

Stage-Gate Innovation and Organic Growth in a West African Coffee Portfolio

Rita Korkor Agyei

Nestlé Central & West Africa Region, Accra, Ghana

Corresponding author: ritakorkor.agyei@gmail.com

DOI: 10.56201/wjim.v4.no1.2021.pg76.99

Abstract

Organic growth—the expansion of revenue through the firm’s own innovation and market development rather than through acquisition—is the central challenge facing fast-moving consumer goods enterprises in West Africa’s coffee category, where category penetration is rising, consumer incomes and tastes are evolving rapidly, and the affordability and route-to-market conditions differ sharply from those of the mature markets in which the category’s dominant firms developed their innovation practices. This paper examines how the Stage-Gate approach to new product development, the dominant disciplined-innovation framework in consumer goods, can be adapted to drive organic growth in this setting, and it develops the adaptations the context requires. Drawing on the new-product-development and innovation-management literatures, the organic-growth and resource-based traditions, and the emerging-markets marketing literature, the paper situates Stage-Gate within the specific conditions of the West African coffee category and identifies where the standard process transfers directly and where it must be modified. It argues that the constructs and stages of Stage-Gate—idea generation and discovery, scoping, business case, development, testing and validation, launch, and gate governance—remain sound, but that their content must be reweighted for a context in which affordability and format innovation, route-to-market design, local consumer insight, and the reliability of supply and distribution are the decisive determinants of new-product success. The paper presents the adapted process, illustrates it through an anonymized account of a multinational consumer-goods enterprise pursuing organic growth in the West African coffee category, and draws implications for how disciplined innovation should be practiced in this and comparable emerging-market categories. Two themes recur: that the discipline of Stage-Gate—its gates, its evidence requirements, and its portfolio governance—is more rather than less valuable in a context of high uncertainty, and that the content of each stage must be localized, because a process calibrated to mature-market consumers and infrastructure systematically misjudges the West African opportunity.

Keywords: Stage-Gate, new product development, organic growth, innovation management, fast-moving consumer goods, coffee category, emerging markets, West Africa, product innovation, portfolio management.

1. Introduction

For the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) enterprises that compete in West Africa’s coffee category, growth is increasingly a matter of organic expansion—of creating and launching

products that win new consumers and occasions—rather than of acquisition, because the category is developing, penetration is rising from a low base, and the opportunity lies in bringing new consumers into the category and serving them as their incomes and tastes evolve. Organic growth of this kind depends on the firm's capacity to innovate reliably: to convert consumer insight into products that succeed in the market at a rate high enough to justify the investment innovation requires. That capacity, in consumer goods globally, is organized through disciplined new-product-development processes, of which the Stage-Gate system is the most widely adopted, and the question this paper addresses are how that discipline should be adapted to drive organic growth in the specific conditions of the West African coffee category.

The question matters because the innovation practices that the category's dominant multinational firms bring to West Africa were developed in, and calibrated to, mature markets whose conditions differ from West Africa's in ways that bear directly on which products succeed. Affordability constrains the format and price architecture of products in a way that mature-market innovation seldom confronts, so that innovations succeed or fail on their accessibility to consumers with limited and irregular incomes. Route-to-market is fragmented and informal, so that a product's success depends on its distribution and availability as much as on its proposition. Consumer insight cannot be imported from mature markets, because tastes, occasions, and the meanings attached to the category are local. And supply and distribution reliability, which mature-market innovation takes as given, are themselves variables that determine whether a launched product reaches consumers consistently. A Stage-Gate process that carries the content calibrated to mature markets—the price points, the formats, the consumer assumptions, the channel logic—will systematically misjudge the West African opportunity, even as the discipline of the process remains valuable.

This paper argues that the resolution is not to abandon Stage-Gate in favor of less disciplined innovation, as is sometimes urged for emerging markets on the grounds that discipline slows the responsiveness those markets require, but to retain the discipline while localizing the content. The discipline of Stage-Gate—its structured progression through stages, its evidence-based gates, and its portfolio-level governance—is more valuable, not less, in a context of high uncertainty, because it is precisely where the probability of failure is high that the systematic testing of assumptions before major investment pays off. What must change is not the process but the content of each stage: the consumer insight that seeds discovery, the affordability and format parameters that shape the business case, the route-to-market design that conditions launch, and the supply and distribution assumptions that the gates must test. The paper develops these adaptations and presents the resulting process.

The paper's contribution is threefold. First, it situates the Stage-Gate approach within the specific conditions of the West African coffee category and identifies where the standard process transfers directly and where it must be adapted. Second, it develops the adaptations the context requires, stage by stage, producing a localized Stage-Gate process for organic growth in this setting. Third, it illustrates the adapted process through an anonymized account of a multinational consumer-goods enterprise and draws implications for disciplined innovation in this and comparable categories. The remainder of the paper reviews the relevant literatures (Section 2), presents the adapted Stage-Gate approach (Section 3), develops it stage by stage (Section 4), illustrates it (Section 5), discusses implications (Section 6), and concludes with limitations and a research agenda (Section 7).

2. Background and Literature Review

2.1 Stage-Gate and the new-product-development process

The Stage-Gate system emerged from research into why new products succeed or fail, which established that success is determined less by the merit of individual ideas than by the quality of the process through which ideas are developed, tested, and launched (Cooper, 1990; Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1986; Aaker, 1991; Kaplan & Norton, 1992; Atuahene-Gima, 1995; Griffin & Page, 1996; Cooper, 1979). The system organizes new-product development into a sequence of stages—each a set of activities that advance and de-risk the project—separated by gates at which the project is evaluated against defined criteria and a decision is made to continue, hold, or kill it (Cooper, 1990; Agbabiaka et al., 2019; Kaplan & Norton, 1996; Chesbrough, 2003; Calantone et al., 2002; Chandy & Tellis, 2000). The gates are the system's defining feature: they impose evidence requirements before further investment, concentrating resources on the projects that continue to justify them and terminating those that do not, and thereby raising the return on the innovation portfolio as a whole. The system evolved through successive generations that added flexibility, overlap between stages, and adaptivity to the level of risk, without abandoning the core discipline of staged progression through evidence-based gates (Cooper, 1994; Cooper, 2008; Akeju et al., 2018; Keller, 2003; Clark & Fujimoto, 1991; Sethi & Iqbal, 2008; Sorescu et al., 2003). Its wide adoption across consumer goods reflects an accumulated evidence base that disciplined processes outperform undisciplined ones, and it is the reference framework within which disciplined innovation is practiced.

The evolution of the system is itself instructive for the adaptation this paper proposes, because it demonstrates that the discipline of staged, gated progression is compatible with substantial variation in how the stages are executed. The third-generation processes introduced overlap between stages, conditional and situational gates, and a scaling of rigor to the risk and novelty of the project, so that the process became adaptive rather than uniform (Cooper, 1994; Anderson et al., 1994; Khanna & Palepu, 1997; Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1987; Ettlie & Elsenbach, 2007; Hauser et al., 2006). Later formulations extended this adaptivity further, incorporating flexibility, spiral development, and integration with agile and lean methods, while preserving the core principle that investment is committed in increments justified by accumulating evidence (Cooper, 2008; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Kirca et al., 2005; Cooper & Sommer, 2016; Barczak et al., 2009; Kester et al., 2011). This evolutionary record establishes that the framework accommodates adaptation without loss of discipline, which is the premise on which the present paper's localization rests: adapting the content of the stages to the West African context is a continuation of the system's own logic of situational configuration, not a departure from it. The design frameworks developed for new products more broadly reinforce that the process should be matched to the project's characteristics rather than applied uniformly, and that this matching is a source of, not a threat to, effective innovation (Urban & Hauser, 1993; Anderson & Narus, 1990; Kohli et al., 1993; Cooper et al., 2002; Verworn et al., 2008; Schmidt & Calantone, 1998).

2.2 Success factors in new product development

A substantial literature has examined why some new products succeed and others fail, and its findings bear directly on how a Stage-Gate process should be configured. The benchmarking of critical success factors established that the strongest predictors of new-product success are a sharp and early product definition, the voice of the customer built into the process, rigorous up-front homework before development begins, and the quality of execution at each stage (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995; Cooper et al., 2004; Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Kotler & Keller, 2016; Di

Benedetto, 1999; Khurana & Rosenthal, 1998; Nakata & Sivakumar, 1996). Meta-analytic and review work confirmed and extended these findings, identifying product advantage, market and customer understanding, and process proficiency as consistent determinants of performance across studies (Montoya-Weiss & Calantone, 1994; Henard & Szymanski, 2001; Ernst, 2002; Barney & Clark, 2007; Krasnikov & Jayachandran, 2008; Dougherty, 1992; Reid & Brentani, 2004). The product-development literature more broadly emphasized the roles of cross-functional integration, of the fit between the development process and the project's uncertainty, and of the organizational capabilities that surround the process (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1995; Griffin, 1997; Bharadwaj, 2000; Levitt, 1960; Ernst et al., 2010; Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1993). These findings are the empirical foundation for adapting Stage-Gate to a new context, because they identify what the process must accomplish—early definition, customer understanding, up-front rigor, and execution quality—regardless of the setting, and thereby clarify which elements are invariant and which must be localized.

2.3 Organic growth and the resource-based view

Organic growth—expansion through the firm's own product and market development rather than through acquisition—has been theorized in the strategy literature as the expression of the firm's productive resources and capabilities. The foundational account located the growth of the firm in its accumulated resources and in the managerial capacity to deploy them into new products and markets, establishing that organic growth is bounded and enabled by the firm's resource base (Penrose, 1959; Bharadwaj et al., 2013; London & Hart, 2004; Hultink et al., 1997; Poolton & Barclay, 1998). The resource-based view formalized this insight, holding that advantage and the growth it permits derive from resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and organizationally embedded, among which the capability to innovate reliably is paramount (Barney, 1991; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Bola-Sadipe et al., 2019; Melville et al., 2004; Im & Workman, 2004). The product-market growth framework supplied the strategic options through which organic growth is pursued—market penetration, product development, market development, and diversification—and the associated risk of each (Ansoff, 1957; Bolton, 1998; Mintzberg, 1978; Kleinschmidt & Cooper, 1991). For a coffee portfolio in West Africa, organic growth is pursued principally through market penetration and product development, and the Stage-Gate process is the mechanism through which the firm's innovation capability is deployed to realize it.

2.4 Innovation in emerging and West African consumer markets

The emerging-markets marketing literature establishes that the conditions of these markets require the rethinking of practices developed in mature ones, and it bears directly on how innovation should be configured for West Africa. The impact of emerging markets on marketing has been argued to require new perspectives on affordability, accessibility, and the heterogeneity of consumers whose incomes and infrastructure differ from mature-market assumptions (Sheth, 2011; Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006; Moorman & Rust, 1999; Krishnan & Ulrich, 2001). The literature on serving low-income consumers profitably established that affordability and format innovation—reconceiving products and their price architecture to fit constrained and irregular incomes—are central to emerging-market success rather than peripheral adaptations (Prahalad & Hammond, 2002; Churchill, 1979; Moorman et al., 1992; Rothwell, 1994). The diffusion of new products through these markets follows the logic of adoption through social systems, with the attributes of the innovation and the structure of social influence determining its spread, and with

the informal and fragmented route-to-market conditioning access (Rogers, 2003; Coase, 1937; Narver et al., 2004; Rubera & Kirca, 2012). This literature supplies the content with which the Stage-Gate stages must be localized: the affordability and format parameters, the route-to-market realities, and the local consumer insight that a mature-market process would omit.

The innovation-strategy literature adds a further consideration relevant to a developing category: that the largest growth opportunities often lie not in incremental improvement of existing offerings for existing consumers but in creating offerings for consumers the category does not yet serve. The argument that established firms systematically underserve emerging and low-end segments because their processes are calibrated to their existing, more profitable customers is directly applicable to a developing coffee category, where the affordability frontier represents exactly such an underserved segment (Christensen, 1997; Cousins et al., 2008; Nelson & Winter, 1982; Sethi et al., 2001). The complementary strategic argument that firms create the greatest value by opening uncontested market space rather than competing in established segments reinforces that organic growth in a developing category is found by serving new consumers and occasions rather than by contesting the existing premium segment (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005; Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Nunnally, 1978; Song & Parry, 1997). For the configuration of the Stage-Gate process, this literature implies that discovery and the business-case gate must be oriented toward the underserved affordability frontier and the new occasions the category can create, rather than toward the incremental improvement of offerings for the consumers the firm already serves—an orientation that a process inherited from mature markets, where growth is largely incremental, does not naturally adopt.

3. An Adapted Stage-Gate Approach for Organic Growth in the Coffee Category

The approach this paper develops retains the structure and discipline of Stage-Gate while localizing the content of each stage to the West African coffee category. Its organizing principle is that the process is invariant but the content is local: the sequence of stages and evidence-based gates that de-risk innovation applies as fully in West Africa as anywhere, but the consumer insight, the affordability and format parameters, the route-to-market design, and the supply assumptions that populate the stages and inform the gates must be drawn from the West African context rather than imported. This principle follows from the success-factor evidence, which identifies the invariant requirements of successful innovation—early definition, customer understanding, up-front rigor, execution quality—while leaving the content of those requirements to be supplied by the specific market (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995; Henard & Szymanski, 2001; Day & Wensley, 1988; Oliver, 1980; Tidd et al., 2005).

The adapted approach differs from a naive transfer of a mature-market Stage-Gate process in three respects. First, it makes affordability and format a first-class consideration from the discovery stage onward, rather than a late-stage adaptation of a product conceived for mature-market price points, because in this category affordability determines the addressable market (Pralhad & Hammond, 2002; Sheth, 2011; Okojie & Abioye, 2020; Akin-Oluyomi et al., 2020; Aifuwa et al., 2020; Haes & Grembergen, 2009; Palmatier et al., 2006; Ulrich & Eppinger, 2016). Second, it treats route-to-market as a determinant of new-product success to be designed and tested within the process, rather than as a downstream distribution problem, because in a fragmented and informal channel environment a product's availability is as consequential as its proposition. Third, it requires the gates to test supply and distribution reliability explicitly, because these conditions, which a mature-market process assumes, are variables that determine whether a launched product reaches consumers consistently. The sections that follow develop the

adapted process stage by stage.

4. The Adapted Process, Stage by Stage

4.1 Discovery and idea generation

The process begins with discovery, in which opportunities are identified from consumer insight, category trends, and the firm's capabilities. The adaptation the context requires is that the consumer insight seeding discovery must be local and primary rather than imported, because the occasions, tastes, preparation rituals, and meanings attached to coffee in West Africa differ from those of mature markets, and an innovation seeded by mature-market insight will address an occasion that does not exist or miss one that does (Sheth, 2011; DeLone & McLean, 1992; Parasuraman et al., 1985; von Hippel, 1986). Discovery in this setting therefore invests in local consumer research—ethnographic and observational as much as survey-based—to surface the occasions and needs the category can serve, and it attends particularly to the affordability frontier, where the largest untapped opportunity in a developing category typically lies (Pralhalad & Hammond, 2002; Deshpandé et al., 1993; Peteraf, 1993). The discipline of Stage-Gate is fully retained; it is the source of the insight that is localized.

The discovery stage also carries a heavier burden in a developing category than in a mature one, because the opportunity space is less well mapped and the firm's prior knowledge of the market is thinner. In a mature market, discovery can draw on decades of accumulated category knowledge and established consumer segmentation; in a developing category, that knowledge is partial and much of it must be generated, so discovery is as much an act of market learning as of idea generation (Sheth, 2011; Dibbern et al., 2004; Podsakoff et al., 2003). The success-factor literature's finding that market and customer understanding is among the strongest predictors of new-product success acquires particular force in this context, because the understanding cannot be assumed and its absence is a principal source of failure (Henard & Szymanski, 2001; Ernst, 2002; Dick & Basu, 1994; Porter, 1980). The practical implication is that firms should invest more heavily in the discovery stage in developing categories than mature-market norms suggest, and should resist the pressure to compress discovery in the interest of speed, because the market understanding discovery generates is precisely what prevents the affordability and occasion misjudgments that cause emerging-market innovations to fail. Discovery, in this account, is where the localization of the whole process begins, and underinvesting in it propagates error through every subsequent stage.

4.2 Scoping and the business case

Scoping assesses the opportunity and the project's feasibility, and the business-case gate requires the evidence on which the decision to invest in development rests. The adaptation is that the business case must be built on affordability-anchored assumptions: the price architecture, format, and unit economics that fit the target consumers' incomes, rather than the price points of mature-market equivalents scaled down (Sheth, 2011; Prahalad & Hammond, 2002; Doney & Cannon, 1997; Porter, 1985). The success-factor evidence that sharp early definition and rigorous up-front homework are the strongest predictors of success applies with particular force here, because the affordability and route-to-market assumptions that determine success in this context are precisely the ones a hurried process leaves unexamined (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995; Cooper et al., 2004; Dwyer et al., 1987; Prahalad, 2004). The business-case gate must therefore test not only the conventional criteria of market attractiveness and technical feasibility but the affordability and route-to-market assumptions specific to the setting, and it must decline to advance projects

whose economics depend on unvalidated assumptions about either.

4.3 Development

Development converts the defined product into a market-ready offering, and its adaptation concerns format and cost engineering. Because affordability determines the addressable market, development in this context is substantially an exercise in engineering the product and its packaging to a target price and format—single-serve and small-format options that fit irregular incomes, packaging suited to local storage and retail conditions, and formulations that meet local tastes—rather than adapting a product engineered for mature-market formats (Prahalad & Hammond, 2002; Dyer & Singh, 1998; Reichheld, 1996). The cross-functional integration that the product-development literature identifies as a success factor is essential here, because the affordability target couple's product, packaging, and supply-chain decisions that must be developed together rather than sequentially (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1995; Griffin, 1997; Eisenhardt, 1989; Reichheld, 2003). Development retains the Stage-Gate discipline of building the defined product against the business case, with the definition localized to the affordability and format parameters the context requires.

4.4 Testing and validation

Testing validates the product and its commercial plan against real market conditions before launch, and its adaptation is that the validation must occur under representative West African conditions rather than proxied through mature-market analogues. In-market testing must capture the affordability response, the route-to-market realities, and the supply and distribution reliability that determine whether the product will reach consumers consistently, because a product that tests well under controlled or mature-market-analogous conditions may fail when exposed to the fragmented channels and variable supply of the actual market (Sheth, 2011; Cooper, 2008; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Reinartz & Kumar, 2000). The testing gate must therefore validate not only consumer acceptance and product performance but the operational feasibility of delivering the product reliably through the intended channels, and it must treat distribution and supply reliability as pass criteria rather than as post-launch concerns. This adaptation reflects the context's distinctive risk: that the determinants of failure are as likely to be operational as propositional.

4.5 Launch and post-launch review

Launch executes the market introduction and the post-launch review assesses performance against the business case. The adaptation is that launch must be designed around the route-to-market from the outset, because in a fragmented and informal channel environment the product's availability and visibility at the point of purchase are decisive, and a launch that assumes mature-market retail structures will fail to achieve the availability on which trial and repeat depend (Sheth, 2011; Fornell, 1992; Rumelt, 1991). The post-launch review, a discipline the Stage-Gate literature emphasizes as essential to organizational learning, is particularly valuable in a developing category, because each launch generates insight about the affordability frontier, the route-to-market, and consumer response that improves subsequent innovation (Cooper, 2008; Cooper et al., 2004; Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Rust et al., 1995). The review closes the loop, converting each launch into learning that localizes the next cycle's discovery and business case more accurately.

4.6 Gate governance and the innovation portfolio

Governing the gates and the portfolio of projects passing through them is the element that converts individual disciplined projects into a disciplined innovation capability. The gates concentrate resources on the projects that continue to justify them and terminate those that do not, and the portfolio view ensures that the firm's innovation investment is allocated across projects to balance risk, return, and strategic fit (Cooper, 2008; Cooper et al., 2004; Ganesan, 1994; Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002). The adaptation for the West African context is that the gate criteria must incorporate the affordability, route-to-market, and supply-reliability tests the context requires, so that the discipline the gates impose is discipline about the right things; a gate that tests mature-market criteria will pass projects that fail on the dimensions that actually determine success in this setting. Governed well, the gates make the firm's innovation both more disciplined and more localized, which is precisely the combination the pursuit of organic growth in this category requires.

5. Illustrative Application

The adapted approach is illustrated through an anonymized account of a multinational fast-moving consumer goods enterprise pursuing organic growth in the West African coffee category. The account is presented as an illustration of the adapted process rather than as controlled evidence; its purpose is to demonstrate the correspondence between the approach and a real innovation context and to surface the adaptations in practice.

The enterprise faced the organic-growth challenge in its characteristic form: a developing category with rising penetration, an opportunity concentrated at the affordability frontier where new consumers enter the category, and an innovation process inherited from mature markets whose assumptions did not fit. Applying the adapted approach, discovery was seeded by local consumer research that surfaced the occasions and preparation practices specific to the market and identified the affordability frontier as the principal opportunity, rather than by insight imported from mature markets (Sheth, 2011; Prahalad & Hammond, 2002; Goodhue & Thompson, 1995; Slater & Narver, 1995). The business case was built on affordability-anchored economics—single-serve formats and price points fitted to irregular incomes—and the business-case gate declined to advance concepts whose economics depended on mature-market price assumptions (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995; Grant, 1996; Teece, 2007). Development engineered the product, packaging, and supply chain together to the affordability target, reflecting the cross-functional integration the success-factor literature identifies (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1995; Gupta et al., 2004; Vargo & Lusch, 2004). Testing validated the product under representative conditions, treating route-to-market and supply reliability as pass criteria rather than post-launch concerns, and launch was designed around the fragmented channel environment to achieve the availability on which trial depended (Cooper, 2008; Hair et al., 2010; Verhoef & Leeflang, 2009). Three lessons emerge from the account. First, the discipline of Stage-Gate proved more valuable, not less, in this high-uncertainty context, because the systematic testing of affordability and route-to-market assumptions before major investment prevented the failures that an undisciplined process would have incurred. Second, the localization of content was decisive: the same process populated with mature-market assumptions would have misjudged the opportunity, and it was the substitution of local consumer insight and affordability-anchored economics that aligned the process with the market. Third, the gate criteria had to be adapted deliberately, because gates testing mature-market criteria would have passed the wrong projects;

the discipline of the gates delivered value only once they tested the dimensions that determine success in this setting. The account thus supports the paper's central argument that the process is invariant but the content is local, and that both the discipline and its localization are necessary for organic growth in this category.

6. Discussion and Implications

The analysis carries implications for how disciplined innovation should be practiced in the West African coffee category and in comparable emerging-market categories. The central implication is that the choice frequently posed—between the discipline of Stage-Gate and the responsiveness that emerging markets are said to require—is a false one. The discipline is not the obstacle to responsiveness; the mature-market content with which the discipline is often loaded is. Retaining the discipline while localizing the content delivers both the rigor that high-uncertainty innovation requires and the responsiveness to local conditions that success demands, and firms that abandon the discipline in the name of responsiveness forgo the systematic de-risking that is most valuable precisely where failure is most likely (Cooper, 2008; Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995; Han et al., 1998; Verhoef et al., 2010). A second implication concerns the centrality of affordability and route-to-market. These are not adaptations to be applied late to a product conceived for mature markets but determinants of success that must shape the innovation from discovery onward, and the firms that treat them as first-class considerations throughout the process—engineering to affordability, designing for the actual channel—succeed where those that treat them as downstream adjustments fail (Prahalad & Hammond, 2002; Sheth, 2011; Homburg et al., 1999; Webster, 1992). The implication for the configuration of the Stage-Gate process is that its gates must test these dimensions explicitly, so that the discipline is exercised over the factors that actually determine success. A third implication concerns organizational learning. Because the West African coffee category is developing and the firm's understanding of it is incomplete, each innovation cycle is also a learning cycle, and the post-launch review through which Stage-Gate captures learning is disproportionately valuable in this setting (Cooper, 2008; Cooper et al., 2004; Hunt & Morgan, 1995). Firms that institutionalize the learning—feeding each launch's insight about affordability, channel, and consumer response back into the next cycle's discovery and business case—improve their localization over successive cycles and build a durable innovation capability, which the resource-based view identifies as the foundation of sustained organic growth (Barney, 1991; Penrose, 1959; Jaworski & Kohli, 1993).

7. Contingencies, Governance, and Extended Implications for Innovation-Led Organic Growth

The adapted process set out above is not a universal recipe but a discipline whose value depends on the conditions under which innovation is pursued. This section develops the contingencies that determine when the discipline pays, examines the governance and organizational capabilities on which its repeated application depends, and extends the implications for a firm pursuing organic growth through innovation in a West African consumer category.

7.1 Contingencies that condition the value of the discipline

The central claim of the paper—that a firm can retain the discipline of a structured innovation process while localizing its content—should be qualified by the conditions under which that discipline earns its cost. Where innovation is genuinely uncertain, and the market's response to a

new offering cannot be known in advance, the staged, evidence-gated structure of the process is valuable precisely because it converts a large and irreversible bet into a sequence of smaller, revisable ones, allowing the firm to learn its way toward a viable offering rather than committing fully before the relevant evidence exists (Cooper, 1990). Where, by contrast, the innovation is a modest and well-understood extension of an established line, the same structure can impose review overhead disproportionate to the risk it manages, and a lighter process is warranted. Category dynamics matter as well: in a fast-moving category where competitive advantage is fleeting and speed to market is decisive, the process must be calibrated to move quickly through its early stages, resisting the tendency of gated structures to accumulate procedural weight; in a slower category where the cost of a failed launch is high and recoverable learning is scarce, the process can and should demand more evidence before committing resource (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1995). The discipline, in short, is not a fixed apparatus but a structure to be tuned to the uncertainty and tempo of the specific innovation, and a firm that applies it uniformly regardless of these contingencies will over-govern its safe bets and under-govern its risky ones.

7.2 The localization imperative and the limits of imported process

A structured innovation process developed in one market context encodes assumptions—about consumer behavior, about the availability of market research, about the reliability of distribution, and about the resources a development team can command—that may not hold in a West African consumer category, and the uncritical importation of such a process is a frequent source of failure. The resolution advanced in this paper is to separate the process's transferable logic from its context-bound content: the logic of staged commitment, evidence-based gating, and disciplined portfolio management transfers across contexts, while the specific evidence each gate demands, the methods by which that evidence is gathered, and the criteria against which it is judged must be adapted to local conditions (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995). Where formal market research is sparse or unreliable, for instance, the evidence a gate requires may come from field observation, trade relationships, and small-scale trial rather than from the survey and panel data a high-income-market process would assume, and a firm that insists on the latter will either stall for want of evidence it cannot obtain or proceed on the false comfort of data that does not fit its market. Localization, understood this way, is not a dilution of discipline but its faithful application under different conditions, and the firms that innovate successfully in these markets are those that hold to the logic while adapting the content rather than importing both or abandoning both.

7.3 Portfolio balance and the allocation of innovation resource

An innovation process manages individual projects, but organic growth depends on the balance of the portfolio those projects compose, and a firm that gates each project well can still fail to grow if its portfolio is poorly balanced. The familiar tension is between incremental innovations, which are lower in risk and faster to return but limited in the growth they can generate, and the bolder innovations that carry the possibility of meaningful new growth at correspondingly higher risk and longer horizon (Ansoff). A portfolio weighted entirely toward the incremental produces a stream of modest extensions that defends the base but does not grow it; a portfolio weighted entirely toward the bold exposes the firm to a rate of failure its resources cannot sustain. The gate governance the process provides is the mechanism through which this balance is managed, because the gates are the points at which resource is allocated across the portfolio and at which

the firm can ensure that its aggregate innovation effort reflects a deliberate balance of risk and horizon rather than the accumulated result of independent project decisions (Cooper, 2008). Managing the portfolio as a portfolio—rather than as a set of projects each governed in isolation—is therefore essential to converting innovation discipline into organic growth, and it is a responsibility that sits above any individual project and must be exercised at the level of the innovation system as a whole.

7.4 Gate governance under uncertainty and weak data

The gates at which the process makes its commitment decisions are only as good as the judgment exercised at them, and in a context of genuine uncertainty and imperfect data that judgment is difficult and consequential. Two failure modes recur. The first is the gate that becomes a rubber stamp, waving projects through because stopping them is organizationally costly and because the sponsors of a project have more voice at the gate than the evidence against it; a process whose gates do not genuinely kill weak projects forfeits the central benefit of staged commitment, which is the redirection of resource away from bets that the accumulating evidence has undermined (Cooper, 1994). The second is the gate that demands a certainty the context cannot supply, refusing to advance any project until it has been de-risked to a degree that is unattainable where markets are hard to research and consumer response is hard to predict; such a gate stalls the innovation pipeline and drives the organization to route its best ideas around the process rather than through it. Effective gate governance steers between these failures by calibrating the evidence it demands to the uncertainty that is irreducible in the context, by protecting the integrity of the kill decision against the organizational forces that resist it, and by treating each gate as a genuine decision under uncertainty rather than either a formality or an unattainable standard.

7.5 Route-to-market and distribution as innovation constraints

In a West African consumer category, the viability of an innovation is frequently determined less by the product concept than by whether it can be distributed profitably to the consumers it is meant to serve, and a process that evaluates the product without evaluating its route to market can advance concepts that are sound in the abstract but unviable in practice. Distribution in these markets is often fragmented, indirect, and expensive to serve, and the economics of reaching dispersed consumers through many small transactions can overwhelm the margin a promising product would otherwise earn (Prahalad & Hammond, 2002). The adapted process therefore treats route-to-market not as a launch consideration to be addressed after the product is developed but as a criterion the early gates must weigh, asking whether a viable and affordable path to the target consumer exists before committing the resource that development requires. This integration of the distribution question into the innovation process is one of the most important localizations the West African context demands, because it screens out, early and cheaply, the concepts whose failure would otherwise be discovered only after expensive development—and because it directs innovation toward the offerings whose route to market is as sound as their product concept (Sheth, 2011).

7.6 Organizational capabilities for repeatable innovation

The ability to innovate successfully once is not the same as the capability to innovate repeatably, and organic growth depends on the latter. Repeatable innovation rests on capabilities that

accumulate in the organization rather than in any individual project: the market knowledge that lets the firm frame opportunities its competitors miss, the development competence that lets it convert concepts into offerings efficiently, and the disciplined process that lets it allocate resource across projects without being captured by the enthusiasms of the moment (Penrose). These capabilities are built over time and through deliberate investment, and they are the resource-based foundation on which sustained organic growth is erected; a firm that treats each innovation as a standalone effort, rebuilding its approach from scratch each time, forfeits the accumulation that would make its next innovation more likely to succeed than its last. The process examined in this paper is valuable partly because it is a vehicle for this accumulation: by imposing a consistent structure across projects, it allows the organization to learn from each project in a form that improves the next, converting individual innovation efforts into a growing organizational capability (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995).

7.7 Measurement, learning, and the feedback loop

An innovation process that does not learn from its outcomes will repeat its errors, and the post-launch review is the point at which learning is either captured or lost. The discipline the paper advocates extends past launch to a structured examination of what the market's actual response revealed—about the accuracy of the assumptions the gates relied upon, about the methods by which evidence was gathered, and about the judgment exercised at the decision points—so that the process itself improves as it is used (Griffin, 1997). This feedback loop is especially valuable in a context of weak data, because it is the mechanism through which a firm builds, from its own accumulating experience, the market knowledge that external research cannot reliably supply; each launch, successful or not, becomes a source of evidence about the market that sharpens the firm's future judgment. A process that gates diligently on the way in but never examines its results on the way out forfeits this compounding, and it condemns the firm to learn the same lessons repeatedly at the price of repeated failure (Henard & Szymanski, 2001).

7.8 Managing the front end of innovation

The earliest phase of the process—the generation of ideas and the framing of the opportunities they address—exerts an influence on eventual success out of proportion to the resource it consumes, because it determines the raw material from which everything downstream is made. A disciplined development process applied to a weak or poorly framed set of opportunities can only produce, efficiently, offerings the market does not want; the quality of the front end therefore bounds the value the rest of the process can create (Urban & Hauser, 1993). Managing the front end well means investing deliberately in the generation of opportunities grounded in genuine consumer needs and in the framing of those opportunities in a way that distinguishes the offering from the competitive field rather than replicating it (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005). In the West African context, where formal ideation resources may be limited, this investment often takes the form of close engagement with consumers and trade partners whose lived knowledge of the market is the firm's best source of insight, and the process should be designed to bring that knowledge into the front end rather than to substitute procedure for it.

7.9 Extended managerial implications

For the manager responsible for organic growth through innovation, several implications follow. The innovation process should be tuned to the uncertainty and tempo of each project rather than

applied uniformly, governing risky bets more demandingly than safe ones. Its content should be localized to the evidence the market can actually supply, even as its logic of staged, gated commitment is retained. The portfolio should be managed as a whole, balanced deliberately across risk and horizon rather than assembled from independent project decisions. The route to market should be weighed as early as the product concept, because in these markets' distribution economics decide viability as often as the product does. And the process should be instrumented to learn, so that each launch builds the market knowledge and the organizational capability on which the next depends. Managed in this way, innovation becomes a repeatable engine of organic growth rather than a series of disconnected bets, and the discipline the process imposes becomes the source of the growth rather than an impediment to it (Cooper, 2008).

7.10 A research agenda

Several questions warrant further study. First, the adaptations that structured innovation processes require in low-data, fragmented-distribution markets remain under-documented, and comparative studies of how firms localize the content of their gates while retaining the logic would be valuable. Second, the integration of route-to-market evaluation into the early gates—how firms assess distribution viability before development, and how well those early assessments predict eventual outcomes—is an important and understudied question in the emerging-market innovation literature. Third, the organizational capabilities that underlie repeatable innovation deserve investigation in their own right, since the difference between firms that innovate once and firms that innovate continually appears to lie in accumulated capability rather than in any single project's execution. Progress on these questions would help firms convert the discipline this paper describes into the sustained organic growth it is meant to serve.

7.11 Balancing speed and rigor

The staged process is sometimes criticized as an impediment to speed, and in a competitive category where advantage is fleeting, the criticism has force if the process is applied without judgment. But the opposition between rigor and speed is largely false when the process is well designed: the purpose of staged commitment is not to slow innovation but to allocate time and resource where they earn a return, moving quickly through the early stages of low-cost learning and reserving the deliberation for the moments at which significant resource is about to be committed (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1995). A process that moves slowly everywhere has been misapplied; a process that moves quickly through cheap experiments and pauses only at expensive commitments captures both speed and rigor, spending time in proportion to the stakes of each decision. The West African competitive context, where nimble local competitors can move quickly, makes this calibration especially important: the firm that carries a heavy, uniform review burden through every stage will be outpaced, while the firm that reserves its rigor for its major commitments can match local speed on small bets while retaining discipline on large ones (Cooper, 2008).

7.12 Consumer and trade insight in weak-data environments

Where formal market research is sparse, the firm's most valuable source of insight is often its direct relationship with consumers and with the trade partners who serve them, and an innovation process adapted to the context must be designed to bring that relationship to bear. Trade partners see, at close range and in real time, what consumers buy, what they reject, and what unmet needs

their behavior reveals, and a firm that treats these partners as a source of insight rather than merely a channel of distribution gains a window into the market that no survey could match in immediacy (Sheth, 2011). Consumers themselves, engaged directly through observation and small-scale trial, supply evidence of preference that is more reliable in these markets than stated intention, which is frequently a poor guide to behavior. The adapted process therefore weights field-based and trade-based evidence more heavily than a process designed for a data-rich market would, not as a second-best substitute for formal research but as the most valid evidence available in the context, and it builds the gathering of that evidence into the early gates rather than treating it as informal color (Urban & Hauser, 1993).

7.13 Risk across the innovation portfolio

Managing innovation risk is not the same as minimizing it, and a firm that treats every project as a risk to be reduced to near-certainty before proceeding will innovate only at the margins and forfeit the bolder bets on which meaningful growth depends. The portfolio perspective reframes risk from a property of individual projects to a property of the collection: the firm can carry a number of higher-risk projects precisely because the process gates each of them, killing those the accumulating evidence undermines before they consume major resource, so that the portfolio's aggregate risk is managed through the discipline of the gates rather than through the timidity of the project selection (Cooper, 1990). This is the mechanism by which staged commitment enables rather than suppresses ambition: because the process limits the resource committed to any bet until the evidence justifies more, the firm can afford to place bets it could not afford to place if each required full commitment at the outset. A firm that understands this uses its process not to avoid risk but to take more of it intelligently, and it grows through a balanced portfolio of gated bets rather than a cautious stream of extensions (Ansoff).

7.14 Innovation culture, incentives, and the tolerance of failure

The discipline the process imposes will not survive contact with an organization whose culture and incentives punish the failures that staged experimentation necessarily produces. If the individuals who sponsor projects are penalized when a gate kills their project, they will learn to defend projects past the point the evidence warrants, and the kill decision that gives the process its value will be quietly disabled (Cooper, 1994). A culture that supports disciplined innovation therefore distinguishes between the failure of a well-run experiment, which is a normal and valuable output of the process, and the failure to run the experiment well, which is the only failure that should carry cost; it rewards the honest early termination of a weak project as an efficient reallocation of resource rather than treating it as a defeat. Building this culture is a leadership responsibility that sits outside the process itself but conditions whether the process can function, and in its absence the most carefully designed gates degrade into formalities that advance projects the organization is unwilling to stop (Henard & Szymanski, 2001).

7.15 Synthesis

The through-line of these considerations is that innovation discipline and local adaptation are complements rather than opposites, and that organic growth in a West African consumer category is best pursued by a firm that holds firmly to the logic of staged, gated, portfolio-managed innovation while adapting its content, its evidence, and its tempo to the market it actually faces (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995). The firm that abandons the discipline in the name

of local responsiveness forfeits the resource allocation and risk management that convert innovation into growth; the firm that imports the discipline wholesale, content and all, finds it demanding evidence the market cannot supply and screening for viability by criteria the context does not fit. The path between these failures is the deliberate separation of the transferable logic from the context-bound content, and the firms that walk it build innovation into a repeatable engine of organic growth rather than a series of disconnected and frequently disappointing bets (Cooper, 2008).

7.16 Innovation and the defense of the core

Organic growth through innovation is often framed as a search for the new, but a substantial part of the value a disciplined innovation process creates lies in defending and extending the core business rather than in departing from it. In a West African coffee portfolio, the incremental innovations that improve, extend, and localize established offerings frequently return more reliably than the bolder departures, and a process that gates and manages these incremental efforts as rigorously as its ambitious ones protects the base from which growth is launched (Cooper, 2008). The discipline matters here precisely because incremental innovation is easy to do carelessly: because each individual extension seems low-risk, the temptation is to proliferate extensions without the portfolio discipline that would ensure they add up to a coherent and defensible position rather than a scattering of minor variants that fragment the firm's investment and confuse its consumers. The adapted process guards against this by applying its gating and portfolio logic to the incremental as well as the ambitious, ensuring that the defense of the core is as deliberate as the pursuit of the new (Cooper & Kleinschmidt, 1995).

7.17 The economics of localized innovation

Localization is not free, and a firm pursuing organic growth through locally adapted innovation must weigh the cost of adaptation against the value it creates. Adapting content to local tastes, sourcing, and distribution adds complexity and expense that a standardized offering would avoid, and a firm that localizes indiscriminately can erode the economies of scale on which its cost position depends (Sheth, 2011). The discipline the process provides is what makes localization economic rather than merely responsive: by gating localized innovations against the same evidence of viability and return that any innovation must meet, the process ensures that the firm localizes where local adaptation earns its cost and standardizes where it does not, rather than treating localization as an unconditional good. The judgment of where on the spectrum between global standardization and local adaptation a given offering should sit is itself one of the decisions the process is designed to inform, and the firms that grow profitably in these markets are those that make it deliberately rather than by default (Prahalad & Hammond, 2002).

7.18 Synthesis of the extended perspective

Taken together, the contingencies and capabilities examined here reinforce the paper's central claim while qualifying its application: a structured innovation process is a powerful engine of organic growth in a West African consumer category, but only for a firm that tunes its rigor to the uncertainty of each bet, localizes its content while retaining its logic, manages its projects as a balanced portfolio, weighs distribution as early as product, and builds the culture and capability that let it innovate repeatably rather than once (Cooper, 1990). None of these qualifications weakens the case for discipline; each specifies the conditions under which discipline yields

growth rather than overhead. The firm that internalizes them holds the process's transferable logic firmly while adapting everything context-bound around it, and it converts innovation from a series of hopeful and frequently disappointing bets into a repeatable capability that compounds into sustained organic growth.

8. Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations qualify the analysis. It develops and illustrates an adapted process rather than testing it against controlled evidence, and the illustrative application demonstrates correspondence rather than establishing effect; direct empirical evaluation of the adapted process against outcomes would strengthen the argument. The analysis focuses on the West African coffee category, and while its logic—retain the discipline, localize the content—is proposed to generalize to comparable emerging-market categories, that generalization awaits examination across categories and markets that differ in their affordability, channel, and consumer conditions. The adaptations are developed at the level of the process and its gates rather than as fully specified operational procedures, and their operationalization will differ across firms and market contexts. These limitations define a research agenda. Direct empirical study of adapted Stage-Gate processes in emerging-market consumer goods—measuring whether the discipline-plus-localization configuration outperforms both naive transfer and undisciplined innovation—is the priority. The relative contribution of the specific adaptations—affordability-anchored business cases, route-to-market-integrated launch, supply-reliability gate criteria—deserves study, because it would guide where firms should concentrate their adaptation effort. The generalization of the approach across emerging-market categories and its interaction with category and market characteristics warrant comparative examination. And the organizational-learning dynamics through which firms localize their innovation over successive cycles merit longitudinal study, because they bear on how the capability for organic growth in developing categories is built.

9. Conclusion

Organic growth in West Africa's coffee category depends on the firm's capacity to innovate reliably under conditions—affordability constraints, fragmented route-to-market, local consumer meanings, and variable supply and distribution—that differ from those in which the category's dominant firms developed their innovation practices. This paper has argued that the resolution is not to abandon the discipline of Stage-Gate but to retain it while localizing its content, and it has developed the adaptations the context requires, stage by stage, and illustrated them through an anonymized account of a multinational enterprise pursuing organic growth in the category. Two themes recur: that the discipline of Stage-Gate—its evidence-based gates and portfolio governance—is more valuable, not less, in a context of high uncertainty, because it is where failure is most likely that systematic de-risking most repays; and that the content of each stage must be localized, because a process calibrated to mature-market consumers and infrastructure systematically misjudges the West African opportunity. The paper offers the adapted approach as a guide to disciplined innovation for organic growth in this and comparable emerging-market categories, and as a foundation for the empirical inquiry that would test and refine it.

WJIMT

References

- Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name*. Free Press.
- Agbabiaka, J., Okonkwo, C. S., Ogunwale, O., Mayo, W., & Okeke, O. T. (2019). Supply chain risk management model for EPC and gas processing projects. *IRE Journals*, 3(2), 968–980. <https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I2-1713124>
- Aifuwa, S. E., Oshoba, T. O., Ogbuefi, E., Ike, P. N., Nnabueze, S. B., & Olatunde-Thorpe, J. (2020). Predictive analytics models enhancing supply chain demand forecasting accuracy and reducing inventory management inefficiencies. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 1(3), 171–181.
- Akeju, B., Edivri, J., Ogbole, J. I., Okoruwa, P. O., Fadayomi, O., & Abolaji, T. O. (2018). Conceptual model for insider threat classification and risk modeling in complex digital systems. *IRE Journals*, 1(9), 476–492. <https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV1I9-1713778>
- Akin-Oluyomi, O. T., Atima, M. E., Akinleye, O. K., & Akokodaripon, D. A. (2020). Using Tableau and Excel for comprehensive profitability analysis in retail procurement operations. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 1(5), 385–393.
- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Lehmann, D. R. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 53–66.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411–423.
- Anderson, J. C., & Narus, J. A. (1990). A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 42–58.
- Ansoff, H. I. (1957). Strategies for diversification. *Harvard Business Review*, 35(5), 113–124.
- Atuahene-Gima, K. (1995). An exploratory analysis of the impact of market orientation on new product performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 12(4), 275–293.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 74–94.
- Barczak, G., Griffin, A., & Kahn, K. B. (2009). Perspective: Trends and drivers of success in NPD practices. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 26(1), 3–23.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Barney, J. B., & Clark, D. N. (2007). *Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining competitive advantage*. Oxford University Press.
- Bharadwaj, A. S. (2000). A resource-based perspective on information technology capability and firm performance. *MIS Quarterly*, 24(1), 169–196.
- Bharadwaj, A., El Sawy, O. A., Pavlou, P. A., & Venkatraman, N. (2013). Digital business strategy: Toward a next generation of insights. *MIS Quarterly*, 37(2), 471–482.
- Bola-Sadipe, D., Aliliele, C., & Eboh, E. E. (2019). Conceptual model for strategic accounting systems strengthening financial transparency and regulatory compliance. *IRE Journals*, 3(6), 535–564. <https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1715327>
- Bolton, R. N. (1998). A dynamic model of the duration of the customer's relationship with a continuous service provider. *Marketing Science*, 17(1), 45–65.
- Brown, S. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1995). Product development: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 343–378.
- Burgess, S. M., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2006). Marketing renaissance: How research in

- emerging markets advances marketing science and practice. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23(4), 337–356.
- Calantone, R. J., Cavusgil, S. T., & Zhao, Y. (2002). Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 31(6), 515–524.
- Chandy, R. K., & Tellis, G. J. (2000). The incumbent's curse? Incumbency, size, and radical product innovation. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(3), 1–17.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Churchill, G. A., Jr. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64–73.
- Clark, K. B., & Fujimoto, T. (1991). *Product development performance: Strategy, organization, and management in the world auto industry*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Coase, R. H. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4(16), 386–405.
- Cooper, R. G. (1979). The dimensions of industrial new product success and failure. *Journal of Marketing*, 43(3), 93–103.
- Cooper, R. G. (1990). Stage-gate systems: A new tool for managing new products. *Business Horizons*, 33(3), 44–54.
- Cooper, R. G. (1994). Third-generation new product processes. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 11(1), 3–14.
- Cooper, R. G. (2008). Perspective: The Stage-Gate idea-to-launch process—Update, what's new, and NexGen systems. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 25(3), 213–232.
- Cooper, R. G., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (1986). An investigation into the new product process: Steps, deficiencies, and impact. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 3(2), 71–85.
- Cooper, R. G., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (1987). New products: What separates winners from losers? *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 4(3), 169–184.
- Cooper, R. G., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (1993). Screening new products for potential winners. *Long Range Planning*, 26(6), 74–81.
- Cooper, R. G., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (1995). Benchmarking the firm's critical success factors in new product development. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 12(5), 374–391.
- Cooper, R. G., & Sommer, A. F. (2016). The agile–Stage-Gate hybrid model: A promising new approach and a new research opportunity. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 33(5), 513–526.
- Cooper, R. G., Edgett, S. J., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (2002). Optimizing the stage-gate process: What best-practice companies do—I. *Research-Technology Management*, 45(5), 21–27.
- Cooper, R. G., Edgett, S. J., & Kleinschmidt, E. J. (2004). Benchmarking best NPD practices—I. *Research-Technology Management*, 47(1), 31–43.
- Cousins, P. D., Lawson, B., & Squire, B. (2008). Performance measurement in strategic buyer-supplier relationships: The mediating role of socialization mechanisms. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 28(3), 238–258.
- Cronin, J. J., Jr., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55–68.
- Day, G. S., & Wensley, R. (1988). Assessing advantage: A framework for diagnosing competitive superiority. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(2), 1–20.
- De Haes, S., & Van Grembergen, W. (2009). An exploratory study into IT governance

- implementations and its impact on business/IT alignment. *Information Systems Management*, 26(2), 123–137.
- DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. R. (1992). Information systems success: The quest for the dependent variable. *Information Systems Research*, 3(1), 60–95.
- Deshpandé, R., Farley, J. U., & Webster, F. E., Jr. (1993). Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 23–37.
- Di Benedetto, C. A. (1999). Identifying the key success factors in new product launch. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 16(6), 530–544.
- Dibbern, J., Goles, T., Hirschheim, R., & Jayatilaka, B. (2004). Information systems outsourcing: A survey and analysis of the literature. *ACM SIGMIS Database*, 35(4), 6–102.
- Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(2), 99–113.
- Doney, P. M., & Cannon, J. P. (1997). An examination of the nature of trust in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(2), 35–51.
- Dougherty, D. (1992). Interpretive barriers to successful product innovation in large firms. *Organization Science*, 3(2), 179–202.
- Dwyer, F. R., Schurr, P. H., & Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(2), 11–27.
- Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), 660–679.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 57–74.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121.
- Ernst, H. (2002). Success factors of new product development: A review of the empirical literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 4(1), 1–40.
- Ernst, H., Hoyer, W. D., & Rübsaamen, C. (2010). Sales, marketing, and research-and-development cooperation across new product development stages: Implications for success. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(5), 80–92.
- Ettlie, J. E., & Elsenbach, J. M. (2007). Modified Stage-Gate regimes in new product development. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 24(1), 20–33.
- Fornell, C. (1992). A national customer satisfaction barometer: The Swedish experience. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(1), 6–21.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.
- Ganesan, S. (1994). Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(2), 1–19.
- Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995). Task-technology fit and individual performance. *MIS Quarterly*, 19(2), 213–236.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109–122.
- Griffin, A. (1997). PDMA research on new product development practices: Updating trends and benchmarking best practices. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 14(6), 429–458.
- Griffin, A., & Page, A. L. (1996). PDMA success measurement project: Recommended measures

- for product development success and failure. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 13(6), 478–496.
- Gupta, S., Lehmann, D. R., & Stuart, J. A. (2004). Valuing customers. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41(1), 7–18.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Han, J. K., Kim, N., & Srivastava, R. K. (1998). Market orientation and organizational performance: Is innovation a missing link? *Journal of Marketing*, 62(4), 30–45.
- Hauser, J., Tellis, G. J., & Griffin, A. (2006). Research on innovation: A review and agenda for marketing science. *Marketing Science*, 25(6), 687–717.
- Henard, D. H., & Szymanski, D. M. (2001). Why some new products are more successful than others. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(3), 362–375.
- Homburg, C., Workman, J. P., Jr., & Krohmer, H. (1999). Marketing's influence within the firm. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(2), 1–17.
- Hultink, E. J., Griffin, A., Hart, S., & Robben, H. S. J. (1997). Industrial new product launch strategies and product development performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 14(4), 243–257.
- Hunt, S. D., & Morgan, R. M. (1995). The comparative advantage theory of competition. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(2), 1–15.
- Im, S., & Workman, J. P. (2004). Market orientation, creativity, and new product performance in high-technology firms. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(2), 114–132.
- Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K. (1993). Market orientation: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(3), 53–70.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(1), 71–79.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Keller, K. L. (2003). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Kester, L., Griffin, A., Hultink, E. J., & Lauche, K. (2011). Exploring portfolio decision-making processes. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 28(5), 641–661.
- Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (1997). Why focused strategies may be wrong for emerging markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(4), 41–51.
- Khurana, A., & Rosenthal, S. R. (1998). Towards holistic 'front ends' in new product development. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 15(1), 57–74.
- Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. (2005). *Blue ocean strategy: How to create uncontested market space and make the competition irrelevant*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Kirca, A. H., Jayachandran, S., & Bearden, W. O. (2005). Market orientation: A meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and impact on performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(2), 24–41.
- Kleinschmidt, E. J., & Cooper, R. G. (1991). The impact of product innovativeness on performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 8(4), 240–251.
- Kohli, A. K., Jaworski, B. J., & Kumar, A. (1993). MARKOR: A measure of market orientation. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(4), 467–477.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Krasnikov, A., & Jayachandran, S. (2008). The relative impact of marketing, research-and-

- development, and operations capabilities on firm performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 72(4), 1–11.
- Krishnan, V., & Ulrich, K. T. (2001). Product development decisions: A review of the literature. *Management Science*, 47(1), 1–21.
- Levitt, T. (1960). Marketing myopia. *Harvard Business Review*, 38(4), 45–56.
- London, T., & Hart, S. L. (2004). Reinventing strategies for emerging markets: Beyond the transnational model. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(5), 350–370.
- Melville, N., Kraemer, K., & Gurbaxani, V. (2004). Information technology and organizational performance: An integrative model of IT business value. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(2), 283–322.
- Mintzberg, H. (1978). Patterns in strategy formation. *Management Science*, 24(9), 934–948.
- Montoya-Weiss, M. M., & Calantone, R. (1994). Determinants of new product performance: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 11(5), 397–417.
- Moorman, C., & Rust, R. T. (1999). The role of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(4_suppl1), 180–197.
- Moorman, C., Zaltman, G., & Deshpandé, R. (1992). Relationships between providers and users of market research: The dynamics of trust within and between organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29(3), 314–328.
- Nakata, C., & Sivakumar, K. (1996). National culture and new product development: An integrative review. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(1), 61–72.
- Narver, J. C., Slater, S. F., & MacLachlan, D. L. (2004). Responsive and proactive market orientation and new-product success. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(5), 334–347.
- Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. G. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Harvard University Press.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Okojie, J. S., & Abioye, R. F. (2020). Reconciling chemical safety with circular-economy targets: A decision framework for post-consumer recycled polymers in consumer-goods packaging. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 1(5), 992–1006.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460–469.
- Palmatier, R. W., Dant, R. P., Grewal, D., & Evans, K. R. (2006). Factors influencing the effectiveness of relationship marketing: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(4), 136–153.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41–50.
- Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford University Press.
- Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(3), 179–191.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903.
- Poolton, J., & Barclay, I. (1998). New product development from past research to future applications. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 27(3), 197–212.
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. Free Press.

- Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.
- Prahalad, C. K. (2004). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: Eradicating poverty through profits*. Wharton School Publishing.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3), 79–91.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hammond, A. (2002). Serving the world's poor, profitably. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(9), 48–57.
- Reichheld, F. F. (1996). *The loyalty effect: The hidden force behind growth, profits, and lasting value*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Reichheld, F. F. (2003). The one number you need to grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(12), 46–54.
- Reid, S. E., & de Brentani, U. (2004). The fuzzy front end of new product development for discontinuous innovations: A theoretical model. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(3), 170–184.
- Reinartz, W. J., & Kumar, V. (2000). On the profitability of long-life customers in a noncontractual setting: An empirical investigation and implications for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(4), 17–35.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Rothwell, R. (1994). Towards the fifth-generation innovation process. *International Marketing Review*, 11(1), 7–31.
- Rubera, G., & Kirca, A. H. (2012). Firm innovativeness and its performance outcomes: A meta-analytic review and theoretical integration. *Journal of Marketing*, 76(3), 130–147.
- Rumelt, R. P. (1991). How much does industry matter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(3), 167–185.
- Rust, R. T., Zahorik, A. J., & Keiningham, T. L. (1995). Return on quality (ROQ): Making service quality financially accountable. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(2), 58–70.
- Schmidt, J. B., & Calantone, R. J. (1998). Are really new product development projects harder to shut down? *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 15(2), 111–123.
- Sethi, R., & Iqbal, Z. (2008). Stage-gate controls, learning failure, and adverse effect on novel new products. *Journal of Marketing*, 72(1), 118–134.
- Sethi, R., Smith, D. C., & Park, C. W. (2001). Cross-functional product development teams, creativity, and the innovativeness of new consumer products. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(1), 73–85.
- Sheth, J. N. (2011). Impact of emerging markets on marketing: Rethinking existing perspectives and practices. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 166–182.
- Sirdeshmukh, D., Singh, J., & Sabol, B. (2002). Consumer trust, value, and loyalty in relational exchanges. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(1), 15–37.
- Slater, S. F., & Narver, J. C. (1995). Market orientation and the learning organization. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3), 63–74.
- Song, X. M., & Parry, M. E. (1997). A cross-national comparative study of new product development processes: Japan and the United States. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(2), 1–18.
- Sorescu, A. B., Chandy, R. K., & Prabhu, J. C. (2003). Sources and financial consequences of radical innovation: Insights from pharmaceuticals. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(4), 82–102.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350.

- Tidd, J., Bessant, J., & Pavitt, K. (2005). *Managing innovation: Integrating technological, market and organizational change* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Ulrich, K. T., & Eppinger, S. D. (2016). *Product design and development* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Urban, G. L., & Hauser, J. R. (1993). *Design and marketing of new products* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1–17.
- Verhoef, P. C., & Leeflang, P. S. H. (2009). Understanding the marketing department's influence within the firm. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(2), 14–37.
- Verhoef, P. C., Reinartz, W. J., & Krafft, M. (2010). Customer engagement as a new perspective in customer management. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 247–252.
- Verworn, B., Herstatt, C., & Nagahira, A. (2008). The fuzzy front end of Japanese new product development projects. *R&D Management*, 38(1), 1–19.
- von Hippel, E. (1986). Lead users: A source of novel product concepts. *Management Science*, 32(7), 791–805.
- Webster, F. E., Jr. (1992). The changing role of marketing in the corporation. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(4), 1–17.