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Abstract: The essence of this study is to examine the relationship between sustainability strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State. Four objectives, research questions and hypotheses were postulated in order to get close to the unknown of the study. Two hundred and sixty-six senior personnel and distributors formed the sample size from thirty-eight (38) manufacturing firms. A self-designed instrument was used for the collection of primary data and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was the statistical tool used in analyzing the primary data. From the findings of the study it was revealed that there is relationship between sustainability strategy and service quality innovativeness in manufacturing firms in Ogun State. Based on the findings, it was recommended that manufacturing firms should keep to the strategic rules of being not easy to imitate, heterogeneity, unique and rare, etc., to enjoy the full benefit of sustainability strategy in the industry. Again, serious caution should be exercise in adopting more than one sustainability strategies at the same time.
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1. Introduction

Every organisation is a going concern and a perpetual entity that want to remain relevant till eternity as such sustainability as a strategy becomes imperatives for such organisation to survive. This becomes imperatives and more important because it is only organisation that can survive the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous business environment that will remain functional and relevant Olorunmola, Hettey,& Sule (2019).

The real essence of sustainability is to ensure survival and more importantly, to be a great tool for competitive advantage. It was asserted by Ioannou & Serafeim (2019) that though sustainability might be spreading like a wild fire, it must be a necessary yardstick for achieving survival and building block for competitive advantage over competitors of the organisation. Sustainability, therefore, could be described as those activities an organisation get involved in to stay afloat in the business environment. But today, sustainability is more of green-washing than being a real corporate strategy as asserted by (Laufer, 2003; Ramus, 2005 as cited in
Baumgartner and Ebner, 2010) that sustainability is “done simply on the basis of a changed rhetoric, of green-washing.” Baumgartner and Ebner, 2010 went further with the assertion that “one reason for green-washing could be that corporations do not really know how they can integrate sustainability issues into their business routines and their strategies” and that “it seems that sustainability issues are pursued more coincidentally than with a clear strategy.”

This is because strategy is simply a way of doing things different and distinct from other organisations in the same industry. Strategy by Michael Porter’s seminal (1996:64) in the article “What is Strategy” said it “is about being different” and that “the essence of strategy is choosing a unique and valuable position rooted in systems of activities that are much more difficult to match” (Ioannou & Serafeim, 2017).

However, sustainability as a strategy was said have different types as exposed in Dyllick, 2000; Hardtke and Prehn, 2001; Schaltegger et al., 2002; Baumgartner, 2005:61; Baumgartner, 2009 and Baumgartner and Ebner, 2010). It is, then, imperative to say that this study will rely on those different types discussed in Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010 and they are introverted (risk mitigation), extroverted (legitimization), conservative (efficiency) and visionary (holistic) strategies.

Service quality has been identified by Abdulla, 2006 as quoted in Wijetunge, 2016 as “an emerging competitive dimension in today’s business world and identified as one of the strategies of success”. One of the best way of providing quality service is by requesting from your customers what exact do they expect from your organisation in terms of service they want to enjoy as benefit for the value they are paying for and in return there is more patronage and trust for the firm’s service.

Innovativeness can be said to be positive disruption created by goods or services. Innovativeness was said to be “a measure of the possible interruption that a product (process or service) can create in marketing and technological processes” Garcia & Calantone (2002) as quoted in Senbabaoglu, (2017). Therefore, service quality innovativeness could be describe then as possible interruption or disruption of an emerging competitive dimension in today's business world that a product can create in marketing and technological processes. It must be noted that service quality innovativeness is to create competitive dimension and strategies of success for organisations that embraced it. In discussing service quality innovativeness, we will take into cognizance the reliability, responsibility, accessibility, comfortability, assurance, tangible and empathy as factors for successful implementation.

Today, many scholars had talked about sustainability but not many really looked at sustainability as a strategy as well as the fact that there had been several research on service innovativeness but refused to look at the quality of service innovativeness. This is exactly the gap this work intends looking at to some extent.

The aim of this study is to establish if there is any relationship between sustainability strategies and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State. The objectives are:

1. Establishing the relationship between introverted (risk mitigation) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.
2. Determining the relationship between extroverted (legitimization) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.
3. Evaluating the relationship between conservative (efficiency) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.
4. Ascertaining the relationship between visionary (holistic) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.

In achieving the aim of this study, the following research questions were used as guide:

1. What is the relationship between introverted (risk mitigation) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State?

2. What is the relationship between extroverted (legitimization) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State?

3. What is the relationship between conservative (efficiency) strategy and service quality innovativeness in manufacturing firms in Ogun State?

4. What is the relationship between visionary (holistic) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State?

Again, to compliment the research questions, the following will be our tentative answers to the research questions:

H_01: There is no relationship between introverted (risk mitigation) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.

H_02: There is no relationship between extroverted (legitimization) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.

Concept of Sustainability Strategy

Competitive strategy as argued by Porter (1996) as quoted in Akhamiokhor (2017) is “about being different”. It was added by Porter (1996) as quoted in Akhamiokhor (2017) that, “it means deliberately choosing a different set of activities to deliver a unique mix of value”. It was also argued by Porter (1996) as quoted in Akhamiokhor (2017) that competitive strategy is about gaining competitive position, differentiating your organisation in the eyes of the customer, about value adding via mixture of activities distinct and separate from those activities used by your competitors.

Again, Porter (1980) had earlier describe competitive strategy as “a combination of the ends (goals) for which the firm is striving and the means (policies) by which it is seeking to get there”.

Adopted from Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010 (Independent Variable) Fig. 1: Operational Framework

It, therefore, appear that Porter embrace strategy as both planning and positioning. The suggestion from Porter and other scholars is that owners of business should seriously ignite the spirit of challenging situations and ever be prepared to meet them with pre-planned competitive strategies.
Hence, any business that intends to survive in environmental conditions that are not so palatable should, then, decide on a competitive strategy to utilize in strengths to exploit its opportunities at the same time avoid its weaknesses as much as possible (Ansoff, 1981 as quoted in Doye & Bwisa, 2015). Hence, one of the reigning strategy adopted by manufacturing firms in Nigeria today is sustainability strategy.

With deep thinking about the running and administration of the country, one can easily conclude that the main strategy left for most of the manufacturing firms in Nigeria is to try at least to survive and at the same time sustain the tempo of survival with sustainability strategy which has to do more of the green or rather can be referred to as green strategy. Today, sustainability is more of green-washing than being a real corporate strategy as asserted by (Laufer, 2003; Ramus, 2005 as cited in Baumgartner and Ebner, 2010) that sustainability is “done simply on the basis of a changed rhetoric, of green-washing.” Baumgartner and Ebner, 2010 went further with the assertion that “one reason for green-washing could be that corporations do not really know how they can integrate sustainability issues into their business routines and their strategies” and that “it seems that sustainability issues are pursued more coincidentally than with a clear strategy.”

Many scholars of management had emphasized how important sustainability is to organisations all over the world and this was backed with concrete evidence of sustainability impact on the organisation’s financial stand.

**Introverted (Risk Mitigation)**

“The evaluation of introverted strategy asserts that the strategy focuses on a very low standard of sustainability. Any firm that follow introverted strategy focuses on the basics such as toeing the line and obedience with sustainability-related guidelines.” (Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010)

**Extroverted (Legitimization)**

“A company focusing on the conventional extroverted strategy aims at communicating its sustainability commitment to society in order to differentiate itself from the competitors and to increase its credibility.” (Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010)

However, talking about extroverted strategy, the concern for business sustainability is mostly found in the PR or communication department, there by upsurges the danger of green-washing in the case of limited collaboration between the communication department and other business purposes and developments.

Extroverted (legitimating) strategy focuses on external relationships, license to operate. “As this strategy is focused on external presentation of sustainability, these aspects are especially important, which supports the increase of credibility in society such as corporate citizenship, no corruption or cartel, health and safety and also collaboration to improve the relationship and working together with stakeholders on related sustainability issues”(Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010).

Transformative extroverted strategy and conventional extroverted strategy are the same in terms of general orientation. Any company that follows extroverted strategy is a teamster for corporate sustainability in society and gains higher credibility” (Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010). An extroverted strategy can turn to be transformative in an offensive manner. A transformative strategy relates with the market as well as tries changing market situations enthusiastically. This strategy proposes to generate fresh market chances considering sustainable development which
include elements of the conservative and visionary strategy (Baumgartner, 2005:62 as quoted in Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010).

Conservative (efficiency)

Conservative (efficiency) strategy focuses on economic efficiency and cleaner production. “Conservative strategy is oriented mostly towards internal measures, focusing on cost efficiency and very well defined processes. Within this strategy, commitment is especially crucial in the investment in appropriate technology, sophisticated health and safety for employees and above all ecological sustainability” Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010.

“Also, the measures have to be derived in order to analyse and to increase the processes and to assess, based on appropriate measures, corporate sustainability. Other sustainability aspects are not much focused on in conservative strategy; in particular, society-related issues are less important” Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010.

Visionary (Holistic)

Visionary (holistic) strategy focus on issues of sustainability within all the organisation business activities that allow for competitive advantages derivable from differentiation and innovation of offering unique products to the advantages of their customers and stakeholders’. There are two different types of visionary strategies which are conventional and systemic strategies. Visionary strategies display an exceedingly advanced sustainability assurance so as to convert a market frontrunner in sustainability matters. There is similarity in the two strategies though differ on the issue of incentive and orientation. “The conventional visionary strategy is very much oriented towards its impact on the market, whereas the systemic visionary strategy combines outside-in and inside-out perspectives in order to achieve a unique competitive position, but based on an internalization and continuous improvement of sustainability issues inside the company.” (Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010)

Visionary strategies ensue in two diverse forms, that is, in a conventional manner and in a systemic manner (Baumgartner and Biedermann, 2007 as cited in Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010). Conventional visionary strategies focused on market opportunities in are source full way. “As long as sustainability issues lead to market advantages, they are part of the strategic management of conventional visionary oriented companies, so the focus is outside-in, that is, inputs for the strategy formulation are derived from the market perspective. Systemic visionary strategies combine this view with an inside-out perspective, the market based view is supplemented with a resource based view and sustainable development is deep seated in the normative level of the company” Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010.

Systemic Visionary Strategy in disparity to the conventional strategy, for firms that follow the systemic visionary strategy it is imperative to display in all sustainability facets very good outcomes, as the firm has to indicate to investors and market the firm’s sustainability obligation, and again, to be dynamic in fluctuating positively basic situations in the direction of effort of sustainability. It may happen that, reliant on the industry, on the size of the firm or on other rudimentary conditions, some sustainability facets are more significant than others(Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010).

Concept of Service Quality Innovativeness

In Sule & Amuni (2017) it was asserted that “...little is accomplished by arguing over precise quality definitions or slogans. The first key to managing for quality is being aware of the need to improve; the second is selecting improvement techniques with the best chance for success.”

Service quality according to Crosby, 1979 as quoted in Su, Chen and Chang, 2017 was said to be customer expectation to have
and the way the service is actually perceived, though the results will be in-between. Cronin and Taylor, 1992 as quoted in Su, Chen and Chang, 2017 said that service quality is what an individual expect from the goods and/or services at the receiving time directly to the assessment of the idiosyncratic performance. Again, it was assumed that “service quality is the actual experience and expectations of the service after receiving services to consumers” (Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1985 as quoted in Su, Chen and Chang, 2017).

At the end result of the quality service, the organisation enjoys “increased profitability, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, customer retention and positive word of mouth” (Giese and Cote, 2000 as cited in Wijetunge, 2016). Sasser et al. (1978) as cited in Yarimoglu (2014) defined “the factors that raise the level of service quality such as security, consistency, attitude, completeness, condition, availability, and training of service providers.” Apart from this, “physical quality, interactive quality, and corporate quality also affected the service quality level” Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1982) as cited in Yarimoglu (2014).

Service quality innovativeness should not be confused with service innovation. Service innovation is the outcome of enhanced services and organisations in reaction to the varied desires of different customers, thus increasing the business’s goods or services value (Vang & Zellner, 2005 as quoted in Su, Chen and Chang, 2017). Vang & Zellner (2005) as quoted in Su, Chen and Chang (2017) was of the opinion that service innovation is the improved services result and response of the organizations to the diverse necessities of various customers. Thus, increase in the business’ goods or services value. While, service quality innovativeness is strictly concern with the innovativeness of the service quality and not just the service but the quality of the service.

“For the manufacturing sector, innovation serves as a means of developing and sustaining core competencies through development of internal capabilities such as research and development (R&D) departments and strategized research scopes and investments” (Lim, Schultmann & Ofori, 2010 as quoted in Akhamiokkhor, 2017). “Innovative firms accept and adopt new ideas, products, processes and organizational forms” (Wu, Geng, Li & Zhang, 2010 as quoted in Akhamiokkhor, 2017) “while innovation capability equips firms with an ability to implement and realize innovation. Innovativeness, as a soft element, and innovation capability, as a hard element, are complementary and indispensable in the process of obtaining competitive advantage” Akhamiokkhor (2017). According to Kyei & Bayoh (2017) innovation can be defined as “the creation, development and implementation of a new product, process or service with the goal of improving efficiency, effectiveness or competitive advantage.” It must be noted that “inadequate innovation will likely experience a declining competitive position in the market and, ultimately, weakening performance” (Auken & Madrid-Guijarro, 2008 as cited in Kyei & Bayoh, 2017). Again, Auken and Madrid-Guijarro, (2008) as quoted in Kyei & Bayoh (2017) opined that “firms that develop innovative practices will be better positioned against their competitors in the market and have the opportunity to achieve strong customer retention.”

However, innovativeness is the capability to introduce a new idea, product or services different from those already existing in the market. The innovativeness is the first dimension of entrepreneurship and it is having the capacity to innovate, that is, part of the ingredients to gaining competitive advantage over your competitor. But deviate to assert that “it is not the organisation that is innovative but the sum of people who act and think uniquely and let the organisation to be innovative”. In the Micro-View lecture series it was said that “innovativeness is a new innovation capacity to impact the company’s existing marketing resources, technological resources, skills, knowledge or strategy”. It went further to opine that “innovativeness is a new idea capacity to form paradigm shift in science, technology or market structure in an industry” (Table 1).
According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996) as quoted in Doye and Bwisa (2015) innovativeness shows a tendency for an organisation "to engage in and support new ideas, novelty, experimentation, and creative processes that may result in new products, services, or technological processes". Evidence of innovativeness may take numerous ways. This may happen along a continuum for simple willingness to make use of the existing product to a passionate commitment, mastering of the latest in technologies (Wiklund and Sleperdhed 2003 as quoted in Doye and Bwisa, 2015).

It was made known by Su, Chen & Chang (2017) that for a service provider to comply with accessible facility environment, it should provide impaired people, aged, pregnant women and even, children a friendly space and access to such facility.

### Table 1: Determinants of Service Quality

| 1. RELIABILITY: consistency of performance and dependability, accuracy in billing, keeping records correctly, performing the service right at the designated time. |
| 2. RESPONSIVENESS: willingness or readiness of employees to provide service, timeliness of service such as mailing a transaction slip immediately, calling the customer back quickly, giving prompt service. |
| 3. COMPETENCE: possession of the required skills and knowledge to perform the service, knowledge and skill of the contact and support personnel, research capability of the organization. |
| 4. ACCESS: approachability and ease of contact, the service is easily accessible by telephone, waiting time to receive service is not extensive, convenient hours of operation, convenient location of service facility. |
| 5. COURTESY: politeness, respect, consideration, friendliness of contact personnel, consideration for the consumer's property, clean and neat appearance of public contact personnel. |
| 6. COMMUNICATION: keeping customers informed in language they can understand and listening to them, explaining the service itself and its cost, assuring the consumer that a problem will be handled. |
| 7. CREDIBILITY: trustworthiness, believability, honesty, company reputation, having the customer's best interests at heart, personal characteristics of the contact personnel. |
| 8. SECURITY: freedom from danger, risk, or doubt, physical safety, financial security, confidentiality. |
| 9. UNDERSTANDING/KNOWING THE CUSTOMER: understanding customer needs, learning the customer's specific requirements, providing individualized attention, recognizing the regular customer. |
| 10. TANGIBLES: physical evidence and representations of the service, other customers in service facility. |

Source: Parasuraman et al., 1985 in Yarimoglu, 2014.

Wijetunge (2016) asserted that for a service provider to comply with responsiveness, such service must be delivered promptly and assist customers such that the speed of reaction plays an important role in the whole exercise. Wijetunge (2016) went further that in displaying empathy feeling by the service provider, there should be enthusiasm and competency to give tailored consideration to your client. On the part of tangibility, such service can be viewed from the “appearance of a service firm's facilities, employees, equipment, and communication materials” Wijetunge (2016).
For reliability, there must be provision of the pledged productions at the specified level and for assurance there should be capability of such service firm in the direction of inspiring faith and guarantee in the firm via knowledge, civility and honesty of the employees (Wijetunge, 2016). It was stated in Yarimoglu (2014) that there are ten determinants of service quality and for your firm to consider innovativeness of service quality almost all the ten attributes/determinants must be visible. They are reliability, responsiveness, competence, and access. Others are courtesy, communication, credibility, security, understanding/knowing your customer, and tangibles.

**Method**

Survey research design was used for this study. All the manufacturing firms in Ogun State form the population of the study but for convenience and full participation those highly dense industrial estate formed the target population, that is, Agbara, Sango Ota and Sagamu industrial estates. As a usual practice, some manufacturing firms were not willing to take part in the study but we had fifteen (15) manufacturing firms from Sango Ota, eighteen (18) from Agbara and five (5) from Sagamu Industrial Estates that were ready to participate in the survey.

Research questionnaire was used as the instrument for the survey and it was administered on two managers (Marketing and/or Sales Managers) and five main distributors of each manufacturing firm. That is, seven questionnaire on each manufacturing firm of thirty-eight (38) manufacturing firms. Our sample size, therefore, was two hundred and sixty-six (266) participants and since the sample size is not large and can be easily covered by the researchers, no sampling method was used. Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was the statistical tool used in analysing the primary data got through questionnaire and testing of the hypotheses.

**Results**

**Hypotheses Testing**

The basic rule of decision is to accept the null hypotheses where \( p > 0.05 \) and reject the null hypotheses where \( p < 0.05 \) significant level. As a tradition, testing of hypotheses were done in null form.

**Table 1** Relationship between Risk Mitigation and Service Quality Innovativeness

| Risk Mitigation | Service Quality Innovativeness |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Pearson Correlation(r) | 1 | .635** |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| N | 265 | 265 |

**Table 2** Relationship between Legitimization and Service Quality Innovativeness

| Legitimization | Service Quality Innovativeness |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Pearson Correlation(r) | 1 | .678** |

**Source:** SPSS Output, (2019)

**Table 1** Relationship between Risk Mitigation and Service Quality Innovativeness

**Table 2** Relationship between Legitimization and Service Quality Innovativeness
Table 3 Relationship between Efficiency and Service Quality Innovativeness

| Efficiency          | Service Quality Innovativeness |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Pearson Correlation(r) | 1                               |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .639**                          |
| N                   | 265                             |
| Pearson Correlation(r) | .678**                          |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .005                            |
| N                   | 265                             |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Coefficient of Correlation ($r^2$) = 0.46  Source: SPSS Output, (2019)

Testing of Hypothesis One (H$_{01}$)

H$_{01}$: There is no relationship between introverted (risk mitigation) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.

Table 1 – Risk Mitigation and Service Quality Innovativeness: The result of the data analysis show medium relationship level. The $r = 0.635$, showing positive medium correlation between the variables. The findings reveal a medium relationship between the variables. Hence, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis Two (H$_{02}$)

H$_{02}$: There is no relationship between extroverted (legitimization) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.

Table 2 – Legitimization and Service Quality Innovativeness: The result of the data analysis shows medium relationship. The $r = 0.678$, showing a positive medium correlation between the variables. The findings reveal medium relationship between the variables. Hence, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis Three (H$_{03}$)

H$_{03}$: There is no relationship between conservative (efficiency) strategy and service quality innovativeness in manufacturing firms in Ogun State.

Table 3– Efficiency and Service Quality Innovativeness: The result of the data analysis shows medium relationship. The $r = 0.639$,
showing positive medium correlation between the variables. The findings reveal a medium relationship between the variables. Hence, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis Four (H₀⁴)

**H₀⁴:** There is no relationship between visionary (holistic) strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State.

Table 4—Holistic and Service Quality Innovativeness: The result of the data analysis shows high relationship. The $r = 0.763$, showing a positive high correlation between the variables. The findings reveal a high relationship between the variables. Hence, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted.

Discussion of Findings

**Risk Mitigation and Service Quality Innovativeness**

The result of risk mitigation and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms (Hypothesis One) analysis shows that there exist a remarkable (medium) relationship between risk mitigation and service quality innovativeness. This is evidence, given that $r^2 = 40\%$. The analysis revealed that 40% total variation in risk mitigation accounted for service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms. This suggest that for every upturn in the level of introverted (risk mitigation) strategy, there is a corresponding 40% increase in the level of service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State. This signifies that there is medium relationship between risk mitigation strategy and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms. This findings harmonize with that of that stated that there is evidence of sustainability impact on financial stand of firms to facilitate service quality innovativeness. Again, introverted (risk mitigation) strategy focus on legal and the external standards concerning the organisation’s environmental and social aspects in order to avoid risks for the company and remain relevant. (Baumgartner, 2009 as cited in Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010)

| Table 4: Relationship between Holistic and Service Quality Innovativeness |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Holistic | Service Quality Innovativeness |
| Pearson Correlation | 1 | .763** |
| Holistic Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | 265 |
| N | 265 | 265 |
| Service Quality Innovativeness Pearson Correlation | .763** | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| N | 265 | |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

Coefficient of Correlation ($r^2$) = 0.582

Source: SPSS Output, (2019)

**Legitimization and Service Quality Innovativeness**

The result of legitimization and service quality innovativeness (Hypothesis Two) analysis displays that there is significant positive relationship between the variables. This indicates strong correlation between the variables. However, the coefficient of determination ($r^2$) shows that it is 46%. This implies that extroverted (legitimization) strategy accounted for 46% of service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms. This findings is in track with that of Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010 that said that "service quality innovativeness is achieved with this strategy (legitimization) that is focused on external presentation of sustainability, these aspects
are especially important, which supports the increase of credibility in society such as corporate citizenship, no corruption or cartel, health and safety and also collaboration to improve the relationship and working together with stakeholders on related sustainability issues.

**Efficiency and Service Quality Innovativeness**

The analysis of efficiency and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms (Hypothesis Three) revealed that there is 41% level of positive relationship between efficiency and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms. The result was indicated that 41% increase in the service quality level of manufacturing firms was accounted for by conservative (efficiency) strategy. The analysis of the bivariate relationship between efficiency and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms reveals a positive medium relationship. This findings tarry with the words of Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010 that stated that commitment is especially crucial in the investment in appropriate technology, sophisticated health and safety for employees and above all ecological sustainability give rise to proper service quality innovativeness.

**Holistic and Service Quality Innovativeness**

The analysis of holistic and service quality innovativeness(Hypothesis Four) exposes that there is a positive relationship between holistic and service quality innovativeness as the correlation was high. The coefficient of determination show that $r^2 = 58\%$. This analysis is indicating that visionary (holistic) strategy accounted for additional 58% increase in the service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State. The assertion of Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010 that stated that the issues of sustainability within all the organisation business activities that allow for competitive advantages derivable from differentiation and innovation of offering unique products to the advantages of their customers and stakeholders ensure service quality innovativeness.

**Conclusion**

Based on the fact that all the null hypotheses were rejected, we, thereby, conclude that there is relationship between sustainability strategy (introverted, extroverted conservative and visionary strategies) and service quality innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Ogun State. This, therefore, signify that manufacturing firms especially, those in Ogun State need to apply at least one of the listed sustainability strategies to be able to achieve service quality innovativeness which is a key to gaining customer loyalty and continuous patronage. Again, manufacturing firms need to know that there is need to catch a niche by doing at least one thing different from their competitors, in ensuring their product quality.

**Recommendations**

Based on the study findings, manufacturing firms especially those situated in Ogun State, Nigeria should keep to the strategic rules of being not easy to imitate, heterogeneity, unique and rare, etc., to enjoy the full benefit of sustainability strategy in the industry. Again, it can be seen that each of the four sustainability strategies were found to have relationship with service quality innovativeness singularly but same cannot be said of using more than one of the strategies at the same time. As such, serious caution should be exercised in this respect.
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