ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

STRATEGIC AGILITY AND ITS IMPACT ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA

Adebayo Chukwudi Okafor And Nnena Ifeoma Eze

Department of Business Management, University of Uyo, Uyo, Nigeria.

Abstract

This study was carried out to examine the influence of strategic agility on organizational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-south Nigeria. Strategic agility was proxied into strategic leadership and flexibility. Survey research design was adopted for the study. The total population was 319 staff of selected quoted manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. 177 was arrived at as sample size, using Taro Yamene's formula for sample size determination. Both primary and secondary sources of data were employed for the study. Proportionate sampling technique was adopted to ensure efficient representation of each firm while the research instrument was a structure questionnaire. Descriptive and Inferential statistics were used in analyzing the study. Findings revealed that strategic leadership had a high correlation value of R = 0. 861 with an Unstandardized Coefficient Beta β=0.666. While flexibility showed an Unstandardized Coefficient Beta of β=0.766. From the findings, it was concluded that strategic agility has a positive significant influence on organizational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-south Nigeria. As such, it is recommended that management of selected manufacturing firms in south-south Nigeria should embrace strategic leadership as it will empower their organizations to navigate complex and ever-changing business landscapes successfully. Equally, management of selected manufacturing firms in south-south should inculcate flexibility as one of their core operational policy if they are to thrive in a dynamic environment.

Keywords: Strategic agility, Strategic leadership, Flexibility, Organizational Performance, Manufacturing firms

Introduction

In today's world of rapid technological advancement and business world dynamism, it is not only the most fit organizations that survive, but also those with a high degree of adaptability. The world system is evolving quickly. The business world has been overtaken by new developments, and organization competition is rising. In order to thrive and survive, one must anticipate, plan for, adapt to, and respond to progressive changes and automatic disruptions in turbulent and disastrous situations. Therefore, strategic agility is required. Strategic agility in organizations helps them recover from shocks and get ready for changes. Organizations are currently subjected to constant change on a larger scale. The necessity of maintaining a competitive edge has grown as a result of the impact of numerous factors, including technology, innovation, industry trends, and heightened competition (Adamik, Nowicki, and Szymanska, 2018).

The ability of an organization to recognize and respond to changes in the business environment is known as strategic agility. Tallon and Pinsonneault (2011) define it as a company's capacity to quickly react to changes in the business environment, adjust to them, and take action to manage uncertainty. Strategic agility, according to Kumkale (2016), is a tool for giving an organization a competitive edge. It is the capacity to affect factors that

affect the market, like competition, sustainability, and technology. One must adapt to the dynamics of the industry in order to survive. It is possible to summarize these hypotheses by saying that strategic agility is a chance to establish and maintain a competitive advantage.

Core competence, strategic sensitivity, flexibility, strategic leadership, accessibility, strategic insight, internal response orientation, external response orientation, human resource capability, and information technology capability are the metrics Akhigbe (2019) lists for measuring strategic agility. Nonetheless, the focus of this research is on the flexibility and strategic leadership aspects of strategic agility. Managers that practice strategic leadership assist team members and the organization by applying their strategic vision and innovative problem-solving abilities. The ability to adapt an organization's supply chain strategies and practices to the extent required to implement its plan is known as flexibility. An essential indicator of agility, organizational flexibility helps businesses adapt to the rapid changes in the global environment and technology. The ability of the organization to obtain fresh perspectives, offer innovative solutions, and modify its procedures and policies is necessary for the strategy's effective execution. The notion of flexibility was first proposed by Atkinson (2016), who asserts that all expanding organizations need different kinds of operational and structural flexibility in order to better compete and adjust to shifting market conditions.

Performance is the ability of an organization to use its resources effectively and efficiently in order to accomplish its objectives (Al Karim, 2019). The objectives of an organization differ based on why they were founded. Businesses have three main goals, just like manufacturing companies: profit, growth, and survival. Organizational performance includes setting objectives, monitoring progress toward those objectives, and making the required modifications to meet those objectives more successfully and economically (Adubasim, Unaam, and Ejo-Orusa, 2018). The gap between an organization's intended outputs (or goals and objectives) and actual outputs or results is known as organizational performance. Organizational performance is associated with the productivity and efficacy of the company. In relation to the phenomenon being studied, it is a contextual idea (Adubasim and Odunayo, 2019). Based on these assumptions, the study aims to evaluate the impact of organizational strategic agility on the overall performance of a subset of Nigerian manufacturing firms.

Improving business performance is a constant challenge for organizations worldwide. A major challenge for most business managers in the twenty-first century is maintaining targeted business performance in the face of open market competition and globalization. Companies across various global industries have encountered inconsistent performance, appearing unsure of how to respond to policies that are flexible, as well as inconsistent performance stemming from difficulties in the domestic and global business environment.

While the issue of strategic leadership and flexibility has always been ignored, the poor performance of Nigerian manufacturing firms has been attributed to problems with inadequate physical infrastructure, high taxes from various government agencies, and poor power supplies and diesel costs. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, not many studies have examined inadequate strategic leadership and flexibility as a significant obstacle to the declining performance of manufacturing firms. Of the few studies that have looked at strategic agility, none have been carried out in south-south Nigerian manufacturing firms. Sadly, it is frequently observed that the majority

of manufacturing companies in southern Nigeria find it difficult to adjust to shifting consumer tastes, new technological advancements, and other market trends because they lack strategic agility.

Furthermore, most Nigerian manufacturing companies lack strategic leadership, which results in inefficient operations that are not tailored to changing market conditions. Their inability to effectively manage risk can occasionally result in unforeseen disruptions to their production processes, supply chain, or other operational areas. Furthermore, these manufacturing companies' lack of flexibility has caused them to make bad choices that are out of step with their long-term objectives or the shifting dynamics of the market. These have resulted in lost opportunities, decreased profitability, increased expenses, decreased productivity, diminished market share, and diminished competitive advantage. It is against this backdrop that this study was designed to examine the effect of strategic agility on the performance of selected manufacturing firms in South South region of Nigeria.

Objective of the Study

The general objective of the study was to examine the influence of strategic agility on Organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-south Nigeria. The specific objectives are to:

i. examine the effect of strategic leadership on Organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria;

ii. ascertain the effect of flexibility on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following questions were formulated in order to aid in conducting the study:

i. What is the effect of strategic leadership on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South South Nigeria? ii. What is the influence of flexibility on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South South Nigeria?

Hypotheses of the Study

Ho_1: Strategic leadership does not have significant effect on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South South Nigeria

Ho_2: Flexibility does not have significant influence on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South South Nigeria

Literature Review Concept of Strategic Agility

Over time, an agile organization has come to be recognized as one that is quick to adapt to changes, recognizes opportunities, and steers clear of serious collisions in a setting that is becoming faster by the day. Human resources broaden job scopes, eliminate job layers, and increase agility uses and practices. To function admirably in chaotic settings, any organization must develop resilience and agility (Peterson, Day, and Mannix, 2015). The agility changemanagement strategy focuses on being adaptable, removing obstacles of all kinds that impede the flow of people, work, resources, and information, and ensuring that the plan is implemented quickly and universally. (Eishardt and Brown, 2017). The ability of a company to grow, modernize, apply dynamic, adaptable, and lively capabilities, shift swiftly, and prosper in a fastpaced, unpredictable, and turbulent environment is known as agility.

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

According to Tallon and Pinsonneault (2011), agility is the organizational capacity to recognize and respond quickly, nimbly, and wealthyly to external opportunities and threats. Agility, according to Nadkarni and Narayanan (2017), is the capacity to change quickly and consciously; this change entails quick adjustments to investment plans, asset deployment, and strategic actions. As a deliberate strategy to gain a competitive advantage, agility is defined as defined, efficient distinctions in a firm's outputs, structures, or processes that are identified, planned, and executed (Tallon and Pinsonneault, 2011). Organizational agility is a company's ability to detect changes in its environment and adapt to them by consciously altering the amount and pace at which it produces variety in comparison to its rivals.

Strategic Agility (SA) is defined by TabeKhoshnood and Nematizadeh (2017) as a concept consisting of two components; responsiveness and knowledge management. They further interpret strategic agility as the ability of an organisation to detect changes through the opportunities and threats existing in the business environment, and to give rapid response through the recombination of resources, processes and strategies. Extensive review of the SA literature shows that an agile organisation can be successful in competitive environment through the abilities of responsiveness, competence, flexibility and speed so that it achieves competitive advantage in the market (Oyedijo, 2012). Doz and Kosonen (2008) considered SA to be a means by which organisations transform, reinvent themselves, adapt, and ultimately survive. They see SA as the capacity of a firm to continuously adjust and adapt its strategic direction in a core business in order to create value for the firm. Sampath (2015) considered SA to be about being adaptive to changes in the business context, spotting opportunities, threats and risks, and launching new strategic initiatives rapidly and repeatedly; while Teece, Peteraf and Leih (2016) referred to SA as the capacity of an organisation to efficiently and effectively redeploy and redirect its resources to value creating and value protecting (and capturing) higher-yield activities as internal and external circumstances warrant.

Strategic Leadership

The concept of leadership, which has been prefixed with the word "strategic," is well-liked in both general management and strategy literature. Referring to the body of existing literature demonstrates the diversity of definitions for leadership. It is regarded as the process by which one person persuades another to accomplish a shared objective (Northouse, 2010). According to Weihrich, Cannice, and Koontz (2013), leadership is the process of fostering an appropriate environment and motivating people to work tirelessly toward achieving the goals and/or objectives of the organization. Another way to think of leadership is as the process by which a person develops a vision and not only persuades others to share it but also organizes and inspires them to work together to accomplish the goals that the organization has set. Similarly, strategy with its root words in Greek “strategos or strategia” meaning art of the general is closely associated with military establishment as reflected in the Chinese general, Sun Tzu’s Art of War as far back as 500BCE (Kazmi, 2022; Thompson and Strickland, 2013; Grant, 2008; Haycock, Cheadle and Bluestone, 2012, David, 2013). Strategy has no exact meaning as it means different things to different people and it is sometimes confused with tactics (Kazmi, 2002). The earliest definition of strategy by Chadler (1962) cited in (Kazmi, 2002; Athapaththu, 2016) has to do with stating the long run goals and objectives, specifying the courses of action to be taken and allocation of the requisite resources to attain the set goals. In specific terms, strategy can be defined as “how to” set about any worthwhile endeavor.

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

Organisational Flexibility

Organizational flexibility, a crucial component of agility, helps an organization adapt to the rapid changes in the global environment and technology. It is the capacity of an organization to receive new ideas, suggest innovative solutions, and modify its operations and policies in order to successfully carry out its strategy. The term "flexibility" was first used by Atkinson (2016), who asserts that any expanding organization needs a variety of operational and structural flexibility to better compete in a changing market. There are three categories of organizational flexibility, according to Atkinson (2016): financial, numerical, and functional flexibility. The employee can be multiskilled, perform various tasks and functions, and be assigned any work at any time thanks to the functional flexibility. Numerical flexibility deals with the ability to increase or decrease the staff strength as situation demands, while financial flexibility involves payments based on merits. The flexibility of an organisation increases its value. Volberda (2013) suggest speed and variety as the criteria for organisational flexibility, spends addresses the time taking foe an organisation to respond to issues while variety addresses the quality and numbers of options available to the organisation for effective response to change.

Concept of organisational Performance

Organizational performance, according to Cascio (2014), is the extent to which the work mission is attained as determined by the work outcome, intangible assets, customer link, and quality services. Organizational performance, according to Kaplan and Norton (2001), is the ability of the organization to use its physical and human resources to achieve its objectives in an effective and efficient manner. This definition gives organizations the rationale for basing employee workbased performance evaluations on objective performance criteria. This is beneficial for both creating strategic plans for the organization's future performance and assessing the accomplishment of the organization's goals (Ittner and Larcker, 2012). Although many studies have found that different companies in different countries tend to emphasize on different objectives, literature suggests financial profitability and growth to be the most common measures of Organisational performance. Conversely, researchers have argued that no one definition is inherently superior to another and the definition that a researcher adopts should be based on the disciplinary framework adopted for the study (Cameron and Whetten, 2013).

The concept of performance lends itself to an almost infinite variety of definitions, many of which relate to specific contexts or functional perspectives. Anthony (2014) gave a general definition and well-crafted definition of performance, sharing the concept of two primary components, efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency refers to performance in terms of inputs and outputs so that the resulting higher volume for a given amount of inputs, means greater efficiency. Effectiveness refers to the performance by the degree to which planned outcomes are achieved (for example: objective to avoid interruptions of supply over a period of time can be regarded as an efficient outcome).

Strategic Agility and Firm Performance

According to Weber and Tarba (2014), strategic agility gives an organization the capacity to continuously, suitably, and promptly adapt to its strategic direction in order to achieve overall firm performance. Adopting strategic agility in the business environment of the twenty-first century will improve ongoing performance and

sufficient organization adjustment to the dynamic business environment and adapt in due course (Ofoegbu and Akanbi, 2012). An organization's ability to adapt strategically to its partners, suppliers, customers, rivals, and government policies determines how well it performs (Amniattalab and Ansari, 2016). Strategic agility was conceptualized by Rohrbeck and Kum (2018) as a potent predictor to help steer clear of the detrimental effects of changes in the business environment and to be ready for future developments so that one can outperform rivals and achieve greater profitability. Studies have emphasized that strategic agility enhance operational productivity, product reliability, quality of service and speed and operational performance (Al-Romeedy, 2019). Most literatures on the link between strategic agility and firm performance in different industries have shown that strategic agility practices by organisations significantly improve firm competitive advantage and overall performance.

Lee (2004) highlighted that firms ought to be agile and be able to sense and respond to market changes quickly and smoothly to maintain and improve their operational performance. Firms that fail to be agile might find themselves losing market share and competitive advantage due to a lapse in their operational performances. Organisations have accepted the fact that turbulence in the marketplace is uncontrollable and unpredictable, limiting firms‟ ability to respond effectively in a pre-planned manner. Sambamurthy, Bharadwaj and Grover (2010) highlighted that there is increasing recognition that agility is an imperative for success of contemporary firms as they face intense rivalry, globalization, and time-to-market pressures. Through Organisational agility the firm is able operations with speed and surprise, without disrupting enhanced operational performance. Agile firms are resilient to shocks and upheavals in their business environments, adaptive to emerging opportunities, and entrepreneurial in creating new business models to ensure enhanced operational performance (Bharadwaj and Sambamurthy, 2012).

Sambamurthy, Bharadwaj and Grover (2010) argue that information technology (IT) management capabilities provide a platform for firms to develop the appropriate digitized processes and knowledge systems that enhance their agility and therefore ensure their operational performances are increased. Weill and Vitale (2012) indicates that information technologies provide superior information management capabilities, analytical decision support, and enhanced communication. Organisations are able to utilize information technologies in creating new business models for enhanced performance. A strategic alliance is also an agility strategy which companies use to achieve operational performance; they are based on cooperation between companies. Through strategic alliances, companies can improve their competitive positioning, gain entry to new markets, supplement critical skills, and share the risk and cost of major development projects and thus enhance their operational performance. Also, organisation employ HRM practices as an agility strategy seeking to employ, train and motivate it employees to ensure it them and thus ensure enhanced operational performances.

Resource-Based View (RBV)

Resource Based View Theory by M. Barney in 1991. The theory holds that competitive advantage stems from a firm’s unique resources that are valuable, rare, and inimitable. Firm resources include both assets and capabilities. Assets are observable and can be valued, such as spatial preemption, brand equity, and patents. In contrast, capabilities are not observable and difficult to quantify; they are the glue that brings the assets together and

deploys them advantageously (Makadok, 2001). Because capabilities are deeply embedded in organisational routines, they are idiosyncratic and difficult to imitate or duplicate, which makes them the most likely sources of competitive advantage (Day, 1994). According to RBV capability can transform firm assets into superior performance (Hult, Ketchen and Slater, 2005; Zhou, Yim and Tse, 2005). Therefore, in relation to this study, these specific capabilities are at the center stage in determining how an organisation responds to changes in the environment in which it operates. In this study, the capabilities are seen in form of alertness, flexibility, accessibility and strategic insight. Further, capabilities touches on the intricate aptitude for the firm to offer high quality services to match customer needs and expectations. This to a great extent would enhance operational performance of the firm.

The theory paraphrased stipulates that, for a firm to excel in its area of operation with competition from other firms, its resources must have competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Barney noted that such resources should have some characteristics, denoted as VRIN. This means the resources should be value adding, rare, in-imitable and non-substitutable by competitors. However, Danny (2003) countered Barney theory and asserted that competitive advantage does not depend so much on resources but on intangible assets as skills, processes or assets which a firm cannot cost. Gomes et al., (2011) had also noted such assets were less used as measures of maintenance performance. This competitive advantage is not limited to specific innovative offerings but also arises from a firm's history of innovation activity, which "culminates in a uniquely valuable system of strategic attributes" (Roberts and Amit 2003). If it is difficult for a competitor to imitate a specific bundle of capabilities, which are themselves valuable, then a firm has a competitive advantage.

Empirical Review

Lengnick-Hall and Beck (2019) conducted a study to give details why firms' resilience capacity can be regarded as a predictor to strategic agility, and also as moderator of the connection involving a firm's dynamic actions and performance subsequently. Survey research design was adopted. Population of the study consisted of all employees of the listed firms in Karach Stock exchange. Data collected was analyzed using multiple regression statistical tool with the help of SPSS version 22. As findings, it was asserted that resilience capacity provides the basis for restoration after a severe shock and can offer an opportunity for an organisation to undergo a positive transformation as a result of overcoming an exceptionally challenging experience. As recommendation, since strategic agility facilitates a firm to introduce and apply nimble, flexible, and energetic competitive moves, it should be made acceptable to respond to absolutely fluctuations imposed by numerous variables. Also, shifts should be introduced in order to create innovative realities in marketplace. The present study is conducted in manufacturing firms while this one was conducted in the stock exchange.

Oyedijo (2019) conducted a study to examine the correlation between strategic agility and competitive performance in telecommunication industry in Nigeria. A survey research design was adopted for the study. Population was made up of all the core staff in the telecommunication firms. Rating of respondents on the total strategic agility items were summed together and averaged as to get a strategic agility index for every participating organisation. Strategic agility data were gotten via questionnaire which was completed by staff in the Top Management Team of each firm using data on sales revenue, profit growth, financial strength, performance

stability, and operating efficiency. The results of the analysis indicated a noteworthy correlation between strategic agility and competitive performance. It was concluded that strategic agility impacts the competitive performance of telecom firms in Nigeria. As recommendation, for telecom firms to perform maximally, strategic agility should be included in their policy statement. This study was conducted in telecom firms while the current study is conducted in manufacturing firms.

Ahiazu and Eketu (2018) carried out a study to investigate empirically, the association between product innovation and firm's resilience in selected Public Universities within southsouth of Nigeria. The work studied the relationship concerning product innovation and three various dimensions of firm's resilience which are – keystone vulnerability, situation awareness, and adaptive capacity. Survey research design was adopted for the study. Population was made up of academic staff from public universities. Data for the study was from primary source in which questionnaire was the instrument for data collection. The Spearman rank order correlation statistical tool was used to analyze the data collected. Finding revealed a noteworthy association between product innovation and organisational resilience. It was concluded that innovation in product meaningfully influences the awareness, vulnerability and adaptive capacity of the studied institutions. This study considered other variables of agility and it was conducted in an educational sector while the current study is conducted in the manufacturing industry.

Ghorban-Bakhsh and Gholipour-Kanani (2018) conducted a research to investigate the influence of strategic flexibility on creativity among managers and employees of a cultural center of education (Ghalamchi). The study employed Survey research design. The statistics society has 212 members, all of them are Ghalamchi Institute administrators. The Morgan table was utilized to sample 136 persons, and a simple sampling approach was applied. Questionnaires were used to gather data. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the questionnaire's reliability. Its rating is 0/96, indicating that the questionnaire is very reliable. The data was analyzed with the help of linear regression. The result showed that strategic flexibility has a strong influence on creativity among managers and employees of a cultural center of education. Conclusively, strategic flexibility has favorable and substantial influence on knowledge management and Organisational innovation. As recommendation, education administrators should be flexible in their dealings as this will increase their creativity. This study considered only one dimension of strategic agility while the current study considered more than one dimension of agility.

Methodology

The survey research design is use in this study. The choice of this design was influenced by the nature of the research problem. The target population for this study was three hundred and nineteen (319). This population size comprises all senior, middle and intermediate management staff of selected quoted manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. These firms were selected based on proximity and are quoted by the Nigerian Stock Exchange as Breweries in Nigeria. The distribution of the population is shown below:

Table 1: Population Distribution Table

Respondents	No of staff
Champion Breweries Plc. Uyo	88

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

Nigeria Bottling Company Port Harcourt	64
International Breweries plc Port Harcourt	74
Nestle Nigeria plc, Port Harcourt	93
Total	319

Source: Human Resource Departments of Organisations under Study (2024).

Taro Yamani's formula was used to determine a sample size of 177 respondent from the selected Manufacturing firms in Akwa Ibom State and Rivers State.

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

N = population n = sample size e = error term

From the formula above, the sample size is given as:

n = 319/ 1+319 (0.05)2
n = 319/ 1+319 (0.0025)
n = 319/ 1+0.7975)
n = 319/1.7975 = 177
n = 177

A sample size of 177 respondents was used for this study

Proportionate sampling technique was adopted for the study. For copies of questionnaire to be proportionally allotted to different cadre of employees in the study organisation, Bowley's formula for proportionate representation was used which as follows:

$nh = \frac{nNH}{N}$

= sample size

Where: n = population of a strata

NH = population

N

Substituting;

Champion Breweries Plc. Uyo

$= \frac{88 \times 177}{319} = 49$

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

Nigeria Bottling Company Port Harcourt

$$= \frac{64 \times 177}{319} = 36$$

International Breweries plc Port Harcourt

$$= \frac{74 \times 177}{319} = 41$$

Nestle Nigeria plc, Port Harcourt

$$= \frac{93 \times 177}{319} = 51$$

Table 2: Sample Distribution Table

Respondents	No of staff
Champion Breweries Plc. Uyo	49
Nigeria Bottling Company Port Harcourt	36
International Breweries plc Port Harcourt	41
Nestle Nigeria plc, Port Harcourt	51
Total	**177**

Source: Researcher's Computation, (2024).

Data for this research were obtained from primary. The primary source comprises relevant information to this study that were obtained through the use of structured copies of questionnaire. The questionnaire was Likert scale rating ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This study utilized descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographic part of the questionnaire. Simple Linear Regression in which SPSS package of version 25 was used in analyzing the data in order to ascertain the effect of the identified variables. **Specification of Model**

Simple linear regression analysis was used to test the influence using the Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS version 25).

Model Specification for Objective One

$Y = \beta 0 + \beta^1 X1 + \varepsilon$ …….. (1)

Whereby Y = dependent variable (Organizational Performance), β_0 = Beta Coefficient X_1= , Strategic leadership $\beta 1$, = coefficients of determination ε = error term.

[1] 1. Champion Breweries Plc. Uyo 49 41 8 84.0

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

Model Specification for Objective Two

$Y = \beta 0 + \beta 2X2 + \varepsilon$ …….. (2)

Whereby Y = dependent variable (Organizational Performance), β_0 = Beta Coefficient X_1= , Flexiblity

β1, = coefficients of determination ε = error term.

Data Presentation

This section is basically designed to present, analyzed and interpret the primary data obtained via the questionnaire which was purposively administered to the respondents in media house. These are shown in the table below:

Table 3: Copies of Questionnaire Administered and the Response Rate

S/N	Copies of questionnaire (%) distributed	Copies of Copies retrieved	of Percentage Not retrieved	questionnaire useable	questionnaire
2.	Nigeria Bottling Company Port Harcourt	36	32	4	89.0
3.	International Breweries plc Harcourt Port	41	36	5	88.0
4.	Nestle Nigeria Port plc, Harcourt	51	41	10	80.0
	Total	**177**	**150**	**27**	**85.0**

Source: Compiled from questionnaire response, (2024).

From table 3, Out of the 177 copies of the questionnaire that were sent, 150 had been correctly filled out and returned. This makes up 85.0% of the total copies of the questionnaire and was determined to be useful. 27 copies of the questionnaire were returned incompletely filled, so they were rejected, despite the researcher's best attempts to assure adequate and accurate completion of the questionnaire by self-administering.

Table 4: Age distribution of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-25YEARS	12	8.0	8.0	8.0
	26-30YEARS	25	16.7	16.7	24.7
	31-35YEARS	57	38.0	38.0	62.7
	36-40YEARS	25	16.7	16.7	79.4
	41 AND ABOVE 31 YEARS	31	20.6	20.6	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

Source: Fieldwork (2024)

From table 4, 12 respondents representing 8% were between 20 – 25 years of age, 25 respondents representing 16.7% were between 26 -30 years of age. Those between 31 – 35 years were 57 representing 38.0%. Those between 36 – 40 years were 25 representing 16.7% and those above 41 years of age were 31 representing 20.6% of the respondents. The above analysis shows that the respondents were mature enough to understand the subject matter and respond accordingly.

Table 5: Respondents' years of service in the organisation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-5years	21	14.0 49.3	14.0 49.3	14.0 63.3
	6-10years	74			
	11-15years	55	36.7	36.7	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Fieldwork (2024)

From table 5, 21 respondents representing 14.0% of the respondents have spent between 1 - 5 years working in the organisation, 74 representing 69.3% respondents have spent between 6 - 10 years, and 55 representing 36.7% respondents have spent between 11-15 years. The analysis shows that the respondents have spent some reasonable years working in the organisation to understand the intricacies and factors affecting the organisation. **Table 6: Percentage analysis of Responses on Strategic Leadership**

Strategic Leadership	**Extent of Agreement**					
	SA	A	UD	SD	D	Total
We make well-informed decisions based on data, experience, and an understanding of the organisation's capabilities and limitations.	66 (44%)	61 (41%)	2 (1%)	12 (8%)	9 (6%)	150 (100%)
We delegate authority and responsibility to their team members, empowering them to contribute to the organisation's success.	57 (38%)	66 (44%)	6 (4%)	11 (7%)	10 (7%)	150 (100%)
We envision and execute a long-term plan that guides an organisation or a team toward its goals and objectives.	62 (41%)	65 (43%)	2 (1%)	9 (6%)	12 (8%)	150 (100%)
We have a clear and inspiring vision of the future	66 (44%)	57 (38%)	6 (4%)	11 (7%)	10 (7%)	150 (100%)

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

Source: Field Survey (2024)

Table 6 shows that 66 respondents representing 44% strongly agreed, 61 respondents representing 41% agreed, 2 respondents representing 1% were undecided, 12 respondents representing 8% strongly disagreed and 9 respondents representing 6% disagree that they make well-informed decisions based on data, experience, and an understanding of the organisation's capabilities and limitations. Also, 57 respondents representing 38% strongly agreed, 66 representing 44% agreed, 6 respondents representing 4% were undecided, 11 respondents representing 7% strongly disagreed, and 10 representing 7% agreed that they delegate authority and responsibility to their team members, empowering them to contribute to the organisation's success. Equally, shows that 62 respondents representing 41% strongly agreed, 65 respondents representing 43% agreed, 2 respondents representing 1% were undecided, 9 respondents representing 6% strongly disagreed, 12 respondents representing 8% disagreed that they envision and execute a long-term plan that guides an organisation or a team toward its goals and objectives. Moreso, shows that 57 respondents representing 38% strongly agreed, 66 representing 44% agreed, 6 respondents representing 4% were undecided, 11 respondents representing 7% strongly disagreed, and 10 representing 7% agreed that they have a clear and inspiring vision of the future.

Table 7: Percentage analysis of Responses on Flexibility Flexibility Extent of Agreement

	SA	A	UD	SD	D	Total
We respond quickly and effectively to changes in the market, customer demands, technological advancements	58 (39%)	67 (45%)	5 (3%)	11 (7%)	9 (6%)	150 (100%)
We generate alternative solutions, and see situations from different perspectives.	63 (42%)	62 (41%)	4 (3%)	12 (8%)	9 (6%)	150 (100%)
We integrate with other systems, support various applications, and be easily upgradable or scalable	52 (35%)	71 (47%)	8 (5%)	4 (3%)	15 (10%)	150 (100%)
We seize opportunities, and effectively navigate challenges.	66 (44%)	61 (41%)	2 (1%)	12 (8%)	9 (6%)	150 (100%)

Source: Field Survey (2024)

Table 7 shows that 58 respondents representing 39% strongly agreed, 67 respondents representing 45% agreed, 5 representing 3% were undecided, 11 respondents representing 7% strongly disagreed, 9 respondents representing 6% disagreed that we respond quickly and effectively to changes in the market, customer demands, technological advancements. Also, it shows that 63 respondents representing 42% strongly agreed, 62 respondents representing 41% agreed, 4 respondents representing 3% were undecided, 12 respondents representing 8% strongly disagreed, 9 respondents representing 6% disagreed that we generate alternative solutions, and see

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

situations from different perspectives. Equally, it was revealed that 52 respondents representing 35% strongly agreed, 71 respondents representing 47% agreed, 8 respondents representing 5% were undecided, 4 respondents representing 3% strongly disagreed, 15 respondents representing 10% disagreed that we integrate with other systems, support various applications, and be easily upgradable or scalable. Moreso, it shows that 66 respondents representing 44% strongly agreed, 61 respondents representing 41% agreed, 2 respondents representing 1% were undecided, 12 respondents representing 8% strongly disagreed and 9 respondents representing 6% disagreed that they were seize opportunities, and effectively navigate challenges.

Testing of Hypotheses

Ho_1: There is no significant effect of strategic leadership on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South South Nigeria.

Hi_1: There is significant effect of strategic leadership on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South South Nigeria

Table 8: Regression analysis strategic leadership and organisational performance

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.861[a]	.575	.571	.44520

a. Predictors: (Constant), strategic leadership

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.445	1	49.445	62.587	.000[b]
	Residual	50.576	149	.790		
	Total	100.021	150			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), strategic leadership

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.470	.089		6.430	.000
	strategic leadership	.666	. 021	.861	12.827	.000

a. Dependent Variable: organisational performance

The model summary in table 8 shows an R- value of 0.861. The result shows a positive influence of strategic leadership on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. The R square-

ISSN: 3064-8424

Business and Management Sciences Journal

Research Article

value of 0.571 shows that 57.1% variation in strategic leadership was accounted for by variations in organisational performance. The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model significantly predicts the dependents variable given the F- value of 62.587 and its corresponding P- value of 0.00. This implies that there is a positive influence of strategic leadership on organisational performance. Also, the B-coefficient of 0.666 implies that holding every other thing constant, the model predicts 0.666 units increase in strategic leadership given a unit increase in organisational performance.

Ho_2: There is no significant effect of flexibility on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria

Hi_2: There is significant effect of flexibility on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria

Table 9: Regression analysis showing result for flexibility on organisational performance Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.752[a]	.555	.551	.43222

a. Predictors: (Constant), flexibility

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.445	1	49.445	55.117	.000[b]
	Residual	50.576	149	.790		
	Total	100.021	150			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), flexibility

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.570	.089		5.130	.000
	flexibility	.766	. 021	.752	11.117	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational performance

The model summary in table 9 shows an R- value of 0.752. This result shows a positive effect of flexibility on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South South Nigeria. The R square- value of 0.551

shows that 55.1% variation in flexibility on organisational performance. The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model significantly predicts the dependents variable given the F- value of 55.117 and its corresponding P- value of 0.00. This implies that there is significant effect of flexibility on organisational performance. Also, the Bcoefficient of 0.766 implies that holding every other thing constant, the model predicts 0.766 unit increase in flexibility on organisational performance.

Discussion of Findings

Based on the first objective of the study which was to examine the effect of strategic leadership on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. The model summary shows an R- value of 0.861. The result shows a positive influence of strategic leadership on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. The R square- value of 0.571 shows that 57.1% variation in strategic leadership was accounted for by variations in organisational performance. This was in line with the work done by Tairas, Kadir, Muis and Mardiana (2016) investigated "the influence of strategic leadership and dynamic capabilities through entrepreneurship strategy and operational strategy in improving the competitive advantage of private universities in Jakarta, Indonesia. The results showed that strategic leadership had a positive and significant relationship with competitive advantage with respect to private universities in Jakarta. The relationship between strategic leadership and competitive advantage became inverse and negative when entrepreneurship strategy was introduced as moderating variable. And was contrary to the work of Semuel, Siagian and Octavia (2017) conducted a study into "the effect of leadership and innovation on differentiation strategy and company performance in Indonesia. The results showed that due to lack of empirical data support, leadership did not bear direct relationship with product differentiation. But leadership directly bore positive and significant relationship with corporate performance. In sum therefore, leadership only indirectly related to differentiation via innovation as intervening variable.

Based on the second objective of the study which was to examine the effect of flexibility on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. This result shows a positive effect of flexibility on organisational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. The R square-value of 0.551 shows that 55.1% variation in flexibility on organisational performance. The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model significantly predicts the dependents variable given the F- value of 55.117 and its corresponding P- value of 0.00. This implies that there is significant effect of flexibility on organisational performance. This study is in support of Ghorban-Bakhsh and Gholipour-Kanani (2018) conducted a research to investigate the influence of strategic flexibility on creativity among managers and employees of a cultural center of education (Ghalamchi). The result shows that strategic flexibility has a favorable and substantial influence on knowledge management and organisational innovation, according to the findings. Also, the link between strategic flexibility, performance, and other competencies was investigated by Voola and Muthaly (2017). The Resource Based View is used to suggest that strategic flexibility has a direct and indirect impact on performance via complete market orientation.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The ability of an organization to recognize changes in the form of opportunities and threats in the business environment and to react quickly by rearranging resources, procedures, and strategies is known as strategic agility. A thorough analysis of the research on strategic agility demonstrates that an agile organization can gain a competitive edge in the market by demonstrating leadership, adaptability, and speed in a competitive setting. Therefore, it is advised that management of particular manufacturing companies in southern Nigeria adopt strategic leadership, as this will enable their organizations to successfully navigate challenging and constantly evolving business environments. It is seen that strategic leadership involves anticipating, planning, and executing actions that align with the organisation's strategic goals, fostering innovation and adaptability, and engaging stakeholders to work collectively towards a shared vision. Equally, management of selected manufacturing firms in south-south should inculcate flexibility as one of their core operational policy if they are to thrive in a dynamic environment.

References

Adamik, A., Nowicki, M., and Szymanska, K. (2018). Openness to co-creation as a method of reducing the complexity of the environment and dynamizing companies' competitive advantage. *Management & Marketing – Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 13(2), 880896.

Adubasim E. I. and Odunayo O. A. (2019). The relationship between technological orientation and Organisational performance of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Journal of Management Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 14(7), 21-37

Adubasim, I. E., Unaam, A. O., and Ejo-Orusa, H. (2018). Knowledge transfer and Organisational performance of deposit money banks In Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research* (AJHSSR), 2(12), 90-98

Ahiauzu, L. U., & Eketu, A. C. (2015). Product innovation and organizational resilience in public universities in south-south Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7 (33): 37-46

Akhigbe A. Y. (2019). The effect of organisation agility on organisation performance: *International Review of Management and Business Research* 5(1): 49-56.

Al Karim, R. (2019). How Organizational Training Affects Employee Performance: A Case on Bangladesh Private Banking Sector. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Research*, 2 (4), 34-52

Al – Qudah, S. (2018). The Influence of Strategic Agility and Tackling competitive challenges toward improving performance among Jordanian pharmaceutical companies. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 8(5), 753 – 765

Athapaththu, H. K. S. H. (2016). An Overview of Strategic Management: An Analysisof the Concepts and the Importance of Strategic Management. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(2), 124

Atkinson, W. (2016). The Structure of Literary Taste: Class, Gender and Reading in the UK. *Cultural Sociology*, 10(2), 247-266.

Brown, S.L., and Eisenhardt, K.M. (1998). *Competing on the edge: Strategy as structured chaos*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Cascio, W. (2014). Leveraging employer branding, performance management and human resource development to enhance employee retention. *Human Resource Development International*, 17(2), 123-132

Doz, Y. L., and Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), pp. 370-382.

Ittner, E. & Larcker, M. (2012). *Organizational Culture: A Key to Financial Performance*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kaplan, R. S. and D.P. Norton (2001). *The Strategy-Focused Organization: How Balanced Scorecard Companies Thrive in the New Competitive Environment*, Boston: HBS Press

Kazmi, A. (2002). *Business Policy and Strategic Management. Second Edition*. New Delhi: Tata McGrawHill Publishing Company Limited Kumkale, İ. (2016). Organisation's Tool for Creating Competitive Advantage: Strategic Agility. *Balkan and Near Eastern Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3), pp. 118-124

Nadkarni, S., and Narayanan, V. K. (2017). Strategic schemas, strategic flexibility, and firm performance: The moderating role of industry clockspeed. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28: 243-270

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership theory and practice* (*6th edition*). Sage Publications Inc

Oyedijo, A. (2012). Strategic agility and competitive performance in the Nigerian telecommunication industry: An empirical investigation. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(3), 227-237.

Peteraf, M. and Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility: Risk, Uncertainty, and Strategy in the Innovation Economy. *California Management Review*, 58(4)

Peterson, R.S., Day, R.D., & Mannix, E.A. (eds.) (2003). *Leading and managing people in the dynamic organisation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rohrbeck, R. and Kum, M. (2018). Corporate Foresight Benchmarking Report 2018: How Leading Firms Build a Superior Position in Markets of the Future, *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 211221

Sambamurthy, V., Bharadwaj, A., and Grover, V. (2016). Shaping agility through digital options: Reconceptualizing the role of information technology in contemporary firms. *MIS quarterly*, pp. 237-263

Sampath, J. M. (2015). Exploring the significance of strategic agility in building sustainable competitive advantage for retail banks in India. Working Paper Series No.ST-1601.SVKM's *Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies, School of Business Management, deemed University*.

Tabe-Khoshnood, N. and Nematizadeh, S. (2017). Strategic agility and its impact on the competitive capabilities in Iranian private banks. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(2), 220 229.

Tallon, P. P., and Pinsonneault, A. (2011). Competing perspectives on the link between strategic information technology alignment and Organisational agility: insights from a mediation model. *MIS Quarterly*, pp. 463-486

Weber, Y. and Tarba, S. (2014). Strategic Agility: A State of the Art INTRODUCTION TO THE SPECIAL SECTION ON STRATEGIC AGILITY. *California Management Review*, 56(3), 5-12

Weill, P and Vitale, MR (2001) *Place to Space*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston