

## **BLUE OCEAN STRATEGY AND THE PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED ALUMINUM EXTRUSION FIRMS IN SOUTH-SOUTH AND SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA**

**Onoigboria Marceline<sup>1</sup> Eluka Jonny<sup>2</sup> Nwagbala Stella<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1,2&3</sup>*Department of Business Administration, Tansian University, Umunya,  
Anambra State, Nigeria.*

**Emails:** [nn.amahalu@unizik.edu.ng](mailto:nn.amahalu@unizik.edu.ng)<sup>1</sup>; [saintsunnygroup@gmail.com](mailto:saintsunnygroup@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>;  
[oo.okafor@unizik.edu.ng](mailto:oo.okafor@unizik.edu.ng)<sup>3</sup>

*All correspondence to:* [saintsunnygroup@gmail.com](mailto:saintsunnygroup@gmail.com)

### **ABSTRACT**

*The study examines the relationship between Blue Ocean Strategy and the Performance of selected Aluminum Extrusion Firms in South-South and South-East Nigeria. It aimed to investigate the relationship between value innovation strategy and product quality, and also to determine the relationship between cost leadership strategy and customer satisfaction. The population of the study was 509 which comprised the aluminum dealers, management and staff of the selected aluminum firms. The descriptive statistic tools included tables, percentages, mean scores and standard deviation to reduce the data into comprehensible form. The findings of the study show that there is a significant positive relationship between cost leadership and customer satisfaction and that there is a significant positive relationship between value innovation and product quality. In conclusion, the study was able to establish a nexus between Blue Ocean Strategy and the Performance of Aluminum Extrusion Firms in the South-South and South-East regions of Nigeria.*

**Key words:** *Blue Ocean, Value Innovation Strategy, Product Quality, Extrusion Firms, South-South, South-East, Nigeria.*

**CITE AS:** Onoigboria, M., Eluka, J. & Nwagbala, S. (2025). Blue ocean strategy and the performance of selected aluminum extrusion firms in South-South and South-East Nigeria, *Tansian University Journal of Arts, Management & Social Sciences*, 9(1), 35 - 62.

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Aluminium sector in Nigeria, particularly in the South-South and South-East regions, is experiencing challenges such as market saturation, fierce competition, and slow innovation (Okpanachi, Ibrahim & Okpanachi, 2021). Conventional competitive strategies, which often focus on outperforming competitors in existing markets, have not significantly improved corporate performance. As a result, organizations are looking for new ways to achieve long-term growth while maintaining customer loyalty. The Blue Ocean Strategy (BOS) proposes a strategic shift from competing in saturated markets (red oceans) to generating new market segments (blue oceans) through value innovation that incorporates both differentiation and cost reduction. Implementing BOS allows Aluminium extrusion companies to capitalise on new demand, reduce competition, and improve customer loyalty and overall business

performance (Okpanachi et al., 2021). Adopting the Blue Ocean Strategy, a strategy that emphasis innovation and value creation, has grown in popularity as a means of avoiding the severe competition of red seas and creating uncontested market space.

To eliminate competition and achieve customer happiness, the Blue Ocean Strategy, which is driven by value innovation, helps to drive value up, allowing consumers to benefit the most from their purchases. More crucially, innovative differentiation of offers that distinguishes a firm from competitors for exceptional product offerings transmits market supremacy and hence improves market share (Mohammed, Ndinya, & Ogada, 2023). Strategy and performance in Aluminium Extrusion businesses are inextricably linked; one leads to the other. Thus, the survival and performance of Aluminium extrusion companies rely on a solid strategy. The recent decline in performance of Aluminium extrusion enterprises and manufacturing in general in Nigeria has concerned both the government and private sector industrialists (Mushin & Rajesh, 2020). According to Thabet and Ramadan (2022), a well-executed Blue Ocean Strategy can lead to improved organisational performance. Financial or non-financial performance metrics may be used. Product quality, profitability, market share, sales volume, customer retention, and customer satisfaction are some of the possible factors.

Recent studies show that BOS has the potential to improve the competitiveness of Nigeria's Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs). For example, Eromafuru (2022) discovered that BOS, as mediated by core competencies, greatly increases the competitiveness of MSMEs in Nigeria. Similarly, Oguche, Agbo, and Enokela (2024) showed that Nigerian SMEs who used BOS saw market expansion and sustained growth. These findings indicate that BOS may be a viable strategy for Aluminium extrusion enterprises in Nigeria to overcome the challenges of a competitive manufacturing environment. Other research, such as those by Njuguna (2021) and Obola, Kwendo, and Otuya (2021), that attempted to investigate strategies focused on competitive strategies, but few studies examined the sustainability of Blue Ocean Strategy as a strategy of choice. Managers of Aluminium Extrusion Firms in the South-South and South-East of Nigeria sought the Blue Ocean Strategy to increase product quality, customer satisfaction, customer retention, engendering customer loyalty, and market share in order to ensure the subsector's survival while also improving its performance. However, despite this step, the aforementioned issues persisted, necessitating a study of this sort to investigate the relationship between Blue Ocean Strategy and the performance of Aluminium Extrusion Firms in Nigeria's South-South and South-East regions.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Nigerian manufacturing firms have recently been on the spotlight for under performance. The low performance appears to be the outcome of the Managers' continued use of old competitive strategy models that focused on competition rather than innovation, despite changing consumer preferences and market dynamics (Vasiljeva et al., 2019). The Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) estimated that two hundred and seventy manufacturing firms closed in 2016. The body went on to say that those who had not closed their doors were losing money, while others were laying off employees in order to survive. Customers now have more knowledge on numerous items than ever before, allowing them to be more discerning, and the inflow of new products into the market arena as a result of competition distracts customers (Friehe et al; 2018). This results in decreased customer loyalty, lower sales volume, poor product quality, customer discontent, and the inability to keep customers. All of these factors contributed to poor performance and posed a threat to survival and sustainability. The Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) alluded to this when it reported that 270 manufacturing firms closed in 2016. The body also stated that other manufacturing firms are laying off employees in order to stay afloat (MAN 2017). Several studies have been carried out in the past to address these issues. Examples include the work of (Kalu et al., 2017; Olaide, 2019).

Despite all efforts by the government and stakeholders to solve these difficulties and ensure that manufacturing firms compete competitively, they appear to have not been fully addressed. To overcome these problems in a fast-paced, dynamic global business environment, manufacturing firm managers must shift their focus from evaluating current competitors to formulating strategies to adapt and remain inventive in the future. As a result, managers of Aluminium extrusion firms, particularly in Nigeria's South-South and South-East regions, have adopted the Blue Ocean Strategy approach. This can be achieved through value innovation strategy, cost leadership strategy, product differentiation strategy, product innovation strategy, and pricing strategy, all with the goal of making competition irrelevant, creating new market space, and delivering a superior and unique value proposition to the target market in a way that competitors cannot match. This is intended to improve the organization's customer satisfaction, product quality, customer retention, customer loyalty, sales volume, and, eventually, the Manufacturing Firms' performance and sustainability. Despite the implementation of the Blue Ocean Strategy, the issue of poor performance among manufacturing firms, particularly Aluminium extrusion firms, appears to remain. This necessitates an inquiry of the relationship between the Blue Ocean Strategy and the

competitive performance of Aluminium firms in Nigeria's South-South and South-East, which is what this study did.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The general objective of the study is to examine the nature of the relationship that exists between the Blue Ocean Strategy and competitive Performance of Aluminium Extrusion Firms in South-South and South-East of Nigeria. The specific objectives are:

1. To examine the relationship between value innovation strategy and product quality.
2. To determine the relationship between cost leadership strategy and customer satisfaction.
3. To investigate the relationship between product differentiation strategy and customer loyalty.
4. To determine the relationship between product innovation strategy and customer retention.
5. To ascertain the relationship between pricing strategy and sales volume.

### **Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses, in their null form, have been formulated in response to the above objectives:

- H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant relationship between value innovation and product quality.  
H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant relationship between cost leadership and customer satisfaction.  
H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant relationship between Product differentiation and customer loyalty.  
H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant relationship between product innovation and customer retention.  
H<sub>05</sub>: There is no significant relationship between pricing strategy and sales volume.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Conceptual Review**

#### **The Concept of Blue Ocean Strategy**

Blue Ocean Strategy is characterised as an undeveloped market area and demand generation that rivals cannot exploit, as well as the potential for extremely lucrative expansion (Rebbouh, 2019). It aims to "offer buyers a huge leap in value," perhaps creating a new uncontested market. Blue Ocean as a notion arose from the realisation that top economic units cannot succeed via competition, but rather by establishing new blue seas (Hassan, 2022). The Blue Ocean Strategy aims to achieve success by holding a unique competitive position that other economic units cannot match (Nazar, Alaa, & Abdulrazzaq, 2022). This is made feasible by

entering new markets with innovative goods or services, attracting and maintaining both existing and new clients. The Blue Ocean Strategy's originality and thoughtfulness, which was developed via value innovation, set the company apart from rivals. The Blue Ocean Strategy arose from the realisation that successful economic units cannot maintain their position as leaders by constantly competing with imagined and actual rivals. The asserted leading and sustainable position may be maintained by establishing Blue Oceans in which value innovation takes precedence over rival operations. Competition, it is believed, diminishes earnings and the ability to develop (Rahmon & Choudry, 2019).

### **Value Innovation**

Innovation entails the creation of new technical advances that integrate into new combinations of current technology and the application of new information obtained by the organisation (Dibie & Basey 2019). Product innovation gives an organisation new life, allowing it to deal with competitive challenges while also meeting changing tastes, preferences, short product life cycles, technical obsolescence, shifting demand, and unique customer requests. Product innovation is the creation of a completely new product or service that significantly improves on current ones in terms of features or intended purpose. It offers a foundation for an organisation to keep ahead of competition by developing or creating items that are either partially or completely new to the market. This makes competition irrelevant (Dibie et al., 2019). Value innovation is widely acknowledged to be the foundation of the Blue Ocean Strategy (Hamra & Gassabi, 2021). It is a simultaneous endeavour to reduce costs while increasing value delivered to consumers. The cost decrease offers the organisation a competitive advantage over competitor organisations, making competition unnecessary. In value innovation, costs and value are inversely related, such that as costs decrease, value for consumers grows.

### **Cost Leadership Strategy**

Cost leadership is otherwise called a low-cost strategy. Cost leadership is attained by offering products or services to the market for consumers at a relatively cheaper price than those of competitors. This strategy raises the sales and market share of the organization. The inability of the competitors to compete on the basis of cost makes their threat as rivals irrelevant (Islami, 2020). The basis of a low-cost strategy largely depends on managing costs. The cost advantages are deliberately achieved through the application of the Blue Ocean four parts framework of raise, eliminate, create, and reduce. Cost leadership position can be attained

through the Blue Ocean constructs of eliminating costs that do not add value to creating customer value, and raising those attributes that others in the market have not yet discovered but can increase customer value. Also, use a reduced construct to eliminate those features that increase cost but do not add value to customers and the organization.

### **Product Differentiation Strategy**

According to Sentanu (2019), pursuing differentiation can be considered a Blue Ocean Strategy because it creates new demand and opens up new market spaces. Differentiation strategy necessitates that the company retains unique product features in order to achieve market leadership. Traditionally, differentiated products command higher prices due to greater value-added features than non-differentiated products. To achieve differentiation, the company incorporates superior brand quality, the use of multiple distribution channels, and ongoing and consistent promotional support to reinforce product distinctiveness in the minds of consumers. The Blue Ocean four paths action framework of raise, eliminate, create, and reduce is used to achieve differentiation. The idea behind differentiation as a competitive strategy is that being unique in what an organization does distinguishes it from the crowd in the Red Oceans and, as a result, from its competitors in the marketplace

### **Product Innovation Strategy**

Dibie, Nto, Unanam, and Bassey (2019) see product innovation as a fundamental agent of growth strategies to enter new markets, increase the firm's market share and ultimately an agent through which an organization secures a competitive advantage. Product innovation is a catalyst for sustainable large market share and increased profitability. Dibie et al. (2019) define innovation as the "Economic application of new ideas that is capable of being transformed to a new product, process or method of production, a new market or source of supply, a new form of commercial business or financial organization". It presupposes making new product offerings, new services, or the addition of value that did not exist before to existing ones.

### **Pricing Strategy**

Price is the mechanism of exchange between the seller and the buyer in any transaction. It measures the importance the customer placed on a product or service in the marketplace (Yakubu, Shehu & Olubunmi, 2019). Pricing Strategy according to Yakubu et al.,(2019) represents the various methods adopt by various companies in the market place to establish

prices for the products or services they offer to the target market. Yakubu et al., (2019) submitted that there are thirteen strategies of pricing, out of which the authors identified low price supplier, strategy experience curve, leader pricing, complementary pricing, penetration pricing, price skimming and premium pricing. Customer retention is mainly determined by the pricing strategies adopted by an organization, be it service or product-oriented organization (Yakubu et al., 2019). The way and manner those at the helm of organizations decide to price the product of their organization affects the rate at which they can retain customers. It is traditional for rational consumers to buy a product that is of high quality yet being sold at a low price relative to those of the organizations offering a high price on a product of same quality.

### **The Concept of Extrusion Firms Performance**

Aluminium Extrusion Firm's performance is a multidimensional concept whose indicators are many and varied. The metric of performance according to Ziyaminyana and Pwaka (2019) include the level of customer satisfaction as measured by the numbers of complaints about the organization's product, number of returns made by customers, the level of customer retention among others. Other metrics of performance are level of customer loyalty, customer satisfaction, product quality, and market share as well as customer retention. Extrusion firms' performance is a measure of the level of how resources of the organization are utilized to achieve the desired goals. In measuring manufacturing firm's performances, mostly subjective measures are preferred to objective measure. The authors argued that the reason for the predominant use of subjective measure of manufacturing performance is that firms are not willing and are reluctant to disclose exact performance records, and managers of manufacturing firm are less willing to share the objective performance of their organizations. Also, objective measures limit the compatibility and accuracy of responses (Rahman and Choudhury (2019). These companies are not required by law to publish their accounts for public consumption thus makes it difficult for researchers to lay hand on reliable financial data for analysis. More concernedly is, where such data are made available, such figures are manipulated to deceive the investing public as is the case of banks in Nigeria prior to its consolidation in 2005 (Rahman and Choudhury (2019). The subjective measures adopted in the study are: Customer satisfaction, customer retention, cost reduction, product quality and market share.

### **Product Quality**

Product quality is a measure of how a product satisfies and meets customer needs and as well meets industry set standards. It explains the degree to which a product possesses desired attributes or features that satisfy the users' requirements. Product quality is one of the several key attributes that customers require from manufacturers. It is the fundamental qualities that customers are looking for or expect to get from a product they purchase (Rahayu, Asim, Nurminingsih & Robert, 2022). Quality from the standpoint of American society for quality is the totality of a product or service's qualities and attributes that influence its ability to satisfy the purpose for which such a product was purchased, whether stated or implied.

### **Customer Satisfaction**

Customer satisfaction is a metric that is used to determine how happy customers are with the product of an organization in the marketplace. It is pivotal to the success of manufacturing organizations, especially the Aluminium extrusion firms. It is one of the measures of the success of a strategy. This is because business owes its existence to customers (Audu, 2018). Satisfaction is crucial from the view of customer because it reflects a positive out-come from the outlay of scarce resources and the fulfillment of unmet needs. It is the barometer that business managers use to gauge the level of acceptability of their offerings in the market place. Customer satisfaction is a measure of the consumer's feelings of pleasure or disappointment emanating from the comparison of a product's perceived performance relative to expectations. It is common in literature that customer satisfaction has a positive relationship with organization's profitability. Common metrics of customer satisfaction are repeat purchase, brand loyalty, referrals; reduced complaints, increased sales volume and profit (Audu, 2018). In the view of the above, the determinant of customer satisfaction is quality of core products, pricing, service delivery, environment where product or service is consumed and the ultimate relationship with clients over time.

### **Customer Loyalty**

Customer loyalty is a fundamental determinant of company long-term success and viability. Behavioural loyalty has to do with repeat purchases of the company's product from a known brand at all times (Hajar et al., 2022). The attitudinal loyalty is a measure of the extent of dispositional commitment as regards to some unique characteristics or value associated with a given brand. In this study, customer loyalty would be measured by re-purchase intentions, usage continuity and willingness to recommend the company's products to others. Customer

loyalty is a profound commitment to customer patronage of desired products or other services. It is the continuous shopping of a product or service by customers with a strong resistance to change from patronizing the company's product in preference to other alternative available products in the market.

### **Customer Retention**

Customer retention is the measure of the ability of a company or product to retain its customers over an extended period of time. It is a measure of a company's ability to turn customers into repeat buyers and prevent them from switching to rival firms. In an extensively competitive environment, customer retention is important for the growth and sustainability of businesses (Daniel & Augustine, 2017; Diaw, & Asare, 2018). To this end, organizations are becoming more aware that it is cost effective for them to ensure that customers in their kit do not defect to rival firms and as such put strategies in place to ensure defection does not occur. As a matter of fact, the ability of a strategy to retain the customers of the organization is one of the metrics for measuring a successful strategy. Organizations are taking preemptive and proactive actions to nip customer defection in the bud. According to Daniel and Augustine (2017) preemptive strategies are actions taken by organizations before the recognition of defection signals from their customers. Proactive strategies are those strategies that organizations applied when the recognition of initial defection is identified in form of complaints for product quality or service and reduced in the volume of patronage of the company's product.

### **Theoretical Review**

This study is anchored on the Blue Ocean Strategy Theory developed by Kim and Mauborgne (2005). The theory posits that firms achieve superior performance not by engaging in head-to-head competition within saturated markets referred to as "red oceans" but by creating "blue oceans," which represent new, uncontested market spaces characterized by innovation and value creation. In blue oceans, competition becomes irrelevant because the firm creates demand in an untapped space through differentiation and cost leadership simultaneously. The core assumption of the theory is that strategic success comes not from battling rivals, but from value innovation, which is the simultaneous pursuit of differentiation and low cost. This strategic move shifts the firm away from conventional competition-based strategies and toward a more creative, demand-generating approach. By breaking the value-cost trade-off, firms can unlock new demand and foster long-term growth. Applying this theory to aluminum

extrusion firms in South-South and South-East Nigeria, the study examines how these firms can transcend the constraints of intense industry rivalry by developing unique value propositions, innovating in product design and delivery, and targeting underserved or emerging market segments. The theory provides a relevant lens for assessing how strategic innovation influences firm performance in terms of market share, profitability, and operational efficiency.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study employed a descriptive survey research design, which enabled the systematic description of existing research phenomena (Njuguna, 2021). The descriptive survey approach provided respondents with the opportunity to share their observations, experiences, values, and perceptions regarding the subject matter. The methodology involved a deliberate effort to discover the nature of relationships between specific variables while maintaining existing environmental conditions without modification. The study selected seven representative states across Nigeria's South-South and South-East regions for data collection. The chosen states included Anambra, Abia, Enugu, Edo, Delta, Rivers, and Ebonyi. This selection was based on their geographical classification as core states within these two regions, ensuring comprehensive regional representation in the research sample. The selection criteria focused on states with significant aluminium extrusion industry presence while maintaining balanced regional coverage.

The populations of the study were the management and employees of the selected Aluminium Extrusion firms in the South-South and South-East of Nigeria which was made up of 260 respondents. On the other hand, dealers in Aluminium products in the selected South-South and South-East States of Nigeria who are customers to the Aluminium Extrusion Firms were the second categories of respondents and they comprised of 249 respondents from 83 Dealers (customers) and were therefore part of the population of the study.

Table 1: Population of the Aluminum Extrusion firms/ Dealers and percentage

| Organization     | Aluminum<br>Extrusion firms | Aluminum<br>product Dealers | Total   |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Number           | 260                         | 83x3 =249                   | 509     |
| Percentage/Ratio | 51 (0.51)                   | 49 (0.49)                   | 100 (1) |

Source: Researcher's computation, 2025

Sources: Anambra, Abia, Enugu, Edo, Delta, Rivers and Ebonyi States. Field work 2025.

The study employed a combination of simple random and purposive sampling techniques to select participants. Management personnel, staff members from aluminium extrusion firms, and aluminium product dealers were all given equal opportunity for selection in the sampling process. The sample distribution maintained a 51% to 49% ratio, accurately reflecting the population proportions - with 51% representing management and employees of aluminium extrusion firms, and 49% comprising aluminium dealers (customers). To ensure equitable representation, the research team proportionally allocated respondents according to each organization's employee size. Larger organizations with more employees consequently contributed more respondents to the study sample. For the actual questionnaire distribution phase, the study implemented a simple random sampling approach to maintain objectivity in participant selection. This sampling methodology helped ensure the research captured diverse perspectives while maintaining appropriate representation across different stakeholder groups in the aluminium extrusion industry. The study employed a semi-structured questionnaire as the primary data collection instrument. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics and the hypotheses were tested using simple linear regression with the aid of Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS version 23) at 5% level of significance.

The research adapted and modified an analytical framework based on established models from Sang and Kimitel (2020) and Njuguna (2021), as identified in the comprehensive literature review. The regression model specification took the following form:

$$\text{Perf} = f \{ \text{BOS} \}$$

Where: Perf denotes Performance and BOS denotes Blue Ocean Strategy.

Therefore:

$$\text{Perf} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \chi_1 + E \text{-----} 1$$

$$\text{Perf} = \beta_0 + \beta_2 \chi_2 + E \text{-----} 2$$

$$\text{Perf} = \beta_0 + \beta_3 \chi_3 + E \text{-----} 3$$

$$\text{Perf} = \beta_0 + \beta_4 \chi_4 + E \text{-----} 4$$

$$\text{Perf} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \chi_1 + \beta_2 \chi_2 + \beta_3 \chi_3 + \beta_4 \chi_4 + \beta_5 \chi_5 + E \text{ -----5}$$

Where: Perf= Is the organizational performance

$\beta_0$ =Is the regression constant

$\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3, \chi_4$ , and  $\chi_5$  are the coefficient of independent variables to be estimated

$\chi_1$ =Value Innovation Strategy

$\chi_2$ =Cost Leadership Strategy

$\chi_3$ =Product Differentiation Strategy

$\chi_4$ =product Innovation Strategy

$\chi_5$ =Pricing Strategy

$E$ =Error term

## RESULT AND ANALYSIS

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics on Value Innovation Strategy

| S/N | Value Innovation Strategy                                                                          | 5             | 4             | 3             | 2            | 1            |      |                    |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------|--------------------|
|     |                                                                                                    | SA            | A             | U             | D            | SD           | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| 1.  | The company is always the first to introduce new products at affordable prices to the market.      | 96<br>(40.9%) | 72<br>(30.6%) | 47<br>(20%)   | 14<br>(6%)   | 5<br>(2.1%)  | 4.03 | 1.02               |
| 2.  | The product of the Aluminum Manufacturing Firms are designed to always meet the need of customers. | 87<br>(37%)   | 76<br>(32.3%) | 48<br>(20.4%) | 15<br>(6.4%) | 8<br>(3.4%)  | 3.94 | 1.07               |
| 3.  | The company has excellent technology for serving customers promptly                                | 30<br>(12.8%) | 37<br>(15.7%) | 60<br>(25.5%) | 87<br>(37%)  | 20<br>(8.5%) | 2.94 | 1.23               |
| 4.  | The product of the company is top most in quality in the market.                                   | 98<br>(41.7%) | 52<br>(22.1%) | 46<br>(19.6%) | 17<br>(7.2%) | 21<br>(8.9%) | 3.81 | 1.30               |

|                 |                                                                                                        |              |               |               |                |              |      |      |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|------|------|
| 5.              | The Number of quality products produced by the Aluminum manufacturing firms has no rival in the market | 13<br>(5.5%) | 30<br>(12.8%) | 35<br>(14.9%) | 139<br>(59/1%) | 17<br>(7.2%) | 2.63 | 1.10 |
| Average mean/SD |                                                                                                        |              |               |               |                |              | 3.47 | 1.14 |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The results indicate a strong belief among respondents that value innovation strategies are being implemented in aluminum manufacturing firms, with particularly high confidence (mean of 4.03) and moderate agreement with a standard deviation of 1.30.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics on Cost Leadership Strategy

|    |                                                                                                                    | SA            | A             | U             | D              | SD            | Mean | Standard<br>Deviation |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------|-----------------------|
|    | Cost leadership Strategy                                                                                           | 5             | 4             | 3             | 2              | 1             |      |                       |
| 6  | Aluminum Extrusion Firms follow a policy of procuring raw materials in large volumes to attract quantity discount. | 95<br>(40.4%) | 81<br>(34.5%) | 48<br>(20.4%) | 0<br>(0%)      | 10<br>(4.3%)  | 4.07 | 1.00                  |
| 7  | The Aluminum Extrusion Firms engage in mass production of limited range of products                                | 84<br>(35.7%) | 41<br>(17.4%) | 54<br>(23%)   | 33<br>(14%)    | 22<br>(9.4%)  | 3.56 | 1.35                  |
| 8  | The Aluminum Extrusion Firms has a network of distribution channels that minimizes distribution costs.             | 8<br>(3.4%)   | 0<br>(0%)     | 55<br>(23.4%) | 118<br>(50.2%) | 53<br>(22.6%) | 2.11 | 0.87                  |
| 9  | The Aluminum company uses a state of the art technology that helps in its cost reduction.                          | 32<br>(13.6%) | 3<br>(1.3%)   | 2<br>(0.9%)   | 100<br>(42.6%) | 97<br>(41.3%) | 2.03 | 1.31                  |
| 10 | Our products are non-branded thus help us                                                                          | 38<br>(16.2%) | 0<br>(0%)     | 66<br>(15.3%) | 64<br>(27.2%)  | 96<br>(40.9%) | 2.23 | 1.41                  |

reduce advertising  
costs

Average mean/SD 2.80 1.19

Source: Field Survey, 2025

With a high mean score of 4.07, the results indicate a strong belief among respondents that cost leadership strategies are being implemented in aluminum manufacturing firms.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics on Product differentiation Strategy

|     | <b>Product differentiation Strategy</b>                                                                           | <b>SA</b>     | <b>A</b>      | <b>U</b>      | <b>D</b>       | <b>SD</b>      | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard Deviation</b> |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------|
|     |                                                                                                                   | <b>5</b>      | <b>4</b>      | <b>3</b>      | <b>2</b>       | <b>1</b>       |             |                           |
| 11. | Our Aluminum Extrusion firms have products with unique features different from other products in the market.      | 98<br>(41.7%) | 76<br>(32.3%) | 15<br>(6.4%)  | 22<br>(9.4%)   | 23<br>(9.8%)   | 3.87        | 1.32                      |
| 12. | We make sure the way we promote our products is different from how others promote theirs.                         | 34<br>(14.5%) | 23<br>(9.8%)  | 37<br>(15.7%) | 26<br>(11.1%)  | 114<br>(48.5%) | 2.44        | 1.62                      |
| 13. | Our firm always aims at superior brand quality which makes customers regard our products highly.                  | 95<br>(40.4%) | 82<br>(34.9%) | 19<br>(8.1%)  | 22<br>(9.4%)   | 16<br>(6.8%)   | 3.93        | 1.22                      |
| 14. | We try to be unique in how we produce and sell our products.                                                      | 91<br>(38.7%) | 85<br>(36.2%) | 19<br>(8.1%)  | 23<br>(9.8%)   | 16<br>(6.8%)   | 3.91        | 1.21                      |
| 15. | The Aluminum Extrusion Firms rely on the state of the art technology to make our product stand out in the market. | 19<br>(8.1 %) | 0<br>(0%)     | 16<br>(6.8%)  | 143<br>(60.9%) | 56<br>(23.8%)  | 2.07        | 1.02                      |
|     | Average mean/SD                                                                                                   |               |               |               |                |                | 3.24        | 1.28                      |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The results reveals that more respondents agree that product differentiation strategies are being implemented in aluminum manufacturing firms, with mean score of 3.93. The firms believe in superior brand quality to retain customers.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics on Product innovation strategy

|                 |                                                                                          | SA             | A             | U             | D             | SD            | Mean | Standard<br>Deviation |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|-----------------------|
|                 | Product<br>innovation<br>strategy                                                        | 5              | 4             | 3             | 2             | 1             |      |                       |
| 16.             | We constantly add values that do not exist before to our product.                        | 84<br>(35.7%)  | 53<br>(22.6%) | 53<br>(22.6%) | 17<br>(7.2%)  | 27<br>(11.5%) | 2.65 | 1.34                  |
| 17.             | We add values to our existing products to meet customer changing tastes.                 | 113<br>(48.1%) | 43<br>(18.3%) | 55<br>(23.4%) | 18<br>(7.7%)  | 5<br>(2.1%)   | 4.03 | 1.11                  |
| 18.             | We always develop new process that enhance our product quality                           | 64<br>(27.2%)  | 39<br>(16.6%) | 54<br>(23%)   | 63<br>(26.8%) | 14<br>(6%)    | 3.32 | 1.29                  |
| 19.             | We always discover new sales market.                                                     | 47<br>(20%)    | 51<br>(21.7%) | 28<br>(11.9%) | 72<br>(30.6%) | 36<br>(15.3%) | 3.00 | 1.40                  |
| 20.             | Our company takes the lead in discovering new supply market before it is known to others | 68<br>(28.9%)  | 57<br>(24.3%) | 5<br>(2.1%)   | 50<br>(21.3%) | 54<br>(23%)   | 3.15 | 1.59                  |
| Average mean/SD |                                                                                          |                |               |               |               |               | 3.23 | 1.35                  |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The results indicate an agreement among respondents that product innovation strategy is being implemented in aluminum manufacturing firms, with particularly high confidence (mean of 4.03) and an affirmation that firms give value to customers.

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics on Pricing Strategy

|                 | Pricing Strategy                                                                                             | SA             | A             | U             | D             | SD             | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|
|                 |                                                                                                              | 5              | 4             | 3             | 2             | 1              |      |                    |
| 21.             | The company has a flexible pricing policy that benefits customers                                            | 105<br>(44.7%) | 51<br>(21.7%) | 34<br>(14.5%) | 43<br>(18.3%) | 1<br>(0.4%)    | 3.92 | 1.17               |
| 22.             | Our pricing strategy is to add a percentage mark-up to our cost of production.                               | 109<br>(46.4%) | 98<br>(41.7%) | 22<br>(9.4%)  | 5<br>(2.1%)   | 0<br>(0%)      | 4.33 | 0.73               |
| 23.             | The organization give discounts to customers in the sales of its product                                     | 48<br>(20.4%)  | 56<br>(23.8%) | 13<br>(5.5%)  | 77<br>(32.8%) | 40<br>(17%)    | 2.98 | 1.44               |
| 24.             | The company pricing strategy affects the sales of the company's product                                      | 59<br>(25.1%)  | 4<br>(1.7%)   | 2<br>(0.9%)   | 44<br>(18.7%) | 125<br>(53.2%) | 2.27 | 1.68               |
| 25.             | The company always aims at providing a high quality product at a low price relative to others in the market. | 141<br>(60%)   | 64<br>(27.2%) | 20<br>(8.5%)  | 9<br>(3.8%)   | 0<br>(0%)      | 4.44 | 0.81               |
| Average mean/SD |                                                                                                              |                |               |               |               |                | 3.58 | 1.17               |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The results indicate a strong belief among respondents that price strategy aims at providing a high quality product at a low price relative to others in the market. This is depicted by a mean score of 4.44.

Table7 Descriptive Statistics on Product Quality

|                 | <b>Product Quality</b>                                                                                                                | <b>SA</b>      | <b>A</b>      | <b>U</b>      | <b>D</b>      | <b>SD</b>     | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard Deviation</b> |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|
|                 |                                                                                                                                       | <b>5</b>       | <b>4</b>      | <b>3</b>      | <b>2</b>      | <b>1</b>      |             |                           |
| 26              | The Aluminum extrusion Firms products are durable.                                                                                    | 118<br>(50.2%) | 56<br>(23.8%) | 46<br>(19.6%) | 1<br>(0.4%)   | 7<br>(3%)     | 4.21        | 0.99                      |
| 27              | The characteristics we are looking for when buying an Aluminum products are satisfied                                                 | 94<br>(40%)    | 53<br>(22.6%) | 34<br>(14.5%) | 40<br>(17%)   | 7<br>(3%)     | 3.82        | 1.23                      |
| 28              | Aluminum products company are manufactured with modern technology whose output can compare favourably with any product in the Country | 146<br>(62.1%) | 53<br>(22.6%) | 4<br>(1.7%)   | 15<br>(6.4%)  | 10<br>(4.3%)  | 4.36        | 1.09                      |
| 29              | Aluminum extrusion products conforms to the customer desires when buying the product                                                  | 42<br>(17.9%)  | 56<br>(23.8%) | 16<br>(6.8%)  | 51<br>(21.7%) | 63<br>(26.6%) | 2.84        | 1.51                      |
| 30              | The aesthetic value the Aluminum products has no rival                                                                                | 33<br>(14%)    | 20<br>(8.5%)  | 45<br>(19.1%) | 66<br>(28.1%) | 64<br>(27.2%) | 2.53        | 1.36                      |
| Average mean/SD |                                                                                                                                       |                |               |               |               |               | 3.55        | 1.24                      |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

With a mean score of 4.36, respondents strongly agree that aluminum products are manufactured with modern technology whose output can compare favourably with any product in the Country.

Table 8 Descriptive Statistics on Customer Satisfaction

|                 | <b>Customer Satisfaction</b>                                                                                  | <b>SA</b>      | <b>A</b>      | <b>U</b>      | <b>D</b>      | <b>SD</b>    | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard Deviation</b> |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------------|
|                 |                                                                                                               | <b>5</b>       | <b>4</b>      | <b>3</b>      | <b>2</b>      | <b>1</b>     |             |                           |
| 31.             | The Aluminum products of the extrusion Firms always meet my need for operational efficiency                   | 139<br>(59.1%) | 34<br>(14.5%) | 14<br>(6%)    | 27<br>(11.5%) | 14<br>(6%)   | 4.13        | 1.30                      |
| 32.             | The Aluminum extrusion firms do offer discounts at a lower price than their competitors.                      | 127<br>(54%)   | 71<br>(30.2%) | 14<br>(6%)    | 5<br>(2.1%)   | 11<br>(4.7%) | 4.31        | 1.03                      |
| 33.             | The Aluminum company has a state of the art technology that provides prompt delivery of products to customers | 92<br>(39.1%)  | 60<br>(25.5%) | 28<br>(11.9%) | 33<br>(14%)   | 15<br>(6.4%) | 3.80        | 1.29                      |
| 34.             | I am happy with the prices of the Aluminum Firms                                                              | 148<br>(63%)   | 40<br>(17%)   | 33<br>(14%)   | 0<br>(0%)     | 7<br>(3%)    | 4.41        | 0.95                      |
| 35.             | The after- sales-services provided by the Aluminum firms keeps me patronizing them                            | 119<br>(50.6%) | 67<br>(28.5%) | 19<br>(8.1%)  | 6<br>(2.6%)   | 17<br>(7.2%) | 4.16        | 1.17                      |
| Average mean/SD |                                                                                                               |                |               |               |               |              | 4.16        | 1.15                      |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Results indicate that customers are satisfied with products of the aluminium firms as revealed by the high mean score of 4.41

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics on Customer Loyalty

| Customer Loyalty |                                                                                                   | SA             | A             | U             | D             | SD            | Mean | Standard<br>Deviation |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|-----------------------|
|                  |                                                                                                   | 5              | 4             | 3             | 2             | 1             |      |                       |
| 36.              | I will always refer people to patronize the products of this Aluminum company.                    | 120<br>(51.1%) | 37<br>(15.7%) | 12<br>(5.1%)  | 49<br>(20.9%) | 10<br>(4.3%)  | 3.91 | 1.35                  |
| 37.              | I will always defend the product of the Aluminum firms whenever I have the opportunity to do so   | 123<br>(52.3%) | 71<br>(30.2%) | 24<br>(10.2%) | 3<br>(1.3%)   | 7<br>(3%)     | 4.32 | 0.94                  |
| 38.              | I have been the customer of this Aluminum company for a while now and will not leave the company. | 134<br>(57%)   | 47<br>(20%)   | 35<br>(14.9%) | 1<br>(0.4%)   | 11<br>(4.7%)  | 4.28 | 1.06                  |
| 39.              | I will promote the product of the company                                                         | 82<br>(34.9%)  | 25<br>(10.6%) | 59<br>(25.1%) | 56<br>(23.8%) | 6<br>(2.6%)   | 3.53 | 1.27                  |
| 40.              | I will like to be a brand ambassador of this Aluminum company                                     | 61<br>(26%)    | 1<br>(0.4%)   | 22<br>(9.4%)  | 67<br>(28.5%) | 77<br>(32.8%) | 2.57 | 1.60                  |
| Average mean/SD  |                                                                                                   |                |               |               |               |               | 3.72 | 1.24                  |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Results show a mean score of 4.32 indicating that customers remain loyal to the products of the aluminium firms and are ever willing to defend the products whenever the opportunity arises

Table 10 Descriptive Statistics on Customer Retention

| Customer Retention |                                                                                                            | SA             | A             | U             | D             | SD             | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|
|                    |                                                                                                            | 5              | 4             | 3             | 2             | 1              |      |                    |
| 41.                | I have been patronizing the Aluminum products for more than five years now because of its flexible pricing | 130<br>(55.3%) | 40<br>(17%)   | 46<br>(19.6%) | 8<br>(3.4%)   | 4<br>(1.7%)    | 4.25 | 1.01               |
| 42.                | I will remain as a customer of the Aluminum extrusion products because of their low price.                 | 28<br>(11.9%)  | 27<br>(11.5%) | 34<br>(14.5%) | 13<br>(5.5%)  | 126<br>(53.6%) | 2.20 | 1.50               |
| 43.                | The moderate discount provided by the Aluminum firms is keeping me with the company                        | 26<br>(11.1%)  | 35<br>(14.9%) | 27<br>(11.5%) | 50<br>(21.3%) | 90<br>(38.3%)  | 2.37 | 1.42               |
| 44.                | I would not defect to another company because I am satisfied with the quality of the company's product.    | 114<br>(48.5%) | 45<br>(19.1%) | 48<br>(20.4%) | 8<br>(3.4%)   | 13<br>(5.5%)   | 4.05 | 1.17               |
| 45.                | The quality of the products of the Aluminum firms is above average                                         | 107<br>(45.5%) | 19<br>(8.1%)  | 29<br>(12.3%) | 71<br>(30.2%) | 2<br>(0.9%)    | 3.69 | 1.35               |
| Average mean/SD    |                                                                                                            |                |               |               |               |                | 3.31 | 1.29               |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The findings reveal that while customer retention is moderately rated overall (mean = 3.31), driven largely by satisfaction with product quality (mean = 4.05) and long-term patronage (mean = 4.25), pricing incentives like low prices and moderate discounts are not strong retention factors (means = 2.20 and 2.37), whereas sales volume is generally rated high (mean = 3.69), especially due to product uniqueness and company reputation.

Table 11 Descriptive Statistics on Sales Volume

|     | <b>Sales Volume</b>                                                                                  | <b>SA</b>      | <b>A</b>      | <b>U</b>      | <b>D</b>      | <b>SD</b>     | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard<br/>Deviation</b> |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
|     |                                                                                                      | <b>5</b>       | <b>4</b>      | <b>3</b>      | <b>2</b>      | <b>1</b>      |             |                               |
| 46. | The unique features of the Aluminum product improve sales turnover in my shop                        | 127<br>(54%)   | 47<br>(20%)   | 40<br>(17%)   | 8<br>(3.4%)   | 6<br>(2.6%)   | 4.23        | 1.03                          |
| 47. | Our sales team carries out constant research to determine customers need and we try to satisfy them. | 110<br>(46.8%) | 45<br>(19.1%) | 49<br>(20.9%) | 6<br>(2.6%)   | 18<br>(7.7%)  | 3.98        | 1.23                          |
| 48. | We provide some free gifts to encourage customers to buy more of our Aluminum products               | 70<br>(29.8%)  | 33<br>(14%)   | 60<br>(25.5%) | 65<br>(27.7%) | 0<br>(0%)     | 3.47        | 1.20                          |
| 49  | The company discounts encourages customer to buy more of the Aluminum products                       | 25<br>(10.6%)  | 25<br>(10.6%) | 44<br>(18.7%) | 62<br>(26.4%) | 72<br>(30.6%) | 2.43        | 1.33                          |
| 50. | The long standing reputation of the company encourages large scale sales of the Aluminum products    | 133<br>(56.6%) | 55<br>(23.4%) | 31<br>(13.2%) | 0<br>(0%)     | 9<br>(3.8%)   | 4.33        | 0.99                          |
|     | Average mean/SD                                                                                      |                |               |               |               |               | 3.69        | 1.16                          |

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The findings show that sales volume is primarily driven by product uniqueness, brand reputation, and customer-focused strategies, while price incentives like discounts have minimal impact.

## Test of Hypotheses

### Hypothesis 1

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between value innovation and product quality.

Table 12 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .879 <sup>a</sup> | .772     | .771              | .85955                     | .157          |

a. Predictors: (constant), Value innovation

b. Dependent variable: Product quality

The model shows a strong positive relationship between value innovation and product quality ( $R = 0.879$ ,  $R^2 = 0.772$ ), indicating that value innovation explains 77.2% of the variation in product quality, thereby justifying the rejection of the null hypothesis and confirming a significant relationship.

### Hypothesis 2

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between cost leadership and customer satisfaction.

Table 13 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .917 <sup>a</sup> | .840     | .897              | 1.18227                    | .290          |

a. Predictors: (constant), cost leadership

b. Dependent variable: customers satisfaction

The analysis reveals a strong and significant positive relationship between cost leadership and customer satisfaction ( $R = 0.917$ ,  $R^2 = 0.840$ ), indicating that cost leadership strategies account for 84% of the variation in customer satisfaction, thereby providing empirical support for rejecting the null hypothesis.

### Hypothesis 3

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between Product differentiation and customer loyalty.

Table 14 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .867 <sup>a</sup> | .751     | .750            | 1.34823                    | .143          |

a. Predictors: (constant), product differentiation

b. Dependent variable: customers loyalty

The result indicates a strong positive relationship between product differentiation and customer loyalty ( $R = 0.867$ ,  $R^2 = 0.751$ ), meaning that product differentiation accounts for 75.1% of the variation in customer loyalty, thus the null hypothesis is rejected and a significant relationship is confirmed.

### Hypothesis 4

H<sub>0</sub> : There is no significant relationship between product innovation and customer retention.

Table 15 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .924 <sup>a</sup> | .853     | .852            | .99685                     | .157          |

a. Predictors: (constant), product innovation

b. Dependent variable: customer retention

The analysis reveals a very strong positive relationship between product innovation and customer retention ( $R = 0.924$ ,  $R^2 = 0.853$ ), indicating that product innovation explains 85.3% of the variation in customer retention, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis and confirming a significant relationship.

### Hypothesis 5

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between pricing strategy and sales volume.

Table 16 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .936 <sup>a</sup> | .876     | .874            | .76047                     | .208          |

a. Predictors: (constant), pricing strategy

b. Dependent variable: sales volume

The result shows a very strong positive relationship between pricing strategy and sales volume ( $R = 0.936$ ,  $R^2 = 0.876$ ), indicating that pricing strategy accounts for 87.6% of the variation in sales volume, thus the null hypothesis is rejected and a significant relationship is established.

### Discussion of Findings

The analysis of hypothesis 1 **revealed a** strong positive relationship between value innovation and product quality ( $R = 0.879$ ,  $R^2 = 0.772$ ). This indicates that 77.2% of the variation in product quality is explained by the firms' value innovation efforts. This result aligns with previous findings by Hajar et al. (2022) and Hendratmoko (2021), affirming that innovation in delivering value particularly through affordable, differentiated offerings contributes significantly to perceived product quality. However, the low mean scores in descriptive statistics suggest that firms may not be fully exploiting value innovation strategies, especially regarding technology and market uniqueness.

In hypothesis 2, a very strong relationship was found between cost leadership and customer satisfaction ( $R = 0.917$ ,  $R^2 = 0.840$ ), meaning 84% of the variance in customer satisfaction is attributable to cost leadership practices. This supports the work of Crimson and Yeni (2019), emphasizing the strategic importance of cost control in improving customer satisfaction. Despite low ratings in specific cost-reduction techniques like distribution and technology, the high overall satisfaction score indicates that even basic cost efficiencies can yield substantial customer value.

The result for hypothesis 3 showed a strong positive relationship between product differentiation and customer loyalty ( $R = 0.867$ ,  $R^2 = 0.751$ ). This confirms that differentiated products account for 75.1% of the variation in customer loyalty, consistent with findings by

Onwuchekwa et al. (2020) and Aballa (2018). However, descriptive data revealed weaknesses in promotional efforts and technological innovation, which could undermine long-term customer loyalty if not addressed.

For hypothesis 4, the regression output revealed a very strong positive relationship between product innovation and customer retention ( $R = 0.924$ ,  $R^2 = 0.853$ ). This implies that 85.3% of changes in customer retention can be linked to product innovation strategies, reinforcing the findings of Samuel et al. (2021) and Kyei & Bayoh (2017). Nevertheless, customers reported low satisfaction with added product value and incentives, suggesting the need for more aggressive innovation and value delivery.

Finally, hypothesis 5 confirmed a very strong relationship between pricing strategy and sales volume ( $R = 0.936$ ,  $R^2 = 0.876$ ), indicating that 87.6% of sales volume variance is explained by pricing decisions. This supports the studies of Akombo (2011) and Hyginus et al. (2019), highlighting pricing as a critical driver of sales performance. Yet, low mean scores for discount strategies suggest that overreliance on price cuts may be ineffective, and firms should consider more comprehensive pricing approaches.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study are summarized below:

1. Value innovation has a significant positive effect on product quality ( $R = 0.879$ ,  $R^2 = 0.772$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ).
2. Cost leadership significantly influences customer satisfaction ( $R = 0.917$ ,  $R^2 = 0.840$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ).
3. Product differentiation has a significant positive impact on customer loyalty ( $R = 0.867$ ,  $R^2 = 0.751$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ).
4. Product innovation is strongly linked to customer retention ( $R = 0.924$ ,  $R^2 = 0.853$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ).
5. Pricing strategy significantly affects sales volume ( $R = 0.936$ ,  $R^2 = 0.876$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ).

This study concludes that competitive strategies—namely value innovation, cost leadership, product differentiation, product innovation, and pricing strategy—play a critical role in enhancing the performance of Aluminum Extrusion Firms. The empirical results show that each strategy significantly influences key performance outcomes such as product quality, customer satisfaction, loyalty, retention, and sales volume. However, descriptive findings

reveal that these strategies are not being fully optimized in practice, particularly in areas like technology adoption, product uniqueness, and promotional effectiveness. To achieve sustainable competitive advantage, firms must bridge the gap between strategic intent and actual implementation.

On the strength of the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. The Aluminum Extrusion Firms should invest in up-to-date production equipments that will deliver high quality products at low cost.
2. It is also recommended that the Aluminum Extrusion Firms should embark on aggressive pursuit of cost reduction through quantity purchase of materials, mass production of limited range of products, distribution channels that minimizes costs and non-branded products so as to take the advantage of cost leadership.
3. It is equally recommended that Aluminum Extrusion Firms should always distinguish their organization's offerings from others through building unique features like colour, textures, depths and uniqueness into their product/service delivery so as to engender customer loyalty.
4. The study also recommended that Aluminum Extrusion Firms should keep adding values that does not exist before through modification of existing products to meet customer's tastes and develop new process so as to retain customers.
5. It is recommended that Aluminum Extrusion Firms should offer discounts, flexible pricing policy and adopt a low price so as to increase their sales volume.

## REFERENCES

- Audu, Y. P. (2018). Customer relationship management practices and customersatisfaction in selected deposit money banks in Kogi State [Master's dissertation,Nasarawa State University].
- Daniel, A. K., & Augustine, T. M. B. (2017). Innovation and customer retention in theGhanaian telecommunication industry. *International Journal of Innovation*, 5(2),171–183.
- Dibie, V. M., Nto, P. O., Unanam, E. L., & Bassey, I. E. (2019). Effect of productinnovation on customer acquisition and retention. *International Journal ofMarketing and Communication Studies*, 4(1), 50–62.
- Eromafuru, E. G. (2022). Blue Ocean Strategy and competitiveness of micro, small, andmedium enterprises in Nigeria: Can core competence mediate?

- Research Perspectives on Management, Innovation, and Sustainability in Organizations: 39MGT 2022. <https://ibimapublishing.com/p-articles/39MGT/2022/3920022/>
- Friehe, T., Langlais, E., & Schulte, E. (2018). On consumer preferences for partial product liability. *Economics Letters*, 173, 128–130.
- Hajar, M., Alkahtani, A. A., Muhammed, A. A., Alkaws, G., Iahad, N., Daru, M. R., & Sieh, K. T. (2022). The effect of value innovation in the superior performance and sustainable growth of the telecommunications sector: Mediation effect of customer satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Sustainability*, 14(10), 6842. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106842>
- Hamra, Y., & Gassabi, I. (2021). Adopting Blue Ocean Strategy to break the competition and create value innovation—Case study of Sun Circus Company. *Journal of Administrative and Financial Sciences Review*, 5(2), 440–454.
- Hassan, N. F., Salman, A. J., & Hawas, A. T. (2022). The Blue Ocean Strategy and its role in achieving competitive advantage. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(6), 1488–1503.
- Islami, X., Mustafa, N., & Latkovikj, T. (2020). Linking Porter's generic strategies to firm performance. *Future Business Journal*, 6(3). [https://doi.org/\[insert DOI if available\]](https://doi.org/[insert DOI if available])
- Kalu, E. U., Alice, C. O., Chioma, D. O., Augustina, O. N., & Chinwe, O. (2017). The relative impact of bank credit on manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 7(2), 38-53.
- Manufacturers Association of Nigeria. (2017). MAN quarterly journal [Periodical].
- Maulana, A., Zain, I. Z., & Dhaniswara, H. (2021). The impact of cost leadership strategy on sales volume in the era of COVID-19 pandemic: A case study of baby product company. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, Rome, Italy.
- Moshin, C., & Rajesh, K. P. (2020). A study on significance of the Blue Ocean Strategy. *Mukt Shabd Journal*, 9(4), 3684-3698.
- Muhammed, A. H., Sanusi, A. M., & Aeshah, M. A. (2020). Role of price towards customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Molecular and Clinical Medicine*, 7(3), 4179-4180.
- Njuguna, S. N. (2021). Competitive strategies and organizational performance: A case of insurance companies in Nyeri County, Kenya [Master's project, Kenya University].

- Obola, J. O., Kwendo, E., & Otuya, W. (2021). Influence of competitive strategies on customer loyalty: A case of Kenya Commercial Bank South Sudan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research*, 9, 1-6.
- Oguche, W. E., Agbo, P. O., & Enokela, I. F. (2024). Leveraging Blue Ocean Strategy for market expansion in SMEs in Nigeria. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, Technology and Innovation*, 1(1).  
<https://ijeti.uniben.edu/index.php/2024/08/23/leveraging-blue-ocean-strategy-for-market-expansion-in-smes-in-nigeria/>
- Olaide, E. O. (2019). The impact of bank credit on economic growth and inflation: The case of Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Management*, 21(2), 71-83.
- Rahman, M. H., & Choudhury, S. (2019). The influence of Blue Ocean Strategy on organizational performance. *Journal of Global Disclosure of Economics and Business*, 8(2), 91-104.
- Rebbouh, M. (2019). Identifying a comprehensive theoretical picture of Blue Ocean Strategy. *Management and Economics Research Journal*, 1(3), 38-53.
- Sentanu, G. E. P. (2019). Blue Ocean Strategy for creating value of the organization: Examination of differentiation with Red Ocean Strategy. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*.
- Thabet, A. M. T., & Ramadan, K. (2022). The implications of the Blue Ocean Strategy on marketing performance: An analytical study of the opinions of a sample of workers in Asiatic Telecom in Iraq. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(5), 1945-1957.
- Vasiljeva, T., Ponkratov, V., Kuznetsov, N., Maramygin, M., & Osiovskaia, T. (2019). Implementation of the Blue Ocean Strategy using simulation: Firm-level evidence from Russian still market. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Systems*, 18(4), 857-871.
- Yakubu, A. N., Shehu, S., & Olubunmi, A. (2019). The impact of pricing strategy on customer loyalty in production companies (a case study of Hi-malt and 7up Bottling Company, Kaduna). *Journal of Management and Corporate Governance*, 11(1), 43-56.
- Ziyaminyana, N., & Pwaka, O. (2019). An investigation into the impact of performance management systems on employee productivity: The case study of information and communication technologies (ICT) companies in Harare, Zimbabwe. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 11(3), 25-34.