A STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF INNOVATION STRATEGY, COMMITMENT TO CHANGE ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: A CASE FROM THE LOGISTICS INDUSTRY

Xiuli Wang [1], Hongwei Li [2*], Huayu Shen [3], Hangyuan Guo [4], Xiaoyang Wang [5]

[1 2 3 4 5] Innovation College, North-Chiang Mai University

[*] **Corresponding Author, E-mail:** hongwei.li@northcm.ac.th

Abstract: This study constructed a core conceptual framework using organizational performance as the dependent variable, innovation strategy, and commitment to change as the independent variables, and by introducing demographic variables such as work sector and age. This study proposes the following research hypotheses: 1. There is a positive and significant relationship between innovation strategy and organizational performance. 2. There is a positive and significant relationship between commitment to change and organizational performance. 3. Innovation strategy, commitment to change have significant predictive power on organizational performance. And using the logistics industry as a case study, the minimum sample size was calculated as 384 using random sampling method, 500 questionnaires were distributed in this study and 483 questionnaires were returned using snowball sampling method and the recovery rate was 96%.

This study found that: 1. There is a significant positive relationship between innovation strategy and organizational performance. 2. There is a significant positive relationship between commitment to change and organizational performance. 3. Innovation strategy and commitment to change have significant predictive power on organizational performance.

Keywords: Innovation Strategy, Commitment to Change, Organizational Performance

Introduction

In today's dynamic and competitive business environment, organizations in a wide range of industries are constantly striving to innovate and adapt to change in order to improve performance and maintain a competitive edge. Among these industries, the logistics industry is a key component of the global supply chain and plays a pivotal role in facilitating the movement of goods and services from production to consumption. As logistics firms move forward in an era characterized by rapid technological advances, globalization, and changing customer demands, understanding the relationship between innovation strategies, commitment to change, and organizational performance has become imperative to achieve sustainable growth and success.

Innovation is widely recognized as a key driver of organizational success, enabling firms to develop new products, services, processes, and business models to meet changing market demands and gain competitive advantage (Damanpour, 2014). In the logistics industry, innovation is particularly important due to its potential to streamline operations, optimize supply chain processes, and improve overall efficiency and effectiveness (Rogers & Tibben-Lembke, 2015). Organizations that strategically prioritize innovation are better able to respond to emerging trends, capitalize on market opportunities, and achieve long-term survival in a rapidly evolving business environment.

Scholars have suggested various innovation strategies that logistics firms can employ to foster creativity, promote continuous improvement, and drive sustainable growth. For example, open innovation, which involves collaborating with external partners, suppliers, and customers to co-create value (Chesbrough, 2019), is gaining traction in the logistics industry as firms seek to leverage external knowledge and resources to drive innovation and expand market reach. Similarly, disruptive innovation, which is characterized by the introduction of new technologies or business models that disrupt existing market models (Christensen, 2015), offers logistics firms the opportunity to revolutionize traditional supply chain processes and unlock new sources of value creation.

Despite the potential benefits of innovation, the effective implementation of innovation strategies in the logistics industry depends on organizational factors, including leadership commitment, resource allocation, and employee engagement (Santos-Vijande, López-Sánchez, & Trespalacios, 2012). Therefore, examining the impact of innovation strategies on organizational performance requires a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between strategic intent, organizational capabilities, and environmental factors that influence the adoption and diffusion of innovations in logistics firms.

In addition to innovation strategy, organizational commitment to change is a key determinant of organizational success and performance (Armenakis & Bedeian, 2015). In today's volatile and uncertain business environment, organizations must demonstrate agility and resilience in response to internal and external disruptions, using change as a catalyst for innovation, growth, and transformation (Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011). In the logistics industry, where complexity and instability are inherent, fostering a culture of change and adaptability is critical to maintaining a competitive advantage and ensuring long-term survival.

Commitment to change encompasses multiple dimensions, including top management support, employee engagement, communication effectiveness, and organizational culture (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Leadership plays a key role in articulating a compelling vision for change, aligning organizational goals with strategic imperatives, and mobilizing resources to support change initiatives (By, 2019). In addition, fostering a change-oriented culture characterized by openness, flexibility, and continuous learning enables logistics firms to navigate turbulent times, seize new opportunities, and drive performance improvement (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993).

However, driving change within an organization is not without its challenges. Resistance to change due to fear of the unknown, loss of control, or perceived threats to job security can often hinder change efforts and undermine organizational performance (Ford, Ford, & D'Amelio, 2008). Overcoming resistance to change requires proactive leadership, effective communication, and stakeholder engagement strategies that promote trust, transparency, and collaboration (Lines, 2004). Therefore, examining the relationship between commitment to change and organizational performance in the context of the logistics industry can provide valuable insights into the drivers, enablers and barriers to organizational transformation and renewal.

The relationship between innovation strategy, commitment to change, and organizational performance represents a complex and multifaceted interplay between factors such as strategic orientation, organizational culture, and operational efficiency in logistics firms. While prior research has examined the separate effects of innovation and change on organizational outcomes, relatively few studies have explored the synergistic effects of innovation strategy and commitment to change on organizational performance in logistics.

Organizational performance is defined as the extent to which an organization achieves its strategic goals and creates value for its stakeholders and is the ultimate measure of success and competitiveness in the logistics industry. Performance outcomes encompass multiple dimensions including financial performance, operational efficiency, customer satisfaction, and market share (Kumar & Banerjee, 2018). By elucidating the mechanisms by which innovative strategies and commitment to change affect organizational performance, researchers can provide valuable insights into the strategic choices, management practices, and organizational capabilities that drive sustainable growth and competitive advantage in the logistics industry.

In addition, understanding the contingent effects of contextual factors such as industry dynamics, technological advances, and market turbulence on the relationship between innovation strategy, commitment to change, and organizational performance is critical to developing targeted interventions and strategic initiatives that enhance organizational resilience and adaptability in the face of uncertainty and disruption (Hitt, Ireland, & Hoskisson, 2017). By adopting a holistic and integrated approach to consider the interconnections between innovation, change, and performance in the logistics industry, researchers can contribute to advancing theoretical knowledge, guiding managerial practice, and developing policy decisions that drive organizational success and sustainability.

In summary, this study aims to investigate the impact of innovation strategy and commitment to change on organizational performance in the logistics industry. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, this study aims to provide actionable knowledge and practical advice to logistics companies in their quest to thrive in this era of unprecedented challenges and opportunities. Through rigorous empirical analysis and theoretical synthesis, this study seeks to advance the academic

understanding of the drivers, mechanisms, and outcomes of innovation and change in the logistics industry, thereby contributing to the broader discourse on organizational effectiveness, strategic management, and innovation governance in the contemporary business environment.

Research Objective (s)

Objective 1: To explore the impact of innovation strategy on organizational performance.

Objective 2:To explore the impact of change commitment on organizational performance.

Objective 3:To explore a model of the relationship between innovation strategy, commitment to change and organizational performance.

Literature Review

Strategy theory since the 1960s by Ansoff (1965) and Chandler (1962) put forward, evolution to date, there are many schools of thought branch, its definition of strategy and thinking about the logic is not the same. Since different enterprises have different production and management objectives, development strategies, innovation resource status and external environment, there are distinctive innovation strategies. James (1999) found 22 distinctive innovation strategies. According to Schumpeter (1934), innovation is a fundamental phenomenon of economic development, and "innovation" is not only the creation of new goods, but also includes new combinations of the original factors of production and production conditions. Drucker (1985) redefined innovation on the basis of Schumpeter's theory, and he believed that innovation means to give new capabilities to the organizational resources, so that the organizational resources can create wealth. He believes that innovation is to give organizational resources new capabilities, so that organizational resources can create wealth and really realize their potential value.

At present, many scholars at home and abroad have put forward a variety of classifications of enterprise innovation strategy, but have not been able to form a unified opinion. March (1991) believes that the differences in organizational learning mechanisms and knowledge characteristics lead to the emergence of different types of innovations, and he puts forward two different types of innovations, namely, exploration and exploitation, on the basis of the binary organizational theory of Duncan (1976). Based on Duncan's (1976) binary organization theory, he proposed two different types of innovation models: exploration and exploitation. Since March (1991) first proposed the concept of exploratory and exploitative innovation, exploration and exploitation have gradually appeared in pairs in the research horizons of many scholars, and have become the core issues that research scholars have paid attention to and explored, and related research on exploratory and exploitative innovation has also begun in this way. Benner and Tushman (2003) summarized the findings of March et al. and came up with the concept of binary innovation strategies, i.e., exploratory and exploitative innovation strategies. Dualistic

innovation strategy is one of the dimensions of corporate innovation strategy division that is used more often in academia nowadays, and has been applied by many scholars in the research related to corporate innovation strategy.

Innovation strategy is the embodiment of the direction and mode of development of an enterprise, which can either seek new ways of value creation to cope with the survival pressure brought about by the fierce competitive environment by practicing exploratory innovation strategy, or tap the potential value of the existing market step by step by implementing exploitative innovation strategy (Liu and Fu, 2016). Benner and Tushman (2003) consider exploratory and exploitative innovation strategies as two innovation modes of firms with different natures. Regarding the way of categorizing binary innovation strategies, a large number of existing studies have shown that exploratory and exploitative innovation strategies are mainly distinguished through the dimensions of innovation outcomes, innovation goals, knowledge base, innovation risks and organizational culture.

The concept of commitment to change evolved from organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is defined as "a state of mind or mental unit that enhances an individual's likelihood of maintaining organizational membership" and emphasizes a commitment to static elements such as a career, an organizational sub-unit, a particular supervisor, or an event at work, as a result of ongoing interaction with the organization (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). 2001). Change commitment, on the other hand, indicates how well employees accept and value new norms and situations introduced into the workplace through organizational change and is a dynamic process (Solinger, Hofimans, Van, 2015). Therefore, although change commitment was developed based on organizational commitment in Mayer & Herscovitch's (2001) workplace model, both organizational commitment and change commitment help employees to better support organizational change. However, because change commitment and organizational commitment have different goals and mechanisms, change commitment can make better predictions about employees' attitudes and support for change. In organizational change, each employee is a relatively independent implementer of organizational change, and each independent individual means that there are thousands of people, and the unique personality characteristics of employees, different types of leadership behaviors or leadership tendencies of leaders will have more or less impact on commitment to change, and many studies have shown that individual factors also have a significant impact on commitment to change. 2001) showed that organizational commitment, team orientation, and change efficacy were significantly positively related to commitment to change in a survey of 413 administrative staff members at a university in the United States. The influence of individual factors on commitment to change also exists in the Chinese context. Chen and Wang (2007) explored the relationship between internal and external control points and commitment to change using a sample of 256 staff members from a local customs office in China.

Organizational performance is one of the variables necessary for many scholars' research to be

carried out, and there are different definitions of it, which vary from different perspectives based on different research purposes. For example, Gregory and Dess (1984), among others, consider organizational performance as a set of behaviors to achieve the strategic goals of the organization, while Ogundipe (2012) considers organizational performance to be achieved when the employees of the organization accomplish the organizational tasks that they have undertaken. At the same time, some scholars also define organizational performance from the perspective of the results it brings to the enterprise, such as Steers (1975), who believes that organizational performance is an evaluation index of the production results of the enterprise, which can be divided into multiple contents and dimensions, while some researchers believe that organizational performance refers to the output of the enterprise in a specific cycle, which is manifested in the quantity of the enterprise's products, the quality of its services, or the efficiency of its organization. efficiency of the overall operation. However, scholars generally agree with the view that performance is a composition, not just a concept. Organizational performance dimensions are divided into four categories: the first is uni-dimensional and multi-dimensional; the second is financial and non-financial indicators; the third is subjective and objective measures; and the fourth is task performance and peripheral performance. Organizational performance influences are divided into external and internal. External includes social capital, policy, and business environment; internal includes resources and capabilities such as reputation, organization, and human resource management. External factors affect the competitiveness of the organization, and internal factors directly affect the performance of the organization. Social capital and policy guidelines influence the external environment, while resources and capabilities are key internally.

Contemporary literature highlights the important role of innovation strategies in driving organizational performance across industries. In the field of logistics, scholars have examined the efficacy of different innovation approaches in improving operational efficiency, customer satisfaction, and financial outcomes. Zhang and Wang (2022) conducted a longitudinal study to examine the impact of innovation strategies on the performance of logistics firms in the context of digital transformation. Their findings indicate that there is a positive correlation between proactive innovation initiatives such as investing in advanced technologies and optimizing processes and the improvement of organizational performance indicators such as cost-effectiveness and service quality. Along with the implementation of innovation strategies, commitment to change is a key determinant of organizational performance, which determines the acceptance of change initiatives by employees and stakeholders. Scholars have explored the multifaceted nature of commitment to change, examining its antecedents, consequences, and moderators in the organizational context. A study by Chen et al. (2020) delved into the role of leadership in facilitating employee commitment to change in logistics firms and its subsequent impact on organizational performance. Using a mixed-methods approach, they found that transformational leadership behaviors, such as heuristic motivation and personalized consideration, were key drivers of

employee commitment to change. Organizations led by transformational leaders demonstrated higher levels of change readiness and adaptability, which translated into tangible performance improvements and competitive advantage. In addition, organizational culture is a key determinant of commitment to change, influencing employee attitudes and behaviors towards innovation and transformation. Zhang et al. (2020) examined the impact of organizational culture on employee commitment to change in logistics firms, highlighting the importance of a supportive and inclusive culture in facilitating change acceptance and implementation. Organizations that prioritized a culture of experimentation, learning, and collaboration demonstrated higher employee engagement and commitment to change, which ultimately drove positive performance outcomes.

Methodology

The population of this study is companies in the logistics industry, covering the areas of transportation, warehousing, freight forwarding, supply chain management and third-party logistics services. The study will clearly define the study population to ensure that the findings are applicable and can provide useful information to that particular group.

Due to the unknown sample size and the unknown proportion of the population, the

$$n = \frac{Z^2}{4e^2}$$

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2}{4\,(0.05)^2} = 384.16$$

Therefore, the minimum acceptable sample size is 384.

After determining an appropriate sample size, snowball sampling techniques were used to ensure a representative sample, and the initial participants in the study were intentionally selected based on key criteria such as department, job role, etc. to ensure a diverse starting point. These initial participants were selected because of their ability to provide valuable insights into the research questions. Once these participants completed the survey, they were asked to recommend colleagues or peer businesses within the organization that might be willing to participate. The sample size is gradually expanded through the entire iterative process. Data will be collected through an online survey platform. Participants will receive an invitation via email that includes a link to the survey. The survey will be administered electronically to facilitate access, minimize response time, and ensure efficient data collection. The survey will be accompanied by clear instructions and assurances of data confidentiality and anonymity to promote honest and candid responses. A total of 483 valid questionnaires were obtained for the analysis of the study.

Results

Of the 483 respondents in this study, 194 (40.2%) were between the ages of 26 and 35, 132

(27.3%) were between the ages of 36 and 45, 71 (14.7%) were between the ages of 45 and 55, and 86 (17.8%) were over the age of 56. Of the 483 respondents in this study, 138 (28.6%) had worked for 1 to 5 years, 127 (26.3%) had worked for 6 to 10 years, 162 (33.5%) had worked for 11 to 15 years, and 56 (11.6%) had worked for 16 years or more. The number of grassroots employees is 265 (54.9%), the number of middle-level employees is 158 (32.7%), and the number of senior-level employees is 60 (12.4%). Among the respondents, 57 (11.8%) worked in the Marketing Department, 122 (25.3%) in the Warehousing Department, 191 (39.5%) in the Transportation Department, 28 (5.8%) in the Finance Department, 46 (9.5%) in the Customer Service Department, and 39 (8.1%) in the Other Departments. The number of employees working in small-sized enterprises is 189, accounting for 39.1%; the number of employees working in medium-sized enterprises is 171, accounting for 35.4%; and the number of employees working in large-sized enterprises is 123, accounting for 25.5%. The types of enterprises are transportation logistics enterprises (125 people, accounting for 25.9%), warehousing logistics enterprises (127 people, accounting for 26.3%), integrated service logistics enterprises (173 people, accounting for 35.8%), and other types of enterprises (58 people, accounting for 12.0%).

In the regression analysis of the effect of innovation strategy on organizational performance, the adjusted R-square was 0.883. innovation strategy (independent variable) could explain 88.3% of the variance in organizational performance (dependent variable). In the test of variance, the F-value is 3622.463 and the significance p-value is .000b less than 0.01, which means that the regression model is highly significant at the 0.01 level and the model is usable and meaningful. After analyzing the coefficient, we find that the unstandardized coefficient of innovation performance is 0.962 and the standardized coefficient is 0.940 with a p-value of 0.000, which means that there is a significant positive relationship between innovation strategy and organizational performance.

In the regression analysis of the effect of commitment to change on organizational performance, the adjusted R-squared is 0.932. commitment to change (independent variable) explains 93.2% of the variance in organizational performance (dependent variable). In the test of variance, the F-value is 6605.740 and the p-value of significance is .000b less than 0.01, which means that the regression model is highly significant at the 0.01 level and the model is usable and meaningful. After analyzing the coefficient, we find that the unstandardized coefficient of commitment to change is 1.020 and the standardized coefficient is 0.965 with a p-value of 0.000, which means that there is a significant positive relationship between commitment to change and organizational performance.

In the regression analysis of the effect of the interaction term of innovation strategy and commitment to change on organizational performance, the adjusted R-square is 0.897. the interaction term of innovation strategy and commitment to change (independent variable) explains 89.7% of the variance in organizational performance (dependent variable). In the test of variance, the F-value is 4178.069 and the significance p-value is .000b less than 0.01, which means that the regression model

is highly significant at the 0.01 level and the model is usable and meaningful. After analyzing the coefficient, we found that the unstandardized coefficient of the interaction term of innovation strategy and commitment to change is 0.143, the standardized coefficient is 0.947, and the p-value is 0.000, which means that there is a significant and positive relationship between the interaction term of innovation strategy and commitment to change and the performance of the organization, and in conclusion, it can be shown that innovation strategy and commitment to change have a significant predictive power.

Discussion

The positive correlation between innovation strategy and organizational performance is consistent with contemporary literature that emphasizes the critical role of innovation in improving organizational outcomes. Scholars such as West and Bogers (2014) assert that in today's dynamic business environments, innovation strategies contribute to the creation of competitive advantage and the achievement of sustainable growth. Furthermore, the emphasis on innovation coincides with the Resource-Based View (RBV), which argues that organizations can achieve superior performance by strategically deploying unique and valuable resources, including innovative capabilities (Barney, 1991).

The second significant positive correlation between commitment to change and organizational performance reflects the growing recognition of change management as a key determinant of organizational success. Researchers such as Armenakis and Harris (2009) emphasize the importance of fostering employee commitment to change initiatives as it contributes to smoother implementation of the change process and better outcomes. This finding highlights the importance of fostering a supportive organizational culture that encourages adaptation and acceptance of change (Oreg et al., 2011).

In addition, the predictive power of innovation strategy and commitment to change on organizational performance was confirmed, which underscores their role as strategic levers to drive organizational effectiveness. This echoes the findings of Hult et al. (2018) which suggest that proactive innovation strategies and change-oriented cultures are key drivers of sustained competitive advantage and superior performance. By incorporating these factors into the strategic decision-making process, organizations can proactively position themselves for long-term success in dynamic and uncertain environments.

In summary, this study provides valuable insights into the relationship between innovation strategy, commitment to change, and organizational performance. The findings highlight the importance of fostering a culture of innovation and readiness for change within an organization to achieve sustainable competitive advantage and superior performance. Looking forward, future research could explore the mechanisms by which these factors interact, as well as the contextual factors that influence their effectiveness in different organizational settings.

Conclusions

This dissertation has illuminated the intricate relationship between innovation strategy, commitment to change, and organizational performance. Through empirical analysis, it has been established that both innovation strategy and commitment to change significantly contribute to organizational performance, with these factors demonstrating substantial predictive power.

The findings underscore the critical importance of fostering a culture that values innovation and embraces change within organizations. By strategically aligning innovation efforts with organizational goals and cultivating employee commitment to change initiatives, organizations can enhance their competitiveness and achieve superior performance outcomes. This study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by providing empirical evidence of the positive impact of innovation strategy and commitment to change on organizational performance. The implications of these findings extend to both academia and practice, offering insights that can inform strategic decision-making and organizational development efforts.

Moving forward, further research could delve deeper into the mechanisms through which innovation strategy and commitment to change influence organizational performance, as well as explore potential moderators and contextual factors that may affect these relationships. Additionally, longitudinal studies could provide valuable insights into the long-term effects of innovation and change initiatives on organizational success.

Overall, this dissertation underscores the importance of embracing innovation and change as strategic imperatives for organizations seeking to thrive in today's dynamic and competitive business environment. By leveraging innovation strategy and fostering commitment to change, organizations can position themselves for sustained success and resilience in the face of evolving market demands and challenges.

References

Ansoff, H.I. (1965). *Corporate strategy: An analytic approach to business policy for growth and expansion*. McGraw-Hill.

Armenakis, A.A., & Bedeian, A.G. (2015). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 21(3), 293-315.

Armenakis, A.A., & Harris, S.G. (2009). Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 127-142.

Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G., & Mossholder, K.W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681-703.

Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.

Benner, M.J., & Tushman, M.L. (2003). Exploitation, exploration, and process management: The productivity dilemma revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 238-256.

By, R.T. (2019). Organizational change management: A critical review. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 32(1), 9-29.

Chandler, A.D. (1962). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of the American industrial enterprise*. MIT Press.

Chen, Y., & Wang, Y. (2007). Antecedents and consequences of employees' adjustment to organizational change: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(6), 803-826.

Chen, Y., Fei, J., & Wang, Y. (2020). The trickle-down effect of leadership on organizational performance: Exploring the roles of employees' commitment to change and organizational learning. *Leadership Quarterly*, 31(2), 101306.

Chesbrough, H. (2019). To recover faster from Covid-19, open up: Managerial implications from an open innovation perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 88, 410-413.

Christensen, C.M. (2015). Disruptive innovation: An intellectual history and directions for future research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(4), 322-344.

Damanpour, F. (2014). Footnotes to innovation diffusion theory. *Institutionalizing Innovation*, 9, 129-145.

Drucker, P.F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. Harper & Row.

Duncan, R.B. (1976). The ambidextrous organization: Designing dual structures for innovation. *Management Science*, 32(6), 694-701.

Ford, J.D., Ford, L.W., & D' Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 362-377.

Gregory, K.L., & Dess, G.G. (1984). A classification of business strategies. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(3), 479-488.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J.P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 474-487.

Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., & Hoskisson, R.E. (2017). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases: Competitiveness and globalization* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hult, G.T.M., Hurley, R.F., & Knight, G.A. (2018). Innovativeness: Its antecedents and impact on business performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 73, 159-168.

James, H.S. (1999). Owner as manager, extended horizons and the family firm. *International journal of the economics of business*, 6(1), 41-55.

Kumar, S., & Banerjee, S. (2018). Organizational performance evaluation: A bibliometric analysis of citations, co-citations and clustering. *Management Decision*, 56(10), 2065-2081.

Lines, R. (2004). Influence of participation in strategic change: Resistance, organizational commitment and change goal achievement. *Journal of Change Management*, 4(3), 193-215.

Liu, Z., & Fu, L. (2016). Analysis of enterprise innovation strategy from the perspective of resource-based theory. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 9(3), 744-757.

March, J.G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87.

Meyer, J.P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 299-326.

Ogundipe, S.E. (2012). Organizational performance and human resources management: A case of banks in South Western Nigeria. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 3(3), 34-42.

Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2011). Change recipients' reactions to organizational change: A 60-year review of quantitative studies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(4), 461-524.

Rogers, D.S., & Tibben-Lembke, R.S. (2015). Going backwards: Reverse logistics trends and practices. *Reverse Logistics Magazine*, 1(1), 1-7.

Santos-Vijande, M.L., López-Sánchez, J.Á., & Trespalacios, J.A. (2012). How organizational learning affects a firm's flexibility, competitive strategy, and performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(8), 1079-1089.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Oxford University Press: London.

Solinger, O.N., Hofman, P.S., & Van, D.J. (2015). The effect of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior on the relationship between procedural justice and employee commitment to change. *Human Resource Management*, 54(5), 779-800.

Steers, R.M. (1975). Task-goal attributes, achievement, and supervisory performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13(3), 392-403.

West, J., & Bogers, M. (2014). Leveraging external sources of innovation: A review of research on open innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(4), 814-831.

Zhang, J., & Wang, Y. (2022). Digital transformation and innovation performance: The mediating role of organizational learning capability. *Journal of Business Research*, 141, 125-137.

Zhang, L., Cao, C., & Li, H. (2020). The effects of organizational culture on organizational performance: A moderated mediation model of knowledge management capability and environmental uncertainty. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 35-44.