How to Cite:
Peter, O. N., Uzor, O. H., & Judith, A. (2022). Impact of product maturity on competitive advantage: A study of Unilever, Nigeria. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, *6*(S4), 12370–12384. https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS4.11968

Impact of product maturity on competitive advantage: A study of Unilever, Nigeria

Ofili N. Peter
Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Delta Statae University, Abraka

Onoye H. Uzor
Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Dennis Osadebey University, Asaba Delta State

Aloamaka Judith
Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Dennis Osadebey University, Asaba Delta State

***Abstract*---**In recent years the concept of competitive advantage has taken centre stage in discussions of business strategy; that is why one of the major challenges organizations face today is how to have a competitive advantage. In most cases, a stand-out product will do the job, since products are perceived as both highly relevant and meaningfully, the ability for any one product to stand out in a competitive category will guarantee the success of such an organization. While there are numerous ways to differentiate brands, identifying meaningful product-driven differentiators can be especially fruitful in gaining and sustaining a competitive advantage. Product maturity is when a firm or brand has grown to the point where it outperforms rival brands in the provision of a feature(s) such that it faces reduced sensitivity for other features. This study used a sample of 150 respondents to provide evidence on the relationship between product maturity and firms' competitive advantage in Nigeria. The study employed the ordinary least square (OLS) regression analysis. This study finds a positive and significant relationship between product maturity and firms' competitive advantage, as well as a positive and significant relationship between product differentiation and competitive advantage. This study, therefore, recommends that

***Keywords*---**impact product maturity, competitive advantage, Unilever, Nigeria.

Manuscript submitted: 9 April 2022, Manuscript revised: 18 June 2022, Accepted for publication: 27 July 2022

Introduction

Business strategy development is concerned with matching customers' requirements (needs, wants, desires, preferences, buying patterns) with the capabilities of the organization, based on the skills and resources available to the business organization, leading to the issue of core competence (Holmes & Hooper, 2016). This concept has been defined as 'something that the organization does at least as well as other organizations, or preferably better than, any other organization in the market'. According to Webster (2015), when products are based on such core competencies, they define the organization's value proposition in each target market and the organization's business strategy; thus, the business strategy adopted by an organization must be able to give it a competitive edge over other competitors in the industry.

The pursuit of competitive advantage is at the root of organizational performance and as such understanding, the source of sustained competitive advantage has become a major area of study in the field of strategic management (Porter, 1985; Barney, 2015). The resource-based view stipulates that the fundamental sources and drivers of competitive advantage and superior performance are chiefly associated with the attributes of resources and capabilities, which are valuable (Barney, 2015; 2017). Furthermore, the resource-based view provides an avenue for organizations to plan and execute their organizational strategy by examining the role of their internal resources and capabilities in achieving competitive advantage.

As globalization leads to more intense competition among manufacturing organizations, with an increase in customer demands, these organizations tend to seek competitive advantage by producing products with more valued features, such as product quality, product flexibility or reliable delivery (Baines & Langfield-Smith, 2018). As such, a differentiation strategy would provide greater scope for these organizations to produce products with more valued, desirable features as a means of coping with such demands. This research work, therefore, focused on how competitive advantage can be achieved through product maturity and differentiation strategy and ultimately, how it influences the competitive advantage of manufacturing firms, using Unilever Nigeria Plc. as a study.

Objectives

1. To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' competitive advantage
2. To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' performance

Hypotheses

HO_1: To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' competitive advantage
HO_2: To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' performance

Review of Related Literature
Product Maturity and the Product Life Cycle

After the introduction and growth stages, a product passes into the maturity stage. The third of the product life cycle stages can be quite a challenging time for manufacturers. In the first two stages, companies try to establish a market and then grow sales of their product to achieve as large a share of that market as possible. However, during the Maturity stage, the primary focus for most companies will be maintaining their market share in the face of several different challenges. In today‘s rapidly changing economic and business environments, organizations compete for customers, revenue, and market share with products and services that meet customers' needs. Global competition has brought about technological changes whereby customers are demanding superior quality products/services with lower prices. More so, this increased rate of global competition has brought about a reduction in the product life cycle. This has led to much emphasis being placed on organizational competencies and the creation of competitive advantage which is believed would give them an edge over other competitors. Though there are many objectives an organization would want to achieve these days, the two major ones are: (i). to achieve a competitive advantage position and (ii). enhance their organization's performance over that of their competitors (Raduan, Jegak, Haslinda, & Alimin 2019). It is, therefore, necessary for business organizations to understand the relationship between the organization's internal strengths and weaknesses, as well as the potential effects on their organization's competitive advantage and performance. It is also necessary that the organization chooses the type of competitive advantage it seeks to attain and the scope within which it will attain it.

Challenges of Product Maturity

The following challenges are peculiar to products and/or services that have reached the maturity stage;

1. Sales Volumes Peak: after the steady increase in sales during the Growth stage, the market starts to become saturated as there are fewer new customers. The majority of the consumers who are ever going to purchase the product have already done so.
2. Decreasing Market Share: another characteristic of the Maturity stage is the large volume of manufacturers who are all competing for a share of the market. With this stage of the product life cycle often seeing the highest levels of competition, it becomes increasingly challenging for companies to maintain their market share.
3. Profits Start to Decrease: while this stage maybe when the market as a whole makes the most profit, it is often the part of the product life cycle where a lot of manufacturers can start to see their profits decrease. Profits will have to be shared amongst all of the competitors in the market, and with sales likely to peak during this stage, any manufacturer that loses market share, and experiences a fall in sales, is likely to see a subsequent fall in profits. This decrease in profits could be compounded by the falling prices that are often seen when the sheer number of competitors forces some of them to try attracting more customers by competing on price.

The Maturity stage of the product life cycle presents manufacturers with a wide range of challenges. With sales reaching their peak and the market becoming saturated, it can be very difficult for companies to maintain their profits, let alone continue trying to increase them, especially in the face of what is usually fairly intense competition. During this stage, it is organizations that look for innovative ways to make their product more appealing to the consumer that will maintain, and perhaps even increase, their market share.

Benefits of Product Maturity

1. Continued Reduction in Costs: just as economies of scale in the Growth stage helped to reduce costs, developments in production can lead to more efficient ways to manufacture high volumes of a particular product, helping to lower costs even further.
2. Increased Market Share through Differentiation: while the market may reach saturation during the Maturity stage, manufacturers might be able to grow their market share and increase profits in other ways. Through the use of innovative marketing campaigns and by offering more diverse product features, companies can improve their market share through differentiation and there are plenty of product life cycle examples of businesses being able to achieve this.

Strategies required by Organizations for Competitive Advantage during Product Maturity

The Generic Strategy

The generic strategies developed by Porte (1985) for achieving a competitive advantage position by an organization are product differentiation and cost leadership. Product differentiation is the most commonly used one of these two strategic typologies (Spencer, Joiner, & Salmon, 2016). A differentiation strategy involves the firm creating a product/service, which is considered unique in some aspects that the customer values because the customer's needs are satisfied. On the other hand, cost leadership emphasizes low costs relative to that of the competitors. He argued that cost leadership and differentiation strategies are mutually exclusive. Recent literature and research studies have notwithstanding, questioned this idea recognizing the fact that organizations may pursue elements of both types of strategy (Chenhall & Langfield-Smith, 2015). Nevertheless, past research has shown that several manufacturing organizations view the differentiation strategy as a more important and distinct means to achieve competitive advantage in constricting to a low-cost strategy (Kotha & Orne, 2015; Baines & Langfield-Smith, 2015).

Value Creating Strategy

According to Barney (2015), when a firm is implementing a value-creating strategy not simultaneously being implemented by any current or potential competitors, such a firm has a competitive advantage. In addition, competitive advantage is described as an advantage that one firm has relative to competing firms. In other words, a competitive advantage exists when the firm can deliver the same benefits as competitors but at a lower cost (cost advantage), or deliver benefits that exceed those of competing products (differentiation advantage). The source of the advantage can be something the business does that is distinctive and difficult to replicate, also known as a core competency (Prahalad & Hamel, 2016).

Although competitive advantage has taken centre stage in discussions of business strategy, a definite definition of the term is quite elusive. However, a common theme has remained 'value creation. According to Porter (1985), 'competitive advantage is at the heart of a firm's performance in competitive markets' This implies that competitive advantage means having low costs, differentiation advantage, or a successful focus strategy. Also, he argues that 'competitive advantage grows fundamentally out of value a firm can create for its buyers that exceeds the firm's cost of creating it. Porter’s arguments reflect the common strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) framework for assessing competitive advantage. Competitive advantage stems from a firm’s ability to leverage its internal strengths to respond to external environmental opportunities while avoiding external threats and internal weaknesses (Mooney, 2017).

Resources-Based Strategy

However, an alternative to this framework is the resource-based view of a firm which argues that the source of sustained competitive advantage is to focus on the superior resources of a firm (Barney, 2015). Furthermore, Barney ties competitive advantage to performance, arguing that “a firm obtains above-normal performance when it generates greater-than-expected value from the resources it employs (Barney, 2015). An organization's resources according to Barney include all assets, capabilities, and organizational processes, and the firm conceives of and implements strategies that improve its efficiency (doing things right) and effectiveness (doing the right things). In traditional strategic analysis language, an organization's resources are strengths that organizations can use to conceive of and implement their strategies.

Competitive advantage results from and is associated with a long list of contributing factors. These factors include operational efficiencies, mergers, acquisitions, levels of diversification, types of diversification, organizational structures, top management team composition and style, human resource management, manipulation of the political and/or social influences intruding upon the market, conformity to various interpretations of socially responsible behaviours, international or cross-cultural activities of expansion and adaptation, and various other organizations and/or industry level phenomena (Raduan et al., 2019).

More recently, however, the process of globalization has been boosted by the economic activities of multinational corporations (MNCs) such as Toyota, Sony, Coca-Cola, etc. These MNCs for a long period have achieved and sustained their competitive advantage via various strategic management practices and approaches (Raduan et al., 2019). Due to the global outreach and impact of these MNCs, they must understand the degree of relationship between their organizational resources, their competitive advantage and the level of their performance. This is because as far as the strategic management of organizations is concerned, the knowledge of the significant attributes of organizational resources and how to generate competitive advantage and performance alone is not sufficient (Raduan et al., 2019).

According to Bani-Hani and AlHawary (2019), competitive advantage from product-price performance is almost short-term, especially in an era where technologies are altering the existing business boundaries. Advantages can only be sustained through competence that is enjoyed at the very roots of products. Even though studies have shown that a significant relationship exists between competitive advantage and organizational performance, competitive advantage and organizational performance are two different constructs with a complex relationship (Ma, 2017). It has been argued that achieving a position of competitive advantage is a precursor to the significant performance of an organization (Barney, 2015) and that competitive advantage results from a long list of varying factors which include operational efficiencies, mergers, acquisitions, levels of diversification, types of diversification, organizational structures, top management team composition and style, human resource management, manipulation of the political and/or social influences intruding upon the market, conformity to various interpretations of socially responsible behaviours and so forth.

Product Differentiation Strategy

Product differentiation strategy can be a tool of a competitive advantage which is adopted by organizations to provide products that satisfy individual customer's needs. In satisfying individual customers' needs, quality has become a major differentiating factor among products (Shammot, 2016). As a result, customers are willing to pay more for products that cater to their size, taste, style, need or expression. Hence, achieving a competitive advantage through product differentiation becomes the main focus of this study.

Product Maturity and Competitive Advantage: A Global Perspective

Business arenas and particularly the product markets of recent times are experiencing the global wave of technology-driven competition, globalization of manufacturing due to faster transitional flows of materials and money, shortening of product life-cycles, the need for greater integration of technologies and increasingly sophisticated customers (McGrath, Anthony & Shapiro, 2016). Furthermore, a lot of organizations have come to realize that to provide value and win customers, there is a need to quickly and accurately identify changes in customer needs, develop more complex products which would satisfy those needs, and provide higher levels of customer support and service. In addition to the above-mentioned issues organizations are faced with, are the more recent important strategic discontinuities they encounter. These discontinuities include the elimination of industry boundaries, fewer distinctions between industrial and service businesses, major advances in logistics, computer-aided design and communication, and the opening of global markets (Hitt, Keats & DeMarie, 2017).

In markets where capacity exceeds demand, value creation generally requires competitive advantage. An organization with a competitive advantage consistently outperforms competitors, that is, it earns greater economic profits (Porter, 1985). To achieve a competitive advantage, firms seek the best match between organizational abilities and market opportunities. Few, if any, competitive advantages can be sustained indefinitely, so the organization must continually seek opportunities to create the most value. Organizations tend to differ in terms of production methods, product features, brand names, locations, and many other aspects. The critical differences that determine success or failure are the sources of competitive advantage. The company's earnings are limited by its competitive advantage. It can obtain no more than the additional value it creates over and above that of its competitors. Therefore, the competitive strategy requires both value creation relative to competitors and capturing a portion of that value through relationships with suppliers and customers. To outbid competitors for customers, the organization must create total value that is greater than or at least as great as that of its competitors.

Competitive Advantage

A variety of definitions and views on competitive advantage have been expounded by various scholars. Porter (1985) says "competitive advantage is at the heart of a firm's performance in competitive markets" thus "competitive advantage grows fundamentally out of value a firm can create for its buyers that exceed the firm's cost of creating it." Barney (2015) says that "a firm experiences competitive advantages when its actions in an industry or market create economic value and when few competing firms are engaging in similar actions."

Besanko, Dranove, and Shanley (2015) say “when a firm earns a higher rate of economic profit than the average rate of economic profit of other firms competing within the same market, the firm has a competitive advantage in that market.” Saloner, Shepard and Podolny (2016) say that “most forms of competitive advantage mean either that a firm can produce some service or product that its customers value than those produced by competitors or that it can produce its service or product at a lower cost than its competitors.”

Given the above, it is apparent that a firm achieves a competitive edge over its competitors by providing a product/service perceived by the customer to yield greater benefits and value than that of the competitors. In addition, competitive advantage will always result in superior performance by the organization which translates to higher profits. Hence, understanding competitive advantage is an ongoing challenge for decision-makers. Historically, competitive advantage was thought of as a matter of position, where firms occupied a competitive space and built and defended market share. Competitive advantage depended on where the business was located and where it chose to provide services. Stable environments allowed this strategy to be successful, particularly for large and dominant organizations in mature industries. The ability to develop a sustained competitive advantage today is increasingly rare.

A competitive advantage laboriously achieved can be quickly lost. Organizations sustain a competitive advantage only so long as the services they deliver and how they deliver them have attributes that correspond to the key buying criteria of a substantial number of customers. Sustained competitive advantage is the result of an enduring value differential between the products or services of one organization and those of its competitors in the minds of customers. Therefore, organizations must consider more than the fit between the external environment and their present internal characteristics. They must anticipate what the rapidly changing environment will be like, and change their structures, cultures, and other relevant factors to reap the benefits of changing times. Sustained competitive advantage has become more of a matter of movement and ability to change than of location or position (Stalk, Evans and Shulman, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

For this study, it is argued that organizations need to make decisions about product maturity to achieve competitive advantage. These decisions will be guided by two main theories; the resource-based theory and the capability theory. An organization's internal resources are of great significance to the profits made by a business organization. It also affects the maintenance of the organization’s competitive advantage and above all the organization’s ability to create market advantage.

The Resource-Based Theory

The resource-based theory has defined firm resources as all assets, capabilities, organizational processes, firm attributes, information, and knowledge controlled by a firm (Barney, 2015). It has gone ahead to propose that a firm has a competitive advantage when it creates a successful strategy based on firm resources that cannot be duplicated by a current or potential competitor. In addition, the theory states that for resources and capability to give a competitive edge, they must be rare, valuable, unable to be imitated, with no substitute, and not transferable.

The resource-based theory believes that an organization's resources are diverse and not completely/freely movable which has led to differences among organizations. Put differently, the heterogeneity of resources has led to business heterogeneity. Since the resources are not completely mobile, the heterogeneity among organizations is bound to exist for a long time. If an organization with scarce resources can create value and its resources either cannot be imitated by its competitors or are easily replaced by other resources, then such an organization has a monopoly position and thus condition necessary for achieving sustainable competitive advantage and excess profits.

According to Fahy (2017) through the resource-based view (RBV) of the firm insights into the nature of competitive advantage, it has already made an important contribution to the field of strategic management. The RBV, which has benefited from the rigour of its economic origins, greatly enhances our understanding of the nature and determinants of sustainable competitive advantage (SCA). It helps to explain why some resources are more advantage-generating than others and also why resource asymmetries and consequent competitive advantages persist even in conditions of open competition. Fahy

(2017) also noted, however, that the vast majority of contributions within the RBV have been of a conceptual rather than an empirical nature, with the result that many of its fundamental tenets remain to be validated in the field. In addition, there were some debates regarding both the nature and the determinants of competitive advantage and the relevancy of the resource-based view.

Resource Capability Theory

Organizations with similar resources often have a difference in the efficiency of resource usage brought about by the differences in capability, which is the reason for the deep-seated competitive advantage. Prahalad and Hamel (2016) defined core capability as the accumulated knowledge of an organization, especially about how to coordinate the different skills of production and the organic integration of a variety of technical flows of knowledge. Core competitiveness is a mixture of many factors; it is the combination of technology, governance mechanisms and collective learning. Core competitiveness is the collection of a set of skills and technology, not a single technology or skill. It is a source of competitive advantage. There are three main features of core capability:

i. The core capability has the full user value, able to create value and reduce costs.
ii. The core capability is unique, it is difficult to imitate by competitors.
iii. The core capability must have the ability to provide support for the organization to access several markets.

Barney (2015) concludes that the resources and capabilities of firms are keys to creating sustained competitive advantage and achieving superior performance validating its choice for this study.

Empirical Review

Generally speaking, only a few numbers of researchers have investigated the direct relationship between product maturity and organizational competitive advantage as well as organizational performance. More so, a sizeable number of those researches were conducted in the developed countries. Nevertheless, several past research studies that have investigated the relationship between the differentiation strategy and organizational performance are as follows:

The study findings of Acquaah and Yasai -Ardekani (2018) show the viability and profitability of implementing cost leadership, differentiation, and the combination of the singular strategies. Nevertheless, the incremental performance benefits to firms implementing a combination strategy do not significantly differ from the performance of firms implementing only the differentiation strategy. In addition, firms that implement a coherent competitive strategy (combination, cost-leadership, or differentiation) tend to gain considerable incremental performance benefits.

Also, the study findings of Amoako-Gyampah and Acquaah (2008) who examined the relationship between manufacturing strategy and competitive strategy and their influence on firm performance indicate that there is a positive relationship between competitive strategy and the manufacturing strategies of cost, delivery, flexibility, and quality. In addition, the result shows that quality is the only manufacturing strategy component that influences performance indirectly.

Prajogo (2017) examined the underlying strategic intent of quality performance and the result of his findings shows that product quality is predicted by differentiation strategy, but not cost leadership strategy. Prajogo and Sohal's (2016) results also indicate that *Total Quality Management* (TQM) is positively and significantly related to differentiation strategy, and it only partially mediates the relationship between differentiation strategy and three performance measures. Allen and Helms (2015) thought that different types of reward practices more closely complement different generic strategies and are significantly related to organizational performance. Finally, Mosakowski's (2015) study's results generally supported the hypothesis that, when the focus and differentiation strategies are established, performance is higher than for other firms. In conclusion, there is a consensus that there is a positive relationship between differentiation and organizational performance.

Tools and Methods

The survey research was adopted for this research work because of the nature of the respondents. This entailed the administering of questionnaires to the chosen sample. The population of the respondents was rather large, made up of all customers/consumers of the products of Unilever Nigeria Plc located in Umuahia, Abia State. Since everyone in the population cannot be given a questionnaire to fill, therefore, a sample of the population was used as respondents for the study. This study adopted a survey research design, whereby it focused on the customers of Unilever Nigeria Plc, manufacturers of household/personal care products. Since product quality is a major determinant variable in the differentiation of products, it was, therefore, important to test the significance of product quality as it relates to the customers/consumers of the products. The customers that bought or use the product remain a key factor in determining a product's quality and differentiating features. They can judge and measure its quality and effectiveness by comparing it with the competitor's products. Data for this study were collected from a sample of customers/consumers of Unilever Nigeria Plc to determine the relationship between product differentiation and organizational performance. Items relevant under the research design are; the study population, sample and sampling technique, and data collection instrument. All these items representing the research design provide a clear view of how the data required for the study are collected and collated, and how the analysis was performed to yield a significantly reliable and valid result

Results and Discussion

Results and Hypotheses Testing

All hypotheses were tested and analyzed using simple linear regression analysis.

HO_1: To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' competitive advantage

HO_2: To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' performance

Hypothesis one shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (competitive advantage) is explained by the model, which is higher product maturity. The values 0.21 and 0.39 in the R squared column are expressed in percentage. This means that the model (higher product quality) explains between 21% and 39% variations in the dependent variable (sales growth). With an F value of 6.623 and a significance level of 0.02, there is a significant relationship between higher product maturity and the competitive advantage of an organization, therefore, the null hypothesis (H01) was rejected.

For the second hypothesis, the analysis shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the model. R^2 was 0.078; F value is 25.698 and a *p*= 0.00. This indicates that there is a significant relationship between the product maturity of an organization and the performance of the organization. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H02) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis (Ha2) was accepted.

Table 1: Summary of Ordinary Least Square Regression Result

Hypotheses	Tools	F-value	R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	df	P-value	Decision
To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' competitive advantage	Regression Analysis	6.623	.078	.963	1	.011	HO_1 rejected
To examine the relationship between product maturity and firms' performance	Regression Analysis	25.698	.078	.974	1	.000	HO_2 rejected

Source: SPSS Output, 2021

Discussion

The analysis carried out in this chapter proves that there is an existence of a positive significant relationship between higher product maturity and the competitive advantage of an organization. The same also applies to the relationship between product maturity and the performance of an organization. It is, therefore, necessary that manufacturing organizations, especially the organization under study (Unilever Nigeria Plc) see the organization's product(s) as a potential tool for creating and maintaining a competitive edge over other competitors in the industry. In other words, organizations should not see product differentiation as though it only helps in increasing sales or profit, but also as a tool that is capable of putting the organization into the limelight thereby achieving a competitive advantage position. Product differentiation will thus enhance the overall capability of the organization in terms of improving its products, which will in turn attract more customers and consumers.

This research study was designed to examine the influence of product differentiation as a tool of competitive advantage on the organizational performance of manufacturing companies, using Unilever Nigeria Plc as a case study. To investigate this relationship, 150 managers of the organization were surveyed. For clear analysis, the study centres on two broad variables; the dependent variable and the independent variable. The dependent variable is taken as an organizational performance which was further broken into sub-variables to include customer satisfaction and sales growth. The independent variable was product differentiation which was operationalized in terms of higher product quality, new product innovation, product design and unique product features.

The hypotheses were tested using the Regression Analysis with the interpretation provided. The result of the Regression analysis indicated that product differentiation as a tool of competitive advantage has a positive and significant influence organizational performance of manufacturing companies in Nigeria. The result supports some previous research results (for example, Mosakowski 2015; Allen & Helms 2015), which indicated a positive and significant relationship between product differentiation strategy and organizational performance.

First, in response to the dynamic nature of the business environment and the ever-changing needs of customers, it is safe to suggest that executive management needs to make sure that they provide adequate satisfaction to their customers. In other words, executive management should pay more attention to customer satisfaction, since their survival in this dynamic environment is highly dependent on their ability to retain a larger customer base compared to their competitors. In addition, executive management should put additional emphasis and pay more attention to product differentiation as it is an important instrument for achieving competitive advantage which leads to greater organizational performance. Furthermore, product differentiation appears as a critical driver for organizational performance, which could perform the role of a bridge that links the positive influence of customer satisfaction to organizational performance.

Conclusion

In conclusion, from the research study, it can be established that however little the significance product maturity holds about an organizational competitive advantage and organizational performance, the fact remains that there is a positive relationship between the variables. This means that manufacturing organizations must pay greater attention to the maturity of the product especially in the case of manufacturing organizations in terms of quality design, innovations and unique features. Finally, firms in the manufacturing sector face domestic and international competition in addition to rapid shifts in customer demands whereby many manufacturing firms have come to realize that to remain viable, a strategy of product differentiation may be a more viable option than strategies based on efficiency and price (Spencer, Joiner and Salmon 2016). This research study further demonstrates that product differentiation could be used as a tool for achieving competitive advantage and enhancing greater organizational performance.

Recommendations

This study, therefore, makes the following recommendations;

1. Therefore, executive management ought to focus and invest more in product differentiation as it could be used as a major competitive advantage tool against competitors in the industry and it is capable of guaranteeing the long-term survival of the organization.
2. More attention should be paid to product maturity by managers and marketing experts to avoid a decline in product sales and market share during maturity. This means that differentiation strategies should be geared to sustain product demand and ensure consumers' loyalty.
3. Finally, product maturity is a very critical point in every product that determines the overall organization's performance in the long run. Hence, organizations must ensure that such products are redesigned and repositioned from time to time to give them a new look in the face of the consumers.

References

Acquaah, M. & Yasai-Ardekani, M. (2018). Implements a combination competitive strategy yield incremental performance benefits? A new perspective from a transition economy in Sub-Saharan Africa. Journal of Business Research, vol. 61.

Allen, R.S. & Helms, M.M. (2015). Employee perceptions of the relationship between strategy, rewards and organizational performance. Journal of Business Strategies, vol. 19

Amoako-Gyampah, K. & Acquaah, M. (2018). Manufacturing strategy, competitive strategy and firm performance: An empirical stud

Baines, A. & Langfield-Smith, K. (2015). "Antecedents to management accounting change: a structural equation approach", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28: 675-98.

Baines, A. & Langfield-Smith, K. (2018). "Antecedents to management accounting change: a structural equation approach", Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28: 675-98.

Bani-Han, I J. S. & AlHawary, F. A. (2019). The Impact of Core Competencies on Competitive Advantage: Strategic Challenge; International Bulletin of Business Administration, Iss.6

Barney, J, B. (2017). Is the resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research? Yes. Academy of Management Review, vol. 26. PP. 41–56.

Barney, J. B. (2015). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, Science, vol.17, Issue 1. PP. 99–120.

Benedicta, O. (2021). Relationship between competitive intelligence and competitive advantage in manufacturing industry. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, *8*(5), 342-351. https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v8n5.1908

Besanko, D., Dranove, D., & Shanley, M. (2015). Economics of Strategy. 2nd Ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Chenhall, R. H., & Langfield-Smith, K. M. (2015).“The relationship between strategic priorities, management techniques and management accounting: An empirical investigation using a systems approach”. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 23 (3).

Fahy, J. (2017). The resource-based view of the firm: Some stumbling blocks on the road to understanding sustainable competitive advantage. Journal of European Industrial Training, vol. 24. Pp. 94–104.

Hitt, M. A., Keats, B. W., & DeMarie, S. M. (2017). Navigating in the new competitive landscape: Building strategic flexibility and competitive advantage in the 21st century; The Academy of Management Executive 12.4: 22-42.

Holmes, G. & Hooper, N. (2016). Core competence and education. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kotha, S. & Orne, D. (2015). Generic manufacturing strategies: A conceptual synthesis Strategic Management Journal (1986-1989). 10.3: 211. Koter, P. & Keller, K. (2011). A Framework for Marketing Management, 4th edition, Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall

Ma, H. (2017). Competitive advantage and firm performance. Competitiveness Review, Vol. 10 Issue 2

Mooney, A. (2017). Core Competence, Distinctive Competence, and Competitive Advantage: What Is the Difference? Journal of Education Business, vol. 83 Issue 2

Mosakowski, E. (2015). A resource-based perspective on the dynamic strategy-performance relationship: An empirical examination of the focus and differentiation strategies. Journal of Management, vol. 19

Porter, M. E. (1985). Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance Free Press, New York.

Prahalad, C.K. & Hamel, G.(2016). The core competence of the corporation. Harvard Business Review, Vol. 68, No. 3. P. 82

Prajogo, D. I. & Sohal, A. S. (2016). The relationship between organization strategy, total quality management (TQM), and organization performance mediate the role of TQM. European Journal of Operational Research, Vol.168 y in a developing economy environment. International Journal of Production Economics, vol.111

Prajogo, D.I.(2017). The relationship between competitive strategies and product. Quality Industrial Management and Data Systems, vol. 107

Raduan, C .R., Jegak, U., Haslinda, A. & Alimin, I. I. (2019). A Conceptual Framework of the Relationship between Organizational Resources, Capabilities, Systems, Competitive Advantage and Performance. Journal of International Studies - Issue 12

Rodriguez, A. C. Z., Gamez, M. R., & Faure, L. G. (2018). Design, construction, and energy of sustainable solar dryers in Jipijapa Canton. *International Journal of Physical Sciences and Engineering*, *2*(2), 88–100. https://doi.org/10.29332/ijpse.v2n2.170

Saloner, G., Shepard, A. and Podolny, J. (2016). Strategic Management. John Wiley & Sons, New York

Shammot, M. M. (2016). Quality Management Practices and Their Impact on Organizational Performance, and Customer Behavior. European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, Issue 34

Spencer, X. S., Joiner, A. T., & Salmon, S. (2016). Differentiation Strategy, Performance Measurement Systems and Organizational Performance: Evidence from Australia. International Journal of Business, Vol. 14(1)

Stalk, G., Evans, P. & Shulman, L. (2015). Competing on capabilities: The new rules of corporate strategy. Harvard Business Review. 70 Issue 2. Pp. 57-69

Webster, F. L. (2015). 'Marketing Management: providing value to customers, in Collins, E.G.C. and Devanna, M.A. (eds), The New Portable MBA. New York: Wile

Widana, I.K., Sumetri, N.W., Sutapa, I.K., Suryasa, W. (2021). Anthropometric measures for better cardiovascular and musculoskeletal health. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, *29*(3), 550–561. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22202