

## Strategic Foresight Capability, Dynamic Capabilities, Organizational Resilience, Innovation Speed, and Firm Performance: Testing a Structural Equation Model

Katarzyna. Nowak<sup>1</sup>, Oliver. McKenzie<sup>2\*</sup>, Dimitrios. Papadakis<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Strategic Management, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

<sup>2</sup> Department of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Schulich School of Business, York University, Toronto, Canada



<sup>3</sup> Department of Business Administration, Athens University of Economics and Business, Athens, Greece

\* Corresponding author email address: [oliver.mckenzie@schulich.yorku.ca](mailto:oliver.mckenzie@schulich.yorku.ca)

### Editor

Davood Feiz<sup>1</sup>  
Affiliation: Professor of  
Management Department, Semnan  
University, Iran  
[feiz1353@semnan.ac.ir](mailto:feiz1353@semnan.ac.ir)

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Mehrdad Bayat<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran,  
Iran.  
Email: [bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir](mailto:bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir)  
**Reviewer 2:** Marco Yamba-Yugsi<sup>1</sup>  
Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101,  
Ecuador  
Email: [marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec](mailto:marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec)

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paragraph discussing organizational resilience defines resilience as “the capacity of firms to withstand shocks, recover from adversity, adapt to changing conditions, and continue functioning effectively.” However, the manuscript does not sufficiently distinguish resilience from dynamic capabilities. A deeper conceptual differentiation is necessary because substantial theoretical overlap exists between these constructs, potentially threatening discriminant validity.

The authors state that “innovation speed may represent an important mediating mechanism linking strategic capabilities to organizational performance.” This proposition is theoretically important, yet the manuscript does not sufficiently explain why innovation speed was selected instead of related constructs such as innovation quality, innovation intensity, or innovation ambidexterity. Additional justification is needed.

In the literature gap section, the claim that “comprehensive empirical models integrating these constructs remain relatively limited” should be strengthened through a more systematic review of prior studies. The authors should explicitly identify which relationships have already been tested and which specific pathways remain underexplored.

In the Methods section, the authors indicate that data were collected from “medium-sized and large organizations operating in various industries across Canada.” Greater detail is required regarding the organizational selection process. Specifically, the manuscript should clarify how organizations were identified, contacted, and recruited, and whether any industry-specific inclusion criteria were applied.

In the Discussion section, the interpretation of findings is largely confirmatory. For example, the paragraph beginning “One of the most important findings of the study was the strong positive relationship between strategic foresight capability and dynamic capabilities” focuses almost exclusively on supporting literature. The discussion would be strengthened by exploring unexpected implications, boundary conditions, and potential alternative interpretations.

The manuscript repeatedly emphasizes the Canadian context, yet the Discussion provides minimal consideration of how Canadian institutional, economic, regulatory, or cultural characteristics may have influenced the observed relationships. A more contextualized interpretation would enhance the study’s contribution and external validity.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement “A stratified random sampling approach was utilized to ensure representation from different sectors and organizational sizes” requires methodological clarification. The manuscript should specify the stratification variables, proportional allocation procedures, sampling frames, and actual response rates for each stratum.

The sample description reports 542 respondents from multiple sectors, yet the manuscript does not provide information regarding organizational representation. It remains unclear whether multiple respondents originated from the same organization. The authors should clarify the number of participating firms and address potential non-independence of observations.

In the paragraph describing the Strategic Foresight Capability Scale, the manuscript refers to a scale developed by Rohrbeck and Kum but does not provide sufficient information regarding adaptation procedures. The authors should report whether items were modified, shortened, translated, or contextualized for the Canadian organizational environment.

The measurement section repeatedly states that previous studies reported satisfactory psychometric properties; however, no evidence is presented regarding measurement invariance across industries. Given the heterogeneous sample, testing measurement invariance across major sectors would substantially strengthen the validity of the findings.

The authors indicate that “Harman’s single-factor test and variance inflation factor analyses were performed to examine the potential influence of common method variance.” However, the results of these analyses are not reported. The manuscript should provide the percentage of variance explained by the first factor and the VIF values to demonstrate that common method bias is not a significant concern.

In Table 1, all variables display relatively high means and low variability. The authors should discuss the possibility of social desirability bias or self-enhancement bias, particularly because managerial respondents evaluated both organizational capabilities and organizational performance using self-reported measures.

The correlation matrix in Table 2 shows strong correlations among several constructs, particularly between Dynamic Capabilities and Innovation Speed ( $r = .77$ ). Although below the .85 threshold, the manuscript should provide stronger evidence of discriminant validity, including the Fornell–Larcker criterion and HTMT ratios.

In Table 3, the authors report CR and AVE values but do not provide individual item loadings, cross-loadings, or item retention decisions. Including a complete measurement model appendix would improve transparency and allow readers to evaluate construct validity more thoroughly.

Figure 1 presents the final structural model, yet the manuscript does not report modification indices or alternative model comparisons. The authors should explain whether competing theoretical models were evaluated and why the presented model was selected as the best representation of the data.

The structural model reports a direct path from Strategic Foresight Capability to Firm Performance ( $\beta = .18, p < .001$ ) alongside multiple indirect paths. However, no formal mediation table is provided. The manuscript should include detailed bootstrap estimates of indirect effects, total effects, confidence intervals, and effect sizes for all mediation pathways.

The reported explanatory power is exceptionally high, with 74% of variance explained in Firm Performance. While impressive, this result raises concerns regarding potential common source bias and model overfitting. The authors should discuss alternative explanations for these unusually large  $R^2$  values and provide robustness checks where possible.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.