journal.uia.no/index.php/JCSW

Hynes, N., & Elwell, A. D. (2016). The role of inter-organizational networks in enabling or delaying disruptive innovation: A case study of mVoIP. *The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 31*, 722-731. doi:10.1108/JBIM-10-2012-0168

Hyypiä, M., & Khan, R. (2018). Overcoming barriers to frugal innovation: Emerging opportunities for Finnish SMEs in Brazilian markets. *Technology Innovation Management Review, 8*(4), 38-48. doi:10.22215/timreview/1151

Isada, F., & Isada, Y. (2017). An empirical study regarding radical innovation, research and development management, and leadership. *Nase Gospodarstvo: NG, 63*(2), 22-31. doi:10.1515/ngoe-2017-0009

Jajja, M. S., Kannan, V. R., Brah, S. A., & Hassan, S. Z. (2017). Linkages between firm innovation strategy, suppliers, product innovation, and business performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 37*, 1054–1075. doi:10.1108/IJOPM-09-2014-0424

Jha, S. K., Parulkar, I., Krishnan, R. T., & Dhanaraj, C. (2016). Developing new products in emerging markets. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *57*(3), 55-62. Retrieved from http://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/developing-new-products-in-emerging-markets/

Johnson, B. (2014). Ethical issues in shadowing research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 9*(1), 21-40. doi:10.1108/QROM-09-2012-1099

Johnson, E. I., & Esterling, B. A. (2015). Coping with confinement: Adolescents'experiences with parental incarceration. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 30*, 244-267. doi:10.1177/0743558414558593

Johnson, M. R. (2016). Information technology implementation in service enhancement: A qualitative case study. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice, 6*(7), 67-69. doi:10.5430/jnep.v6n7p67

Joshi, M. P., Das, S. R., & Mouri, N. (2015). Antecedents of innovativeness in technology-based services (TBS): Peering into the black box of entrepreneurial orientation. *Decision Sciences*, *46*, 367-402. doi.10.1111/deci.12126

Jung, J., Jacobs, C., Pfaff, H., Lehner, B., Driller, E., Nitzsche, A., Stieler-Lorenz, B., (2013). The influence of transformational leadership on employee well-being: Results from a survey of companies in the information and communication technology sector in Germany. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *55*, 772-778. doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e3182972ee5

Kaczynski, D., Salmona, M., & Smith, T. (2014). Qualitative research in finance.

*Australian Journal of Management*, *39*(1), 127-135. doi:10.1177/0312896212469611

Kazadi, K., Lievens, A., & Mahr, D. (2015). Stakeholder co-creation during the innovation process: Identifying capabilities for knowledge creation among multiple stakeholders. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*, 525-540. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.05.009

Karimi, J., & Walter, Z. (2015). The role of dynamic capabilities in responding to digital disruption: A factor-based study of the newspaper industry. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 32*(1), 39-81. doi:10.1080/07421222.2015.1029380

Keenan, J., Poland, F., Wilson, P., Mathie, E., Boote, J., Varley, A., . . . Munday, D. (2017). Research design boundaries for qualitative research, stakeholder and patient and public involvement, and why they matter. *BMJ Open, 7*(Suppl. 2). doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016492.40

Khan, S. N. (2014). Qualitative research method: Grounded theory. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *9*, 224-225. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v9n11p224.

Khandelwal, A. K. (2007). Moving HRD from the periphery to the centre for transformation of an Indian public sector bank: Keynote address, 4th Asian conference of the academy of HRD. *Human Resource Development International, 10*, 203–213. doi:10.1080/13678860701347172

King, A. A., & Baatartogtokh, B. (2015). How useful is the theory of disruptive innovation? *MIT Sloan Management Review, 57*(1), 77-90. Retrieved from http://mitsmr.com/1LezH20

Kivenzor, G. (2015). Developing and marketing new products in the multicultural global environment: Recognizing and managing risks. *Journal of Management and Training for Industries*, *2*(1), 1–26. doi:10.12792/jmti.2.1

Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. (2005). Blue ocean strategy: How to create uncontested market space and make competition irrelevant. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Knorringa, P., Peša, I., Leliveld, A., & van Beers, C. (2016). Frugal innovation and development: Aides or adversaries? *European Journal of Development Research*, *28*(2), 143–153. doi:10.1057/ejdr.2016.3

Konradsen, H., Kirkevold, M., & Olson, K. (2013). Recognizability. A strategy for assessing external validity and for facilitating knowledge transfer in qualitative research. *Advances in Nursing Science, 36*(2), E66-E76. doi:10.1097/ANS.0b013e318290209d

Kotabe, M., Jiang, C. X., & Murray, J. Y. (2017). Examining the complementary effect of political networking capability with absorptive capacity on the innovative performance of emerging-market firms. *Journal of Management*, *43*, 1131-1156. doi:10.1177/0149206314548226

Kotler, P., Keller, K. L., Ancarani, F., & Costabile, M. (2014). Marketing Management (14th edition) Pearson.

Kruth, J. G. (2015). Five qualitative research approaches and their applications in parapsychology 1. *The Journal of Parapsychology, 79*, 219-233. Retrieved from https://www.rhine.org

Kuronen, T. (2014). Visual discourse analysis in historical research: A case of visual archaeology? *Management & Organizational History, 10*(1), 52-70. doi:10.1080/17449359.2014.989233

Kwong, C., Tasavori, M., & Wun-mei Cheung, C. (2017). Bricolage, collaboration and mission drift in social enterprises. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *29*, 609–638. doi:10.1080/08985626.2017.1328904

Leach, M., Rockström, J., Raskin, P., Scoones, I., Stirling, A. C., Smith, A., Olsson, P. (2012), Transforming innovation for sustainability, *Ecology and Society, 17* (2), doi:10.5751/ES-04933-170211

Leavy, B. (2017). Two strategies for innovating in the face of market disruption. *Strategy & Leadership, 45*(4), 9-18. doi:10.1108/SL-05-2017-0051

Leavy, B. (2018). Value innovation and how to successfully incubate blue ocean initiatives. *Strategy & Leadership, 46*(3), 10-20. doi:10.1108/SL-02-2018-0020

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2013). *Practical research: Planning and design* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Lehner, A., Koldewey, C., & Gausemeier, J. (2018). Approach for a pattern-based development of frugal innovations. *Technology Innovation Management Review, 8*(4), 14-27. doi:10.22215/timreview/1149

Leung, L. (2015). Validity, reliability, and generalizability in qualitative research.

*Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 4*, 324-327. doi:10.4103/2249-4863.161306

Long, H. (2015). Validity in mixed methods research in education: the application of Habermas' critical theory. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education,* 1-13. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/1743727X.2015.1088518

Mahnaz, S., Bahramnezhad, F., Fomani, F. K., Mahnaz, S., & Cheraghi, M. A. (2014). Ethical challenges of researchers in qualitative studies: The necessity to develop a specific guideline. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine, 7(*14*),* 1-6. Retrieved from http://www.jmehm.tums.ac.ir/index.php/jmehm/index

Manning, J., & Kunkel, A. (2013). *Researching interpersonal relationships: Qualitative methods, studies, and analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marrone, S. R. (2016). Informed consent examined within the context of culturally congruent care: An interprofessional perspective. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 7*, 342-348. doi:10.1177/1043659615569537

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research?: A review of qualitative interviews in is research. *The Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *54*(1), 11-22. Retrieved from http://www.iacis.org

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin, M. (2016). *Strategies to retain employees in the insurance industry*. *Scholar*

*Wor*ks. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/2847

Massa, L., & Tucci, C.L. (2014). *Business model innovation*. In The Oxford Handbook of Innovation Management, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199694945.013.002

McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Vargo, S. L., Dagger, T. S., Sweeney, J. C., & vanKasteren, Y. (2012). Health care customer value cocreation practice styles. *Journal of Service Research, 15*, 370–389. doi:10.1177/1094670512442806

McCusker, K., & Gunaydin, S. (2015). Research using qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods and choice based on the research. *Perfusion, 30*, 537-542. doi:10.1177/0267659114559116

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Meseko, A. A. (2014). The influence of disruptive innovations in a cardinally changing world economy. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, *5*(4), 24-27. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu

Michailova, S., & Zhan, W. (2015). Dynamic capabilities and innovation in MNC subsidiaries. *Journal of World Business, 50*, 576-583. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2014.10.001

Millar, C. C. J. M., Groth, O., & Mahon, J. F. (2018). Management Innovation in a VUCA world: Challenges and recommendations. *California Management Review*, *61*(1), 5–14. doi:10.1177/0008125618805111

Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G. (2014). Nations versus religions: Which has a stronger effect on societal values? *Management International Review (MIR)*, *54*, 801-824. doi:10.1007/s11575-014-0205-8

Mishra, S., & Nigam, R. (2015). Understanding the relationship between CSR and business performance. *Global Journal of Enterprise Information System*, *7*(3), 54-57. doi:10.18311/gjeis/2015/6579

Mitchell, K. R., & Wellings, K. (2013). Measuring sexual function in community surveys: Development of a conceptual framework. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(1), 17-28. doi:10.1080/00224499.2011.621038

Mourtzis, D. (2018). Design of customised products and manufacturing networks: towards frugal innovation. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing, 31*, 1161–1173. doi:10.1080/0951192X.2018.1509131

Morse, J. M. (2015a). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research*, *25*, 1212-1222. doi:10.1177/1049732315588501

Morse, J. M. (2015b). Data were saturated . *Qualitative Health Research*, *25*, 587-588. doi:10.1177/1049732315576699

Morse, J. M., & Cheek, J. (2014). Making room for qualitatively-driven mixed-method research. *Qualitative Health Research*, *24*, 3–5. doi:10.1177/1049732313513656

Morse, W. C., Lowery, D. R., & Steury, T. (2014). Exploring saturation of themes and spatial locations in qualitative public participation geographic information systems research. *Society & Natural Resources*, *27*, 557-571.

doi:10.1080/08941920.2014.888791

Morse, J. M., & Coulehan, J. (2015). Maintaining confidentiality in qualitative publications. *Qualitative Health Research*, *25*, 151-152. doi:10.1177/1049732314563489

Mumford, M. D., & Gibson, C. (2011). Developing leadership for creative efforts. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 13*, 243–247. doi:10.1177/1523422311425003

Nagy, D., Schuessler, J., & Dubinsky, A. (2016). Defining and identifying disruptive innovations. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *57,* 119-126. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.11.017

Nakata, C., & Antalis, E. (2015). Enhancing market exchanges at the base of the pyramid. *International Marketing Review, 32*, 762–782. doi:10.1108/imr-07-2015-0172

Nam, S. H. (2015). Why disruptive innovations matter in laboratory diagnostics. *Clinical Chemistry, 61*, 935-937. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2014.235358

National Institutes of Health, Office of Extramural Research. (2012). *Protecting human research participants* [Online training course]. Retrieved from http://phrp.nihtraining.com/

Nica, A., Stancu, I., & Stancu, D. (2017). Innovation. an instrument for development of companies. *Amfiteatru Economic, 19*, 509-527. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=524867

Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research.

*Evidence Based Nursing*, *18*(2), 34-35. doi:10.1136/eb-2015-102054

Nogami, V. C., & Veloso, A. R. (2017). Disruptive innovation in low-income contexts: challenges and state-of-the-art national research in marketing. *RAI Revista De Administração E Inovação*, *14,* 162-167. doi:10.1016/j.rai.2017.03.005

Noronha, E., Premilla D'Cruz, & Lateef, M. U. (2018). Navigating embeddedness: Experiences of Indian IT suppliers and employees in the Netherlands. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 1-19. doi:10.1007/s10551-018-4071-3

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *42*, 533-544. doi:10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Pandit, D., Joshi, M. P., Sahay, A., & Gupta, R. K. (2018). Disruptive innovation and dynamic capabilities in emerging economies: Evidence from the Indian automotive sector. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 129*, 323-329. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.09.035

Park, J. & Park, M. (2016). Qualitative versus quantitative research methods: Discovery or justification? *Journal of Marketing Thought, 3(1)*, 1-7. doi:10.15577/jmt.2016.03.01.1

Patton, M.Q. (2015) *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pérez, L., Dos Santos Paulino, V., & Cambra-Fierro, J. (2017). Taking advantage of disruptive innovation through changes in value networks: insights from the space industry. *Supply Chain Management*, *22*(2), 97-106. doi:10.1108/SCM-01-2017-0017

Podmetina, D., Volchek, D., & Smirnova, M. (2015). The relationship between innovation and internationalisation in a turbulent environment. *International Journal of Technology Marketing, 10*, 326-326. doi:10.1504/ijtmkt.2015.070648

Powell, S., Olivier, B., & Yuan, L. (2015). Handling disruptive innovations in HE: Lessons from two contrasting case studies. *Research in Learning Technology, 23,* 1-14. doi:10.3402/rlt.v23.22494

Portugal, E., & Yukl, G. (1994). Perspectives on environmental leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 5*, 271–276. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90017-5

Prahalad, C. (2002). Strategies for the bottom of the economic pyramid: India as a source of innovation. *Reflections*, *3*(4), 6-17. doi:10.1162/152417302760127192

Prahalad, C. K. (2005). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: Eradicating poverty through profits*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing.

Prahalad, C. K. (2011). Bottom of the pyramid as a source of breakthrough innovations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 29*(1), 6–12. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5885.2011.00874.x

Prahalad, C. K. (2012). Bottom of the pyramid as a source of breakthrough innovations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *29*, 6-12. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5885.2011.00874.x

Prahalad, C. K. (2014). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: Eradicating poverty through profits.* (Revised and Updated 5th Anniversary Editions). Upper Saddle

River, NJ: Prentice Hall

Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). *The future of competition: Co-creating unique value with customers*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Radjou, N., & Euchner, J. (2016). The principles of frugal innovation. *Research Technology Management, 59*(4), 13-20. doi:10.1080/08956308.2016.1185339

Radojević, N. (2015). Reverse innovation reconceptualized: much geo-economic ado about primary market shift. *Management International, 19*(4), 70. doi:10.7202/1043077ar

Raeburn, T., Schmied, V., Hungerford, C., & Cleary, M. (2015). The contribution of case study design to supporting research on clubhouse psychosocial rehabilitation. *BMC Research Notes, 8*(1), 1-7. doi:10.1186/s13104-015-1521-1

Raschke, R. L., Krishen, A. S., Kachroo, P., & Maheshwari, P. (2013). A combinatorial optimization based sample identification method for group comparisons. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*, 1267-1271. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.024

Rask, M. (2014). Internationalization through business model innovation: In search of relevant design dimensions and elements. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, *12*(2), 146-161. doi:10.1007/s10843-014-0127-3

Rastogi, C. (2018). M-Kopa Solar: Lighting up the dark continent. *South Asian Journal of Business & Management Cases*, *7*(2), 93–103. doi:10.1177/2277977918774648

Ravishankar, M. N. (2016). A bricolage perspective on technological innovation in emerging markets. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *63*(1), 53–66. doi:10.1109/TEM.2015.2494501

Reardon, D. C., Wright, D., & Malone, E. A. (2017). Quest for the happy ending to mass effect 3: The challenges of cocreation with consumers in a post-certeauian age. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 26*, 42-58. doi:10.1080/10572252.2016.1257742

Reinhardt, R., & Gurtner, S. (2011). Enabling disruptive innovations through the use of 135 customer analysis methods. *Review of Managerial Science*, *5*, 291-307. doi:10.1007/s11846-011-0069-2

Reinhardt, R., Gurtner, S., & Griffin, A. (2018). Towards an adaptive framework of low-end innovation capability – A systematic review and multiple case study analysis. *Long Range Planning*, *51*, 770–796. doi:10.1016/j.lrp.2018.01.004

Revilla, A. J., & Fernández, Z. (2012). The relation between firm size and R&D productivity in different technological regimes. *Technovation*, *32*, 609-623. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2012.06.004

Rizo, C. F., Macy, R. J., Ermentrout, D. M., O'Brien, J., Pollock, M. D., & Dababnah, S. (2015). Research with children exposed to partner violence: Perspectives of service-mandated, CPS-and court-involved survivors on research with their children. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1-29. doi:10.1177/0886260515596534

Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *11*, 25-41. doi:10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

Robinson, G., Morgan, J., & Reed, W. (2016). Disruptive innovation in higher education:

The professional doctorate. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 6*(1), 85-89. doi:10.7763/IJIET.2016.V6.664

Roche, C., Vaterlaus, M., & Young, J. A. (2015). A foster care alumna's past and present technological experience: A feminist case study approach. *Sage Open, 5*(2), 1-9. doi:10.1177/2158244015584946

Rottig, D. (2016). Institutions and emerging markets: Effects and implications for multinational corporations. *International Journal of Emerging Markets, 11*(1), 2-17. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/loi/ijoem

Roy, K., Zvonkovic, A., Goldberg, A., Sharp, E., & LaRossa, R. (2015). Sampling richness and qualitative integrity: Challenges for research with families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 77*, 243-260. doi:10.1111/jomf.12147

Sako, M. (2015). Competing in emerging markets. *Communications of the Association for Computing Machinery*, *58*(4), 27-29. doi:10.1145/2736289

Sandström, C., Berglund, H., & Magnusson, M. (2014). Symmetric assumptions in the theory of disruptive innovation: Theoretical and managerial implications. *Creativity & Innovation Management, 23*, 472-483. doi:10.1111/caim.12092

Savva, M. (2013). International schools as gateways to the intercultural development of North-American teacher. *Journal of Research in International Education, 12*, 214-227. doi:10.1177/1475240913512589

Sarma, S. K. (2015). Qualitative research: Examining the misconceptions. *South Asian Journal of Management*, *22*, 176-191. Retrieved from http://www.sajmamdisa.org

Saunders, B., Kitzinger, J., & Kitzinger, C. (2014). Anonymizing interview data: Challenges and compromise in practice. *Qualitative Research, 14,* 1-17. doi:10.1177/1468794114550439

Scannella, E., (2015). What drives the disintegration of the loan origination value chain in the banking business. *Business Process Management Journal*, *21*, 288-311. doi:10.1108/bpmj-02-2014-0017

Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1934). The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest and the business cycle, Harvard University Press, Cambridge: MA.

Sears, J., & Hoetker, G. (2013). Technological overlap, technological capabilities, and resource recombination in technological acquisitions. *Strategic Management Journal, 35*(1), 48–67. doi:10.1002/smj.2083

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Senyard, J., Baker, T., Steffens, P., & Davidsson, P. (2014). Bricolage as a path to innovativeness for resource-constrained new firms. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 31,* 211-230. doi:10.1111/jpim.12091

Seong, S., Kim, Y., & Szulanski, G. (2015). Leadership, innovation, and strategic change. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *24*, 370-381. doi:10.1177/1056492615572385

Shafie, S. B., Siti-Nabiha, A. K., & Cheng Ling, T. (2014). Organizational culture, transformational leadership and product innovation: A conceptual review. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, *7*30-43. Retrieved from http://www.ijoi-online.org/images/stories/SpecialIssues/OrganizationalInnovationStrategies.pdf#page=30

Shahin, A., Barati, A., & Geramian, A. (2017). Determining the critical factors of radical innovation using an integrated model of fuzzy analytic hierarchy process-fuzzy kano with a case study in Mobarakeh steel company. *Engineering Management Journal, 29* (2), 74-86. doi:10.1080/10429247.2017.1298182

Sharma, A., & Iyer, G. R. (2012). Resource-constrained product development: Implications for green marketing and green supply chains. *Industrial Marketing Management, 41*, 599–608. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2012.04.007

Sharma, A., & Jha, S. (2016). Innovation from emerging market firms: What happens when market ambitions meet technology challenges? *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 31*, 507–518. doi:10.1108/jbim-12-2014-0265

Sharma, M. S., & Halvadia, N. B. (2015). Measuring service quality of internet banking portal in India. *Annals of Management Science, 4*(2), 29-51. doi:10.24048/ams4.no2.2015-29

Sharma, T., & Ghosh, T. (2015). Cognizant India: Reinventing the value proposition. *Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies*, *5*(8), 1-35. doi:10.1108/eemcs-11-2014-0271

Sheth, J. N. (2011). Impact of emerging markets on marketing: rethinking existing perspectives and practices. *Journal of Marketing, 75*, 166–182. doi:10.1509/jmkg.75.4.166

Shorten, A., & Moorley, C. (2014). Selecting the sample. *Evidence Based Nursing*, *17*(2), 32-33. doi:10.1136/eb-2014-101747

Siegle, D., Rubenstein, L. D., & Mitchell, M. S. (2014). Honors students' perceptions of their high school experiences: The influence of teachers on student motivation. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *58*(1), 35-50. doi:10.1177/0016986213513496

Simester, D. (2016). Why great new products fail. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 57*(3), 33-39. doi:10.13007/601

Simmonds, D., & Tsui, O. (2010). Effective design of a global leadership programme. *Human Resource Development International, 13*, 519–540. doi:10.1080/13678868.2010.520478

Singh, A. S. (2014). Conducting case study research in non-profit organisations. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal, 17*(1), 77-84. doi:10.1108/QMR-04-2013-0024

Singh, A., & Kathuria, L. M. (2017). Role of innovation in social value creation at bottom of the pyramid. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research, 13*(1), 68. doi:10.1504/ijbir.2017.10003887

Sloan, A., & Bowe, B. (2013). Phenomenology and hermeneutic phenomenology: The philosophy, the methodologies, and using hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate lecturers' experiences of curriculum design. *Quality & Quantity, 48,* 1291-1303. doi:10.1007/s11135-013-9835-3

Smith, A. (2016). Data collection dangers. *ITNOW*, 57(1), 10-12. doi:10.1093/itnow/bwv004

Soares, D. J. P., Bastos, J., Rodrigues, D. R. G., Pereira, J. P. G. T., & Baptista, A. J. C. (2015). Lean management methods in product development- A case study based on human respect with productivity focus. International Journal of Lean Enterprise Research, 1, 393-411. doi:10.1504/IJLER.2015.076659

Sotiriadou, P., Brouwers, J., & Le, T.-A. (2014). Choosing a qualitative data analysis tool: A comparison of NVivo and Leximancer. *Annals of Leisure Research*, *17*, 218-234. doi:10.1080/11745398.2014.902292

Sparks, C. (2014). Deconstructing the BRICS. *International Journal of Communication 8*, 392-418. Retrieved from http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/search/search

Story, V. M., Boso, N., & Cadogan, J. W. (2015). The form of relationship between firm-level product innovativeness and new product performance in developed and emerging markets. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *32*, 45-64. doi:10.1111/jpim.12180

Sweeney, P. (2014). Emerging markets go organic: Does organizational culture impact market responsiveness and firm performance? *Academy of Management Perspectives, 28*(2), 10–12. doi:10.5465/amp.2014.0064

Teeuw, W., Slot, D., Susanto, H., Gerdes, V., Abbas, F., D'Aiuto, F., . . . Loos, B. (2014). Treatment of periodontitis improves the atherosclerotic profile: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology, 41*, 70-79. doi:10.1111/jcpe.1217179

Tellis, G. J. (2006). Disruptive technology or visionary leadership? *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 23*(1), 34–38. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5885.2005.00179.x

Tetnowski, J. (2015). Qualitative case study research design. *Perspect Fluen Fluen Disord, 25*(1), 39-39. doi:10.1044/ffd25.1.39

Throop, W., & Mayberry, M. (2017). Leadership for the sustainability transition. *Business & Society Review 122*, 221–250. doi:10.1111/basr.12116

Tinoco, J. K., & Ambrose, S. C. (2017). Collaborative customers and partners: The ups and downs of their influence on firm technology competence for new product development. *Journal of Marketing Development & Competitiveness*, *11*(4), 66–78. Retrieved from http://www.na-businesspress.com/JMDC/jmdcscholar.html

Tomofumi, T., & Junichi, T. (2015). Disruptive innovation: A case of full mold casting. *Annals of Business Administrative Science, 14*, 109-126. doi:10.7880/abas.14.109

Trajković, A., & Milošević, I., (2016) Model to determine the economic and other effects of standardisation – a case study in Serbia. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 29*, 673-685, doi:10.1080/14783363.2016.1225496

Tsang, E. W. (2014). Generalizing from research findings: The merits of case studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 16*, 369–383. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12024

UNICEF. (2013). *At a glance: Nigeria.* Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org /infobycountry/nigeria_statistics.html

165

United Nations. (2013). *World population prospectus: The 2012 revision: Volume II: Demographic profiles*. Retrieved from http://esa.un.org/wpp/Documentation/pdf

/WPP2012_Volume-II-Demographic-Profiles

United States Central Intelligence Agency. (2014). *Central Intelligence Agency: The world factbook*. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov

UNO (2013). *World Economic Situation and Prospects*. New York, NY: UN Publication

Urmson, N. (2012). Africa: A case for investment. *Accountancy SA*, 18–19. Retrieved from https://www.accountancysa.org.za/

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2014). *Informed consent information sheet.* Retrieved from http://www.hhs.gov

Van Bochoven, L. (2016). Industry and policy: Partnerships in disruptive times. *Connections: The Quarterly Journal, 15*(2), 19-29. doi:10.11610/Connections.15.2.02

Vance, C. D. (2015). Decision-making considerations for mid-career army officers to pursue master's degrees. *Adult Learning, 26*, 109-115. doi:10.1177/1045159515583260

Vázquez Sampere, J. P. (2016). Missing the mark on disruptive innovation. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *57*(3), 26. Retrieved from https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/debating-disruptive-innovation/

Vázquez Sampere, J. P., Bienenstock, M. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2016). Debating disruptive innovation. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 57*(3), 26-30. https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/debating-disruptive-innovation/

Vernon, F. (2015). The diversity project: An ethnography of social justice experiential education programming. *Ethnography and Education, 11,* 298-315.

doi:10.1080/17457823.2015.1101380

Vertakova, Y. V., Rudakova, O. V., Shadrina, V. V., Kobersy, I. S., & Belova, I. N. (2016). Strategy of disruptive innovation in emerging regional markets: Factors of success and failure. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 6*, 274-279. Retrieved from http://www.econjournals.com/index.php/ijefi.

Vila, C., & Albiñana, J. C. (2016). An approach to conceptual and embodiment design within a new product development lifecycle framework. *International Journal of Production Research, 54*, 2856-2874. doi:10.1080/00207543.2015.1110632

Vinarski-Peretz, H., & Carmeli, A. (2011). Linking care felt to engagement in innovative behaviors in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological conditions. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 5*(1), 43–53. doi:10.1037/a0018241

Von Contzen, E., & Alders, M. (2015). Collective experience in narrative: Conclusions and proposals. *Narrative*, *23*, 226-229. doi:10.1353/nar.2015.0012

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 17–24. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.62.1.17

Wahyuni, D. (2012). The research design maze: Understanding paradigms, cases, methods, and methodologies. *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, *10*(1), 69-80. Retrieved from http://maaw.info/JAMAR.htm

Wall, L. K., & Pentz, R. D. (2015). Another look at the informed consent process: The document and the conversation. *Cancer, 122,* 352-354. doi:10.1002/cncr.29760

Wan, F., Williamson, P. J., & Yin, E. (2015). Antecedents and implications of disruptive innovation: Evidence from China. *Technovation, 39-40*, 94–104. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2014.05.012

Webb, J. R. (2016). Scrapping new product development efforts: When to keep going, when to fold. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *37*(4), 32-40. doi:10.1108/JBS-09-2014-0104

Weeks, M. R. (2015). Is disruption theory wearing new clothes or just naked? Analyzing recent critiques of disruptive innovation theory. *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice*, *17*, 417-428. doi:10.1080/14479338.2015.1061896

Weyrauch, T., & Herstatt, C. (2016). What is frugal innovation? three defining criteria. *Journal of Frugal Innovation, 2*(1), 1-17. doi:10.1186/s40669-016-0005-y

Winterhalter, S., Zeschky, M. B., & Gassmann, O. (2016). Managing dual business models in emerging markets: An ambidexterity perspective. *Research and Development Management. 43*, 464-479. doi:10.1111/radm.12151

Winterhalter, S., Zeschky, M. B., Neumann, L., & Gassmann, O. (2017). Business models for frugal innovation in emerging markets: The case of the medical device and laboratory equipment industry. *Technovation*, *66*, 3-13. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2017.07.002

World Bank. (2013). *Africa continues to grow strongly despite global slowdown, although significantly less poverty remains elusive*. Retrieved from http://www.worldbank.org

World Bank. (2014a). *GDP ranking: Data*. Retrieved from http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/GDP-ranking-table

World Bank. (2014b). *How we classify countries*. Retrieved from http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications

World Bank. (2014c). *Sub-Saharan Africa (developing only): Data*. Retrieved from http://data.worldbank.org/region/sub-saharan-africa

World Bank. (2014d). *Foreign direct investment, net inflows.* Retrieved from http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.KLT.DINV.CD.WD

World Bank. (2016). Retrieved from http://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2016

World Bank. (2017). Retrieved from http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria/overview

World Resource Institute, International Finance Corporation, and World Bank Group (2007). *The next 4 billion: Market size and business strategy at the base of the pyramid*. Retrieved from http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/as_ext_content /what+we+do/inclusive+business/publications/pub_009_the+next+4+billion+market+size+and+business+size+at+the+base+of+the+pyramid

Xie, X., Zeng, S., Zang, Z., & Zou, H. (2017). Identifying the factors determining cooperative innovation effect in emerging economies. *Chinese Management Studies*, *11*, 366-386. doi:10.1108/CMS-01-2017-0013

Xu, C., & Yan, M. (2014). Radical or incremental innovations: R&D investment around CEO retirement. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, *29*, 547-576. doi:10.1177/0148558X14538970

Yang, F., & Zhang, H. (2018). The impact of customer orientation on new product development performance. *International Journal of Productivity & Performance Management*, *67*, 590-607. doi:10.1108/IJPPM-08-2016-0166

Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation, 19*, 321-332. doi:10.1177/1356389013497081

Yin, R. K. (2015). *Qualitative research from start to finish* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press

Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zalan, T., & Toufaily, E. (2017). The promise of Fintech in emerging markets: Not as disruptive. *Contemporary Economics, 11*, 415-430. doi:10.5709/ce.1897-9254.253

Zamawe, F. C. (2015). The implication of using NVivo Software in qualitative data analysis: Evidence-based reflections. *Malawi Medical Journal, 27(1),* 13-15. doi:10.4314/mmj. v27i1.4

Zeschky, M., Winterhalter, S., & Gassmann, O. (2014a). Organising for reverse innovation in Western MNCs: the role of frugal product innovation capabilities. *International Journal of Technology Management, 64* (2/3/4), 255-275. doi:10.1504/IJTM.2014.059948

Zeschky, M., Winterhalter, S., & Gassmann, O. (2014b). From cost to frugal and reverse innovation: Mapping the field and implications for global competitiveness. *Resource Technology Management, 57*(4), 20-27. doi:10.1504/IJTM.2014.059948

Zucker, D. (2014). The Belmont report. *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics reference online*. doi:10.1002/9781118445112.stat06924

# Appendix A: Interview Protocol

The purpose of these interviews is to obtain data and insights regarding the strategies used by organizational leaders to successfully develop new products in an emerging market.. I will adhere to the following protocol to ensure consistency and quality:

1. I will begin by introducing myself as a Walden University doctoral student and provide information describing the purpose of the study and the estimated time of 45 minutes. for the interview session.

2. I will provide two copies of the consent form to the participant for their review and signature, and offer them a chance to ask any questions they may have prior to signing. Once signed, I will give one of the two copies back to the participant.

3. I will ask permission to record the interview, with a reminder that the participant may terminate the interview at any time for any reason.

4. I will begin recording, noting the date and time, and request verbal permission from the participant to proceed with recording the interview.

5. I will commence with the interview questions from Appendix A, using the exact wording and order for each participant, to ensure quality and consistency.

6. After obtaining responses to all the interview questions, I will conclude the interview by thanking the participant and stopping the recording. I will remind the participant of my responsibility to protect their identity and the identity of the organization they represent, and that I will be keeping all data for a period of five years in a safe for which only I have the key or combination.

7. I will request that the interviewee participate in member checking the synthesis of the transcripts via email, telephone, or in person.

# Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. What are your strategies for developing new products in an emerging market?

2. How do you assess the effectiveness of the strategies for developing new products in your organization?

3. What particular strategy do you consider most crucial for the successful development of new products?

4. Why do you consider the strategy as the most crucial for the successful development of new products?

5. What were the key barriers to implementing your strategies for new product development?

6. How did you address the key barriers to implementing your strategies for new product development?

7. What additional information would you like to share regarding the successful development of new products?