



POLAC INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONS & MGT SCIENCE (PIJEMS)
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
NIGERIA POLICE ACADEMY, WUDIL-KANO



**INFLUENCE OF MANAGEMENT INNOVATION ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE:
 EVIDENCE FROM SELECTED MANUFACTURING COMPANY IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA**

Isihak, Abdulrasaq	Department of Business Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Offa, Kwara State
Wahab, Tajudeen Abayomi	Department of Business Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Offa, Kwara State
Ogundipe, Sunday Olakunle	Department of Business Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Offa, Kwara State
Asefon, Sunday Olawoye	Department of Business Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Offa, Kwara State

Abstract

This study investigates the influence of management innovation on organizational performance: evidence from selected manufacturing company in kwara state. Nigeria. This study was conducted making use of manufacturing companies in kwara state. The instruments used for data collection were questionnaires and documents, while a total of four research questions were also used. The data collected from the respondents was analyzed using percentage method and they were used in answering the research questionnaire. The data collected and analyzed showed that there is a significant influence of innovation management dimensions on organizational performance and that there is a significant relationship between management innovation and organizational performance. The following valuable recommendations were made that organizations should take the best care of appropriate equipment at the workstations, allow flexible employees' access to facilities and social benefits and reward for extra work and proposing/implementing improvement. Organizational performance has leading results on the product and long lasting usefulness of an organization.

Keywords: Influence, Management innovation, Organizational performance, Manufacturing Company

1. Introduction

Management experts and theoreticians alike are actually very involved in the ingenuity of contemporary companies. The effectiveness of an organization, especially a knowledge-based organization and its longevity, is recognized as depending on imagination, ingenuity and inventiveness (Martins, Terblanche, 2013). During the past thirty years, researchers have paid much attention to innovation (Gatignon et al., 2012). In a turbulent economic environment, innovation is considered as a very important strategic driver to gain new opportunities, protect knowledge assets, and achieve competitive advantage (Hurmelinna, 2018; Laith Ali and Shahizan Hassan, 2022). Innovative companies are more flexible in dealing with the phenomenon of change as well as can faster react to changes and create opportunities and gain

competitive advantage compared to other companies, and that's why innovation is considered a critical success factor in organizations (Darroch, 2015). The importance of innovations has prompted researchers to identify variables accelerating innovation (Becheikh et al., 2016). Today, companies highly compete in the knowledge. The knowledge-based theory of the firm suggests that knowledge is strategically the most important and crucial source of competitive advantage (Grant, 2016; Drucker, 2010).

Some researchers believe that knowledge management activities are the most important drivers of innovation (Darroch et al., 2021; Liao et al., 2019). The knowledge-based view considers knowledge as a strategic resource in an organization with resource-based view (Grant, 2019; Gold et al., 2018; Laith Ali and Shahizan Hassan, 2019). In the meantime, knowledge creation is one of the important processes

of knowledge management (Nonaka and Tkeuchi, 2021). When people are knowledge creator and create new knowledge, they express their creativity and make innovation happen. It is often difficult to separate organizational culture and organizational structure as both have developed in parallel over the lifetime of the organization. While the literature is in agreement on the nature of organizational culture for managing innovation it is more difficult to discuss the organizational structure conducive to effective management of innovation. Mintzberg (1979) describes the 'innovative organization' in his seminal work but this is a simplistic view of organizational structure for innovation management. Burns and Stalker (2022) on the other hand provide a contingent approach that highlights the complexities of organizational context on the management of innovation, it is this approach that we adopt when considering the relationships within our model. Innovation is seen as the root of long-term success of an organization and a factor leading to its increased efficiency).

Organizations that have a viable and clear potential to evolve are ones that have a greater view of the general market and the motivating forces of the economy and are able to more successfully focus their creative activities. This includes technology review, the development of client requirements, and understanding of the overall business climate, establishing basic goals of the organization, and understanding existing organizational culture. There is a need for a closer insight at the essence of corporate culture and for an inquiry into its interaction with organizational innovation, considering the value of innovation. Managers play an important part in developing and promoting creative cultures, according to Keegan and Turner (2012). Innovative ideas management is a significant move for effective organizational creativity [Wong and Sang Chin (2017)]. It is a good indicator for the realization of innovative ideas and organizational innovation management [Lee and Chang, 2020] as innovation starts with top management who agree that the path to survival is organizational innovation. Top management with an effective leadership style also creates an environment for innovation within the company. It should be capable of empowering and engaging the entire workforce and promoting staff

engagement, growth and learning (Borgelt & Falk, 2021). Obviously, many organizational and environmental factors may affect on organizational innovation, but this research has mainly focused on the one important factor including organizational culture. Reviewed in the literature, management and culture affect on the other organizational aspects, therefore it is vital to know how this factor affects organizational innovation as well as how managers and policy makers should prepare necessary conditions, facilities, and innovative environments for changing organizational culture in organizations.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual Issues

2.1.1 Innovation

One of the first definitions of innovation comes from Schumpeter, who recognized the aspect of novelty in 1920 (Hansen, Wakonen, 2019). According to Schumpeter, innovations are reflected in a new product, a new production method; the opening of a new market, a new supply source; or the creation of a new organizational structure. Innovation on an organizational level is defined as a new product, service, idea, technology, process or structure and it encompasses its invention, development or implementation (Damanpour, 2020).

2.1.2 Management Innovation (MI)

A key factor in defining management innovation is introduced by Mol and Birkinshaw (2019). For them, management innovation is based on the intent to improve performance. A management innovation is the introduction of new managerial practices by the firm to increase its performance. Damanpour and Aravind (2012) adopt the same line of thinking: a management innovation is a new organization, new administrative system, new managerial practices, or new way to create additional value for the company.

2.1.3 Organizational Performance (OP)

Barnard (2021) stated that an organization is a system of activities or power of two or more people which have been consciously coordinated and put forward that an organization emerges when there are people who can communicate and act together to achieve common aims. Schein (2019) defined an organization as the coordination of activities achieved by people

with common aims; work sharing, hierarchy and responsibility under an authority. Similarly, March et al., (2018) put forward that it is a social construction which is formed by relations among its members. Culture is one of the most important social environmental factors in an organization; therefore, it affects the life and development of an organization.

2.1.4 Management Innovation influences Organizational Performance

Woodman, Sawyer, & Griffin (2019) frame the definition of organizational creativity as a subset of the broader domain of innovation. Innovation is then characterized to be a subset of an even broader construct of organizational change. Creativity goes hand in hand with innovation; higher creativity leads to more innovation (Ali Taha, Sirkova, & Ferencova, 2020). They further argue developing an organizational culture that stimulates and promotes creativity and innovation is imperative for organizations seeking a competitive advantage. Creativity does not necessarily mean innovation. There is creativity without innovation, but there is no innovation without creativity; creativity precedes innovation. Creativity means to bring new ideas; innovation means converting these ideas into a successful business. Regarding organizational (corporate/ enterprise) culture, it is one of the most important factors affecting both creativity and innovation in organizations (Ali Taha et al., 2016). Literature suggests that creativity is the base of innovation (Sudath Weerasiri, Zhang Zhengang, 2012). As defined in the Mariam Webster, Innovation can be defined as "the introduction of something new idea, method, or device". However, in the business world, the word Innovation does have a broad, in-depth meaning and its classifications. In today's environment, if a company wishes to be competitive, it must be flexible, innovative, rapid and efficient (Bayó et al., 2021) he further states The future of any company depends on its capacity for sustained and systematic innovation. To understand the Innovation and its legitimate sway on business, anyone should understand the systematic approaches to Innovation and its classifications. Many companies enjoy the occupational innovations transpires within the system of business, manufacturing and service environment. To ensure a company's future competitiveness,

occasional innovation is no longer enough. Companies must have a systematic process with which to adapt swiftly to market changes while generating profitable solutions (Bayó et al., 2021). There are different methods of innovating, each depending on the approach to innovation. There are essentially two approaches. There are different methods of innovating, each depending on the approach to innovation. There are essentially two approaches. The first one is a technology-driven or research-driven innovation. This approach mainly involves the development of new differential technology, which is better than Existing technology, for commercial exploitation. The second is user-driven innovation. The main driving force of this approach is an in-depth understanding of the user's motivations, Problems and needs so that new solutions can then be developed and exploited.

2.2 Empirical Review

Subject literature provides evidence of a significant relation between culture and innovation (Chang & Lee, 2019; Lau & Ngo 2021; Miron & Erez & Naveh, 2019; Obenchain & Johnson, 2020). What empirical research has not elucidated is what type of culture actually stimulates or inhibits innovation. There are different typologies of organizational culture, comprising (Quinn & Spreitzer's, 2021) four cultures: group culture, developmental culture, hierarchical culture, and rational culture; (Chang & Lin's, 2019) types: cooperativeness, innovativeness, consistency, and effectiveness, or Wallach's approach (Wallach, 2018), who categorized organizational culture as bureaucratic, innovative, and supportive, and many others (Reigle, 2019; Wallach, 2019; Kets De Vries & Miller, 2019; Goffee & Jones, 2019; O'Reilly & Chapman & Caldwell, 2021)

Cameron and Quinn's model (Cameron & Quinn, 2021), the Competing Values Framework (CVF), from which four cultures – adhocracy, clan, market and hierarchy – emerge. Organizational culture that fosters innovation the most is adhocracy, typical of a flexible, entrepreneurial and externally oriented organization (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). This is confirmed by, among others, (Jaskyte, 2014; Jaskyte & Kisieliene 2016), whose empirical research provides evidence to support this relation. What authors find out is that innovation in these

organizations is significantly and positively related to the cultural dimension of “innovation” (similar to flexibility) and negatively related to “stability”.

Lau and Ngo (Lau & Ngo, 2014), who studied the effects of adhocracy culture (which they called development culture) on innovation in industrial enterprises. Obenchain and Johnson (Obenchain & Johnson, 2019) demonstrated empirically that in case of universities, adhocratic cultures favour innovation, while hierarchical cultures have an inhibitory effect on it. Lee and Choi (Lee & Choi, 2019) proved the existence of a positive relationship between organizational culture – understood as a set of values including cooperation, trust and learning - and the process of knowledge creation.

Valencia, Sanz Valle and Jiménez (Valencia & Sanz Valle & Jimenez, 2020), who conducted a study of 420 companies. What is more, Donate and Guadamillas demonstrated empirically that in the case of 111 Spanish companies operating in the so-called innovative industries, a prerequisite for achieving a high level of innovation in organizations is adequate organizational culture and knowledge management processes (Donate & Guadamillas 2019).

Pichlak (Pichlak, 2012), in which organizational culture was treated as one of many factors affecting organizational innovation, confirms that the highest level of innovation occurs in organizations where organizational culture fosters experimenting, creative problem solving as well as employee’s initiative (adhocracy culture).

2.3 Theoretical Literature

Innovation Theories

The Schumpeter theory of innovation was popularized by Joseph Schumpeter, an influential twentieth century economic thinker who argued that innovation-originated market power can provide better results than the invisible hand and price competition. Technological innovation creates temporary monopolies that lead to super normal profits which are sooner or later competed by rivals or imitators. The temporary monopolies provide an incentive for companies to develop new products and processes (Schumpeter, 2012). Schumpeter (1934) suggested a possible range of innovation alternatives,

for example, developing new products or services, developing new methods of production, identifying new markets, discovering new sources of supply and developing new organizational forms.

According to the theory of disruptive innovation, “disruption” describes a process where a small company with fewer resources can challenge established incumbent businesses. The new entrants target often overlooked segments of the markets and continuously delivers more value often at lower prices (Christensen, 2021). Markides (2019), further argues that there are three kinds of disruptive innovation: Business model innovation, technological innovation and radical product innovation. Business model innovation is employment of a fundamentally different business model in an existing business. New customers are attracted into the market, or existing customers encouraged consuming more, examples include Amazon, Dell and South West Airlines. Technological innovation use technology to disrupt the current product or services offering to attract customers, for example Uber. Finally, radical innovation creates new-to-the-world products. They introduce products and value propositions that disturb prevailing customer habits and behaviours in a major way for example personal computers and mobile phones.

Organization Performance Theories

Handy’s (2019) framework is one of the most popular organization performance theories. It argues that culture can be classified based on degree of centralization and formalization. Centralization considers the extent to which power and authority is concentrated at the top of the organization. Formalization contents to the extent to which rules, policies and procedures direct organizational activities. The framework contends that there are four types of cultures in organizations. In Power or Club culture, Handy uses a spider’s web as an analogy to depict the culture. Organizations that use this culture have divisions based on functions or products. However, relationship and connection to the spider in the middle matters most than formal titles and positions. Power and influence is concentrated at the centre and loses importance the further you go from the centre. This culture is mostly found in small entrepreneurial organizations. It is excellent for speed

of decision, where speed is more important, than the potential cost of a mistake. It is a good culture to work in, if you are a member of the club and close to the centre. Employees in the club are valued, have a free hand and are handsomely rewarded. An incompetent, aging or disinterested “centre” can quickly destroy the organization. Role culture is the ideal organization, where roles and functions supersede personalities. The organization is divided in a structure of roles and responsibilities which are held together by rules, policies and procedures. The culture is analogized by a Greek Temple. The pillars represent the functions and division of roles in an organization.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research used was survey design method of analysis on the study as the strategy or plan of action regarding events which upon implementation will enable the researcher to investigate the problem of this study. The study was designed in a systematic process of providing answer to the research questions and research objectives.

3.2 Method of Data Analysis

In order to analyze the data collected effectively and efficiently for easy management and accuracy, the simple percentage method was the analytical tools used for this research project. Also, Correlation statistical analytical method will be used in the research work. Correlation as a statistical technique is used in testing of hypothesis so as to predict what the relationship between two variables should be. Having gathered the data through the administration of questionnaire, the collected data will be coded, tabulated, and analyzed according to the research question and hypothesis. Data collection were analyzed by the use of simple percentage analysis and presented in the table. Their response were computed in percentage and entered in the appropriate column for each case, while chi-square was used.

3.3 Model Specification

The study was conducted in Kwara State, Nigeria, and with the findings analysis carried out from selected companies/industries for the purpose of this

research study. As a result of the inability of the researcher to effectively study the whole enterprise under study, a representative number was chosen as the sample size population. One hundred (100) staffs of Tuyil Pharmaceutical company limited Ilorin Kwara state were used as the sample size. The sample size was calculated using the Taro Yamani scientific formula which is given as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:

N is the Population

1 is the constant

e is the degree of error expected

n is the sample size

$$n = \frac{200}{1 + 200 (0.05)^2}$$

$$\frac{200}{1 + 200 (0.0025)}$$

$$\frac{200}{1 + 1}$$

$$\frac{200}{2}$$

$$n = 100$$

3.4 Data and Sources

In this study, questionnaire is the main research instrument used for the study to gather necessary data from the sample respondents. The questionnaire is structured in an open ended form.

This instrument is divided into two sections; Section A and B. Section A deals with the personal data of the respondents while Section B contains research statement postulated in line with the research questions and hypotheses in the earlier Options or alternatives are provided for each respondent to pick or tick one of the options. Since the research instrument used was the questionnaire, it was designed using the likert scale method. The questionnaire was designed in the following ways:

Strongly Agreed (SA)	-	5
Agreed (A)	-	4
Undecided (U)	-	3
Disagreed (D)	-	2
Strongly Disagreed (SD)	-	1

Data for this study came from the primary and secondary data. The primary data was generated

through the field survey using structured questionnaire as a major research instrument. The secondary data on the other hand were obtained from relevant literatures ranging from textbooks, journals, articles, periodicals, seminar paper dissertation. Onwumere (2018) defines validity as “the extent to which a measuring instrument on application performs the function for which it was designed.” Validity is determined by the degree of provision of correct response from sample objects by the relevant research design or research instrument. To ascertain the validity of the instrument, content validity was adopted, in which the researcher subjected the instrument to face validity by giving it to research experts, who examined the items and made sure they were in line with the objectives of the study. The structure and language of the questionnaire were modified in the light of their corrections. The instrument was structured in such a way as to minimize the effect of errors like inconsistency and ambiguity. Anyanwu (2010:87), defines reliability as “the ability of a particular measuring instrument to yield similar result when applied to the same situation at different times.” The reliability of instrument was determined by a reliability test through the use of Cronbach’s Alpha to check the consistency of the intended measure. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients for most of the constructs in the pilot study had an acceptable level of internal consistency based on the suggestion of Nunnally and Bernstein (2015). A total of twenty (20) copies of questionnaire were administered to five selected organizations in kwara state for the study.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach’s Alpha	No. of Items
.841	12

In this case, $\alpha = 0.841$, which shows that the questionnaire is reliable.

The questionnaires were self-administered by the researcher to the participants and distributed to the selected industries in kwara state. Nigeria; 120 questionnaires was planned for distribution. In order to ensure the proper follow up of the questionnaires to be filled and returned, an employee who works there was assigned as a contact person.

4. Results and Discussion

The study deals with the presentation and analysis of the result obtained through questionnaires. The data gathered were presented according to the order in which they were arranged in the research questions, simple percentage and pie graphs were used to analyze the demographic information of the respondents while spearman rank correlation was adopted to test the research hypotheses. One hundred and twenty (120) copies of Questionnaire was Distributed to staff of selected manufacturing companies/industries in Kwara State. Nigeria. One hundred (100) copies were returned out of the total questionnaires distributed.

Questionnaire Distributed is 120 while Questionnaire returned is 100.

4.1Demographics Characteristics of the Research Respondents

Table 2: Age grade of respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	below 17years	15	15.0	15.0	15.0
	18-20years	15	15.0	15.0	30.0
	21-30years	40	40.0	40.0	70.0
	31-40years	10	10.0	10.0	80.0
	41-50years	10	10.0	10.0	90.0
	above 50years	10	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author’s Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 2 above shows the age grade of the respondents used for this study.

15 respondents which represent 15.0percent of the population are below 17 years.15 respondents which represent 15.0 percent of the population are between 18-20years.40respondents which represent 40.0 percent of the population are between 21-

30years.10respondents which represent 10.0 percent of the population are between 31-40years.10respondents which represent 10.0 percent of the population are between 41-50years while 10respondents which represent 10.0 percent of the population are over 50years.

Sex

Table 3: Sex of Respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	60	60.0	60.0	60.0
	Female	40	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 3 above shows the sex distribution of the respondents used for this study.

60 respondents which represent 60.0percent of the population are male while the remaining 40

respondents which represent 40.0 percent of the population are female.

Educational Level

Table 4: Educational level of Respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	HND/ND	30	30.0	30.0	90.0
	BSc.	60	60.0	60.0	60.0
	MSc.	5	5.0	5.0	95.0
	PHD.	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 4 above shows the educational level of respondents used for the survey

30 respondents representing 30.0 percent of the population are HND/ND degree holders.60 respondents representing 60.0percent of the

population are BSc. Degree holders. 5 respondents representing 5 percent of the population are MSc. Degree holders while 5 respondents representing 5 percent of the population are PHD degree holders.

Table Based on the Research Questions

Table 5: Management Style, Techniques and Behaviour Often Reflect on the Performance of the Organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	50	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Agree	25	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Undecided	5	5.0	5.0	80.0
	Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	90.0
	Strongly	10	10.0	10.0	100.0

disagree			
Total	100	100.0	100.0

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 5 shows the responses of respondents that management style, techniques and behaviour often reflect on the culture of the organisation. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent strongly agree that management style, techniques and behaviour often reflect on the culture of the organisation. 25 respondents representing 25.0 percent agree that management style, techniques and behaviour often reflect on the culture of the organisation. 5

respondents representing 5.0 percent were undecided. 10 respondents representing 10.0 percent disagree that that management style, techniques and behaviour often reflect on the culture of the organisation. 10 of the respondents representing 10.0 percent strongly disagrees that that management style, techniques and behaviour often reflect on the culture of the organisation

Table 6: Idea Generation has a Significant Influence on an Organization's Ability to Manage Innovation.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	50	50.0	50.0	90.0
	Undecided	2	2.0	2.0	92.0
	Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	95.0
	strongly disagree	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 6 shows the responses of respondents that idea generation has a significant influence on an organisation's ability to manage innovation. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree that idea generation has a significant influence on an organisation's ability to manage innovation. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent agree that idea generation has a significant influence on an organization's ability to manage innovation.

2percent were undecided. 3 respondents representing 3.0 percent disagrees that idea generation has a significant influence on an organization's ability to manage innovation while the remaining 5 of the respondents representing 5 percent strongly disagrees that idea generation has a significant influence on an organization's ability to manage innovation

Table 7: There is a Significant Influence of Product Innovation on Organizational Performance.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	50	50.0	50.0	90.0
	Undecided	2	2.0	2.0	92.0
	Disagree	5	5.0	5.0	97.0
	strongly disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 7 shows the responses of respondents that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent agree that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture. 2 respondents

representing 2 percent were undecided. 5 respondents representing 5.0 percent disagree that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture while the remaining 3 of the respondents representing 3 percent strongly disagree that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture.

Table 8: There is a Significant Influence of Process Innovation on Organizational Performance.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	50	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Agree	30	30.0	30.0	80.0
	Undecided	5	5.0	5.0	85.0
	Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	95.0
	strongly agree	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 8 shows the responses of respondents that there is a significant influence of process innovation on organizational culture. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent strongly agree that there is a significant influence of process innovation on organizational culture. 30 respondents representing 30.0 percent agree that there is a significant influence of process innovation on organizational

culture. 5 respondents representing 5 percent were undecided. 10 respondents representing 10.0 percent disagrees that there is a significant influence of process innovation on organizational culture while the remaining 5 of the respondents representing 5 percent strongly disagrees that there is a significant influence of process innovation on organizational culture.

Table 9: There is Significant Relationship Between Management Innovation and Organizational Performance.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	30	30.0	30.0	70.0
	Undecided	15	15.0	15.0	85.0
	Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	95.0
	strongly disagree	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 9 shows the responses of respondents that there is a significant relationship between innovation management and organizational culture. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree

that there is a significant relationship between innovation management and organizational culture. 30 respondents representing 30.0 percent agree that there is a significant relationship between innovation

management and organizational culture. 15 respondents representing 15.0 percent were undecided. 10 respondents representing 10.0 percent disagrees that there is a significant relationship between innovation management and organizational

culture while the remaining 5 of the respondents representing 5.0 percent strongly disagrees that there is a significant relationship between innovation management and organizational culture.

Table 10: Organizational has the Character and Foundation of the Organization Plays an Effective Role in the Flow of Sharing Knowledge in the Organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	50	50.0	50.0	90.0
	Undecided	2	2.0	2.0	92.0
	Disagree	5	5.0	5.0	97.0
	strongly disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 10 shows the responses of respondents that organizational culture as the character and foundation of the organization plays an effective role in the flow of sharing knowledge in the organization. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree that organizational culture as the character and foundation of the organization plays an effective role in the flow of sharing knowledge in the organization. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent agree that organizational culture as the character and foundation of the organization plays an effective role

in the flow of sharing knowledge in the organization. 2 respondents representing 2 percent were undecided. 5 respondents representing 5.0 percent disagrees that organizational culture as the character and foundation of the organization plays an effective role in the flow of sharing knowledge in the organization while the remaining 3 of the respondents representing 3 percent strongly disagree that organizational culture as the character and foundation of the organization plays an effective role in the flow of sharing knowledge in the organization.

Table 11: There is a Significant Influence of Organizational Innovation on Organizational Culture.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	50	50.0	50.0	90.0
	Undecided	2	2.0	2.0	92.0
	Disagree	5	5.0	5.0	97.0
	strongly disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 11 shows the responses of respondents that there is a significant influence of organizational innovation on organizational culture. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree that there is a significant influence of organizational innovation on organizational culture. 50 respondents

representing 50.0 percent agree that there is a significant influence of organizational innovation on organizational culture. 2 respondents representing 2 percent were undecided. 5 respondents representing 5.0 percent disagrees that there is a significant influence of organizational innovation on

organizational culture while the remaining 3 of the respondents representing 3 percent strongly disagrees that there is a significant influence of organizational innovation on organizational culture.

Table 12: Organizational Culture is an Element Favourable to the Development of Innovative Activity.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	30	30.0	30.0	70.0
	Undecided	15	15.0	15.0	85.0
	Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	95.0
	strongly disagree	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 12 shows the responses of respondents that organizational culture is an element favourable to the development of innovative activity. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree that organizational culture is an element favourable to the development of innovative activity. 30 respondents representing 30.0 percent agree that organizational culture is an element favourable to the development of innovative activity. 15

respondents representing 15.0 percent were undecided. 10 respondents representing 10.0 percent disagrees that organizational culture is an element favourable to the development of innovative activity while the remaining 5 of the respondents representing 5.0 percent strongly disagrees that organizational culture is an element favourable to the development of innovative activity.

Table 13: There is a Significant Influence of Product Innovation on Organizational Culture.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	50	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Agree	30	30.0	30.0	80.0
	Undecided	5	5.0	5.0	85.0
	Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	95.0
	strongly agree	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 13 shows the responses of respondents that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent strongly agree that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture. 30 respondents representing 30.0 percent agree that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational

culture. 5 respondents representing 5 percent were undecided. 10 respondents representing 10.0 percent disagrees that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture while the remaining 5 of the respondents representing 5 percent strongly disagrees that there is a significant influence of product innovation on organizational culture

Table 14: Competitive in the Organizations Influences Employees Performance.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	30	30.0	30.0	70.0
	Undecided	15	15.0	15.0	85.0
	Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	95.0
	strongly disagree	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 14 shows the responses of respondent that competition in the organization influences employee performance. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree that Competition in the organization influences employee performance. 30 respondents representing 30.0 percent agree that competition in the organization influences employee

performance. 15 respondents representing 15.0 percent were undecided. 10 respondents representing 10.0 percent disagrees that competition in the organization influences employee performance while the remaining 5 of the respondents representing 5.0 percent strongly disagrees that competition in the organization influences employee performance.

Table 15: Dynamism and Creativity Influence Organizational Culture.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Agree	50	50.0	50.0	90.0
	Undecided	2	2.0	2.0	92.0
	Disagree	5	5.0	5.0	97.0
	strongly disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 15 shows the responses of respondents that dynamism and creativity influence organizational culture. 40 respondents representing 40.0 percent strongly agree that dynamism and creativity influence organizational culture. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent agree that dynamism and creativity influence organizational culture. 2 respondents

representing 2 percent were undecided. 5 respondents representing 5.0 percent disagrees that dynamism and creativity influence organizational culture while the remaining 3 of the respondents representing 3 percent strongly disagrees that dynamism and creativity influence organizational culture.

Table 16: Organizational Cultures Prevents or Facilitates the Implementation and Maintenance of Innovation in the Organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	50	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Agree	30	30.0	30.0	80.0
	Undecided	5	5.0	5.0	85.0
	Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	95.0
	strongly agree	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's Analytical Survey, (2024)

Table 16 shows the responses of respondents that organizational culture prevents or facilitates the implementation and maintenance of innovation in the organization. 50 respondents representing 50.0 percent strongly agree that organizational culture prevents or facilitates the implementation and maintenance of innovation in the organization. 30 respondents representing 30.0 percent agree that organizational culture prevents or facilitates the implementation and maintenance of innovation in the organization. 5 respondents representing 5 percent were undecided. 10 respondents representing 10.0 percent disagrees that organizational culture prevents or facilitates the implementation and maintenance of innovation in the organization while the remaining 5 of the respondents representing 5 percent strongly disagrees that organizational culture prevents or facilitates the implementation and maintenance of innovation in the organization.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

Thinking about the implementation of innovation, organizations generally focus on resources, processes and measurement of success, i.e. the easily measurable elements. Results showed that product innovation, process innovation and organizational innovation has a positive impact on organizational performance. Study also indicates that moderation effect of organization culture on the connection of product innovation with organizational culture is positive. The moderation effect of organization culture on the connection of process innovation with organization culture is optimistic. Also the moderation effect of organization culture on the connection of organizational innovation with organization performance is also positive. Results will help the decision makers when they will practice innovation in their organizations that will affect the performance of the organization. It is extremely important to appropriately shape the pro-innovation organizational performance from the point of view of

competitiveness of each company because innovation is often the element that determines the competitive position in the market. The findings will guide managers in regarding their organization's performance as a dimensional phenomenon which has a combined relationship to the innovation management, simultaneously urge them to lead the organization through flexible cultures. For practitioners, it is suggested that they consider dimensions of organization performance alongside the typologies to reach the best fulfilling results. Therefore the study however recommended that:

- i. Large organizations take the best care of appropriate equipment at the workstations, allow flexible employees' access to facilities and social benefits and reward for extra work and proposing/implementing improvements.
- ii. Employees of these enterprises should support their employers to make the best use of their intellectual qualities. Access to social facilities and systems evaluating work should be recommended.
- iii. A significant feature of innovation-oriented culture is change. Employees are willing to take risks that change entails, which may be related to, for example, changing jobs. There should be job guarantee and job security at all time. Adjustment processes also include employment, implying the need for its flexibility. At the same time it should be noted that in times of high unemployment, stabilization of employment (a secure work contract) may be a more important motivating factor to work. Each innovation may be a threat to employees because it violates the current state of balance, which can lead to employees' reluctance to implement innovation and even boycott and sabotage change.

References

- Alegre, J. Lapiedra, R., & Chiva, R. (2019); *A measurement scale for product innovation performance. European Journal of Innovation management*, 9 (4), 333-346.
- Alitaha, V. Sirkova, M. Ferencova, M. (2019); *The Impact of Organizational Culture on Creativity and Innovation. Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 14(1), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2016.14.1.01>

- Angel, L. Meroño-Cerdan, & López-Nicolas, C. (2020). *Understanding the drivers of organization innovation. The Service Industries Journal*, 33 (13), 1312-1325.
- Armbruster, H. (2021); *Organizational innovation The challenge of measuring non-technical innovation in large scale surveys. European journal*.
- Atay, K. (2020). *Okul kulturu The culture of school/ Kuramdan Uygulamaya Egitim Yonetimi /Educational administration: Theory and Practice/*, 23, 179-191.
- Auernhammer, J. Hall, H. (2019). Organizational culture in knowledge creation, creativity and innovation: towards the Freiraum model. *Journal of Information Science*. Vol 40, No 2, 156-166.
- Barnard, C. (2020). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bayó, E., Miranda, C., Planet, V., Sánchez, A., Sanz, M., Comunicació, E., ... Xavier Camps, I. C. C. (2019). *How to become an innovative company*. Retrieved from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/es/deed.ca>
- Becheikh et al., (2019). Strategic determinants of technological innovation in manufacturing SMEs. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences de L Administration*, 23 (2019), pp. 275-300
- Birkinshaw, J., & Hamel, G., & Mol, M.J. (2020). Management innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 825-845.
- Bogers, M. (2019). The Sources of Process Innovation in User Firms. *Journal of Management*.
- Borgelt, K. and Falk, I. (2017), "The leadership/management conundrum: innovation or risk management?" *Leadership & organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 122-36
- Brown, C. J., & Frame, P. (2020). Small Business Innovation Management. *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 2 (3), 209-224.
- Çakar, N. D., & Ertürk, A. (2020). Comparing innovation capability of small and medium-sized enterprises: Examining the effects of organizational culture and empowerment. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 48(3), 325-359.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2021). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Campbell, D. & Stonehouse, B. & Houston, B. (2021). *Business Strategy*. Butterworth Heinemann. 47-48.
- Chang, S. & Lin, C. (2017), *Exploring organizational culture for information security, Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 107(3), 438-58.
- Christensen, C. M. (2019). The ongoing process of building a theory of disruption. *Journal of Product innovation management*, 23(1), 39-55.
- Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (2018). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 128–136.
- Damanpour, F. (2021), *Organizational innovation: a meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators*. The Academy of Management Journal, 34(3), 555-90.
- Damanpour, F., & Gopalakrishnan, S. (2019). Theories of organizational structure and innovation adoption: The role of environmental change. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 15(1), 1-24. doi:10.1016/S0923-4748(97)00029-5
- Damanpour, R., Gopalakrishnan, S. (2021). The dynamics of the adoption of product and process innovations in organizations, *Journal of Management Studies* 38 (1), 45–66
- Darroch, J. (2019), "Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 101-115.
- Darroch, J. and McNaughton, R. (2018), "Examining the link between knowledge management practices and types of innovation", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 210-222.
- Deshpandé, R., Farley, J. U., & Webster, F. E., Jr. (2020). Corporate culture, customer

- orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: a quadrad analysis. *The journal of Marketing*, 23-37.
- Dobni C.B. (2020). The Relationship Between an Innovation Orientation and Competitive Strategy, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 14(2), 331-357.
- Dobni, C.B., (2019). Measuring innovation culture in organizations: The development of a generalized innovation culture construct using exploratory factor analysis, *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 11(4), 539 – 559.
- Donate, M.J. & Guadamillas, F. (2018). Organizational factors to support knowledge management and innovation, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(6), 890-914.s
- Drucker, P. F. (2020). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Dubouloz, S. (2019) '*Innovation organisationnelle et pratiques de mobilisation des RH*', Revue Française de Gestion, Vol. 40, No. 238, pp.60–85.
- Dubouloz, S. and Bocquet, R. (2021) '*Innovation organisationnelle, S'ouvrir pour innover plus?*', Revue Française de Gestion, Vol. 39, No. 235, pp.130–147.
- Fegh-hi, N. (2020). Strategic, structure for organizational performance. *International Journal of Management & Innovation*, 2(2), 9-23
- Francis, D., J. Bessant, (2021). "Targeting innovation and implications for capability development", *Technovation*, 25(3): 171-183.
- French, L. Wendell (2021). *Human Resources Management* (2nd ed.). Houghtom Mifflin.
- Gatignon, H., Tushman, M., Smith, W. and Anderson, R, (2020). *A Structural Approach to Assessing Innovation: Construct Development of Innovation Locus, Type, and Characteristics*. *Management Science*, Vol. 48, 9, pp 1103-1122.
- Getz, I., Brian, M. and Carney, E. (2018) *Liberté & Cie*, (trad. de l'anglais), Flammarion, Paris.
- Giuliani, P. and Robert, M. (2016) '*How to manage the obstacles related to management innovation implementation: lesson from a complex industrial company*', Paper presented at the Association Internationale de Management Stratégique Conference, 30 May–1 June 2016, Hammamet, Tunis.
- Giuliani, P. and Robert, M. (2017) '*L'innovation managériale comme source d'innovations incrémentales de procédés*', in Mignon, S. et al. (Eds.): *L'innovation managériale: enjeux et perspectives*, pp.55–81, EMS, Caen.
- Global Competitiveness Report. (2021). *Global Competitiveness Report*;. Worlwk Economic Forum, www.weforum.org/gcr.
- Godowski, C. (2020) '*Essai sur la dynamique d'assimilation des innovations managériales: le cas des approches par activités*', Comptabilité-Contrôle-Audit, Numéro special, tome, Vol. 9, pp.71–86.
- Gold, A.H., Malhotra, A., y Segars, A.H. (2021). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 185–214.
- Grant, 2019 *Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17 (2016), pp. 109-122
- Hall, R., & Andriani, P. (2012). *Managing Knowledge for Innovation*. Long Range Planning (35), 29-48.
- Hamel, G. (2018). The Why, What, And how of Management Innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(2), 72-83.
- Haneda, N., Motheb, C., & Thic, T. U. (2019). Firm persistence in technological innovation: the relevance of organiztional innovation. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 23 (5), 490–516.
- Hansen, S. O. & Wakonen, J. (2017). Innovation, a winning solution?. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 13, 345–358.
- Hartmann, A. (2021). *The role of organizational culture in motivating innovative behavior in construction firms*, *Construction Innovation*, 6(3), 159-172.
- Hecker, A. and Ganter, A. (2021) '*The influence of product market competition on technological and management innovation: firm level evidence from a large-scale survey*', *European Management Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.17–33.

- Herrmann, A., Tomczak, T., & Befurt, R. (2016). Determinants of radical product innovations. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 9 (1), 20-43.
- Hofstede, G. (2013). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage publications.
- James, R., & Jones, G. (2021). *The Character of a Corporation: How Your Company's Culture Can Make or Break Your Business*, London: Harper Business.
- Jamrog, J., Vickers, M., & Bear, D. (2016). *Building and sustaining culture that supports innovation*. Human Resources Planning, 29(3), 9-19.
- Janicijevic, N. (2019). *Methodological Approaches in the Research of Organizational Culture*. Economic Annals. Vol 46, No 189, 69–100.
- Jassawalla, A.R., Sashittal, H.C. (2020). *Cultures that support product innovation processes*, Academy of Management Executive, 1, 16(3), pp. 42-53.
- Jurado, J. V., Gracia, A. G., & Fernández-de-Lucio, I. (2019). *Does external knowledge sourcing matter for innovation? Evidence from the Spanish manufacturing industry*. Industrial and Corporate Change, 180 (4), 637–670.
- Kaasa, A., & Vadi, M. (2020). How does culture contribute to innovation? Evidence from European countries. *Economics of innovation and new technology*, 19(7), 583-604.
- Kets De Vries, M., & Miller, D. (2020). *Personality, culture and organization*, Academy of Management Review, 11, 266-279.
- Khazanchi, S., Lewis, M., & Boyer, K. (2017). Innovation-supportive culture: the impact of organizational values on process innovation. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25, 871-884.
- Kimberly, J.R. (2020) 'Managerial innovation', in Nystrom P.C et al. (Eds.): *Handbook of Organizational Design*, Vol. 1, pp.84–104, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kimberly, J.R. and Evanisko, M.J. (2019) 'Organizational innovation: the influence of individual organizational and contextual factors on hospital adoption of technological and administrative innovations', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp.689–713.
- Koc, T., & Ceylan, C. (2017). *Factors impacting the innovative capacity in large-scale companies*, Technovation, 27(3), 105–114
- Leavy, B. (2019). *A leader's guide to creating an innovation culture*. *Strategy & Leadership*, 33(4), 38-45.
- Lee, H., & Choi, B. (2018), Knowledge management enablers, processes, and organizational performance, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 22(1) , 179-228.
- Lee, J.(2021), Effects of leadership and leader-member exchange on Innovativeness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(6), 670-687.
- Lee, Y.D. and Chang, H.M. (2020), "Leadership style and innovation ability: an empirical study of Taiwanese wire and cable companies", *Journal of American Academy of Business*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 218-23.
- Lundy, O. & Cowling, A. (2019). *Strategic Human Resource Management*, Routledge, London.
- Malaviya, P., & Wadhwa, S. (2020). Innovation Management in Organizational Context: An Empirical Study, *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 6(2), 1-14.
- March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. (2018). *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Markides, C. (2016). Disruptive innovation: In need of better theory. *Journal of product innovation management*, 23(1), 19-25.
- Martins E.C., & Terblance, F. (2019). Building Organisational Culture that stimulates Creativity and Innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. Vol 6, No 1, 64-74.
- Martins, E., & Martins, N. (2020). An Organisational culture model to promote creativity and innovation. *Journal of Industry Psychology*, 28(4), 58-65. doi.org/10.1016/S0732-0671(04)21003-3
- McLean, L. (2019). *Organizational's Culture influence on creativity and innovation: A review of the literature and implications for Human Resources development*. Advances in

- Developing Human Resources, 7(2), 226-246.
- Menguc, B., & Auh, S. (2020). *Development and return on execution of product innovation capabilities: The role of organizational structure*. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(5), 820- 831.
- Miron, E., & Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2014). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other?, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 175-99.
- Mol, M.J. and Birkinshaw, J. (2020) ‘*The role of external involvement in the creation of management innovations*’, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 9, pp.1287–1312.
- Mol, M.J. and Birkinshaw, J. (2019) ‘The sources of management innovation: when firms introduce new management practices’, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62, No. 12, pp.1269–1280.
- Morcillo, P. (2020). *Siempre nos quedará la innovación*. *Revista Europea de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa*, 21(03), 215-218.
- Naranjo, J., Jiménez, D., y Sanz, R. (2021). *¿Es la cultura organizativa un determinante de la innovación en la empresa?*. *Cuadernos de Economía y Dirección de la Empresa*, 15, 63-72.
- Naranjo, J., y Calderón, G. (2019). *Construyendo una cultura de innovación*. Una propuesta de transformación cultural. *Estudios Gerenciales*, 31, 223-236.
- Nonaka, I & Takeuchi, H. (2019). *The knowledge-creating Company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Obenchain A., & Johnson W. (2020). Product and process innovation in service organizations: the influence of org, *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 9(3), 91-113.
- Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2020). *Business Model Generation*. (T. Clark, Ed) New Jersey: NY, John Wiley & Sons. ISBN: 978-0470- 87641-1.
- Piazuelo, C. (2014). *Innovación en Cultura*. Una aproximación crítica a la genealogía y usos del concepto. Barcelona, España: YProductions.
- Pichlak, M. (2012), *Uwarunkowania innowacyjności organizacji*. Studium teoretyczne i wyniki badań empirycznych, Difin, Warszawa.
- Quinn, R.E. & Spreitzer, G.M. (2011). *The psychometrics of the competing values culture instrument and an analysis of the impact of organization culture on quality of life*, *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 5, 115-142.
- Quinn. R. (2011), “*Diagnosing culture and changing organizational culture*”, “New York: Addison Wesley.
- Rabinson, B.Rivhard. (2018). *Strategic strategy, Formulation and Implementation* (3rd ed.). Irwin Toppan.
- Raymond, C., Aaron, B., & Bertha, L. (2016). Eco-efficiency and SMEs in Nova Scotia, Canada. *Journal of cleaner Production*, 14 (6-7), 542-550.
- Reigle, F. (2011). Measuring organic and mechanistic cultures, *Engineering Management Journal*, 13(14), 3-8.
- Schein, E.H. (2020). *Organizational psychology* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Schlegelmilch, B.B., A. Diamantopoulos, P. Kreuz, (2020). “Strategic innovation: The construct, its drivers, and its strategic outcomes”, *Journal of strategic Marketing*, 11: 117-132.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (2019). *The schumptrr: Theory economic development*. Harvard University Press.
- Sudath Weerasiri, Zhang Zhengang, T. R. (2021). *Innovation and Creativity of Small and Medium ScaleEnterprises (SMEs) in Sri Lanka: A Review Innovation and Creativity of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises*. Business, Global Review, Economics, (February).
- Teece, D.J., (2020) ‘*The diffusion of an administrative innovation*’, *Management Science*, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp.464–470.
- Tejada, P., & Moreno, P. (2019). Patterns of innovation in tourism and Medium-size

- Enterprises. *The Service Industries Journal*, 8 (7), 749-758.
- Thakur, R., Hsu, S. H., & Fontenot, G. (2019). Innovation in healthcare: Issues and future trends. *Journal of Business Research*, 65 (4), 562–569.
- Tushman, M.L. & O'Reilly, C.A. (2017). *Winning Through Innovation: A Practical Guide to Leading Organizational Change and Renewal*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Uzkurt C., & Kumar, R., & Semih Kimzan, H., & Eminoglu, G. (2021). Role of innovation in the relationship between organizational culture and firm performance: A study of the banking sector in Turkey, *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 16(1), 92-117.
- Van Der Panne, G., & Van Beers, C., & Kleinknecht A. (2020). Success and failure of innovation: a literature review, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 7, 309–338.
- Van't, H. N. Van den B. F. (2019) 'Management innovation: exploring the influence of external change agents', Paper presented at the European Academy of Management Conference, 6–8 June, Rotterdam, Holland.
- Vijande, M. L. S. Gonzalez, L. I. A. (2017). *Innovativeness and organizational innovation in total quality oriented firms: The moderating role of market turbulence*, Technovation, No. 27, 514-532.
- Walker, R. M. Damanpour, F. Devece, C. A. (2022). Management Innovation and Organizational Performance: The Mediating Effect of Performance Management, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(2), 367-386.
- Wallac, E. (1983). Individual and organizations: the cultural match, *Training and Development Journal*, 37(2), 29-36.