

THE ROLE OF STRATEGIC AGILITY IN PROMOTING ORGANIZATIONAL EXCELLENCE: A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYTICAL STUDY

Akram Salim Hasan Al-Janabi ^{*},
Alaa Abdulkareem Ghaleb Almado ^{**}, Hussam Ali Mhaibes ^{**},
Hakeem Hammood Flayyih ^{**}

^{*} Corresponding author, Department of Business Administration, Dijlah University College, Baghdad, Iraq
Contact details: Department of Business Administration, Dijlah University College, AlMasafi Street, 10022, Baghdad, Iraq
^{**} College of Administration and Economics, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq



Abstract

How to cite this paper: Al-Janabi, A. S. H., Almado, A. A. G., Mhaibes, H. A., & Flayyih H. H. (2024). The role of strategic agility in promoting organizational excellence: A descriptive analytical study. *Corporate & Business Strategy Review*, 5(2), 129–138.
<https://doi.org/10.22495/cbsrv5i2art11>

Copyright © 2024 The Authors

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN Online: 2708-4965
ISSN Print: 2708-9924

Received: 17.11.2023
Accepted: 24.04.2024

JEL Classification: M10, M12, M15, M19
DOI: 10.22495/cbsrv5i2art11

The study aims to build a model that revolves around the main question of the role of strategic agility (SA) in enhancing organizational excellence (OE). For the purpose of achieving OE and to determine the extent of interest and knowledge of managers at the Midwest Refineries Company (MRC) on the theoretical and practical implications, and on the performance foundations of these two vital variables with the aim of continuous improvement. A questionnaire was used and distributed to a random sample of 54 managers in this important energy production company. The study followed the descriptive analytical approach to answer the questions raised. The study model and dimensions were built according to reference models, most notably the models (Al-Jedaiah & Albdareen, 2020; Doz & Kosonen, 2010). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to perform the calculations coming up with the results and their statistical significance. The study reached important conclusions, most notably revealing the role, effectiveness and clear impact of SA in achieving OE for the purpose of strengthening and attributing it, and the company's ability to invest in the liquidity of vital resources, mobilize them, and reuse them efficiently and easily to accomplish their work and develop their products.

Keywords: Strategic Agility, Organizational Excellence, the Midwest Refineries Company

Authors' individual contribution: Conceptualization — A.S.H.A.-J. and A.A.G.A.; Methodology — A.S.H.A.-J. and A.A.G.A.; Formal Analysis — A.S.H.A.-J. and A.A.G.A.; Investigation — A.S.H.A.-J. and A.A.G.A.; Data Curation — A.S.H.A.-J. and A.A.G.A.; Writing — Original Draft — A.S.H.A.-J. and A.A.G.A.; Writing — Review & Editing — A.S.H.A.-J. and H.H.F.; Visualization — A.S.H.A.-J. and H.H.F.; Supervision — H.A.M.; Project Administration — A.S.H.A.-J. and H.H.F.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

The 21st-century's environmental challenges necessitated businesses to adapt, emphasizing

dynamism, flexibility, and responsiveness to meet market demands and exceed usual standards. Achieving superior performance requires organizational sobriety, empowering human

resources, fostering creativity, and utilizing advanced technologies. This integrated approach aimed at surpassing typical organizational norms, satisfying stakeholders, and prioritizing customer satisfaction (CS) through quality products/services, dynamic customer care, and post-sale services. However, many companies struggle to meet these objectives. Utilizing advanced technologies and effective communication channels is crucial for disseminating information, fostering expertise, and facilitating communication among employees, business units, and stakeholders. This facilitates strategic, sustainable competitiveness and organizational superiority (Shirvani & Iranban, 2013). However, achieving this requires strategic agility (SA) marked by sensitivity, agility, foresight, and adaptability, as well as resource flexibility (RF) for efficient resource utilization. This approach enables proactive decision-making, seizing opportunities, and managing risks effectively in a dynamic and flexible manner (Lungu, 2020; Mavengere, 2013). Apart from quick and situational decision-making by leadership, this study's significance lies in enhancing organizational excellence (OE), performance, product quality (PQ), and technology dissemination (TD) within the Midwest Refineries Company (MRC). The focus is on attaining high competitiveness and CS through flexible strategic approaches, emphasizing strategic sensitivity (SS), unified leadership, and resource liquidity (RL) via strategic agility. These dynamics are reflected in the superiority of MRC's products, their competitive edge, and the continuous improvement of performance to meet customer needs and expectations (Abdulzahra et al., 2023; Nehme et al., 2023). The importance and significance of the study are due to the focus on supporting and developing OE, improving performance and PQ, and disseminating modern technology in the MRC to highly competitive levels in order to achieve CS. This is achieved in flexible strategic contexts, especially through SS, the unity of the company's leadership, and the liquidity of its resources represented by strategic agility. Its effective dynamics are reflected in the superiority of MRC's products, its distinct competitiveness, and the dissemination of modern technologies that ensure continuous improvement of performance and meeting the needs and expectations of the customer. In light of this and its foundations and given the vital importance of SA in its dimensions and the great importance of OE in its dimensions according to this strategic direction, this study has directed in the basic problem as follows:

RQ1: What is the role of strategic agility in enhancing organizational excellence?

RQ2: To what extent are the managers of the Midwest Refineries Company concerned and aware of the content and importance of the two variables of the study, strategic agility in its dimensions, and organizational excellence in its dimensions?

RQ3: Is there a relationship between the two main variables, and the extent of the significant impact of the independent variable, strategic agility, on the responding variable, organizational excellence?

The study aims to uncover how SA supports OE and assess the managers' awareness of these variables' significance in enhancing performance.

Using SA dimensions from Doz and Kosonen (2010) and OE dimensions from Al-Jedaiah and Albdareen (2020) and Shirvani and Iranban (2013), the research employs a descriptive-analytical approach conducted in the MRC. The focus is on giant petroleum industrial complexes for oil refining and manufacturing across multiple locations with a total capacity of 360 thousand barrels per day, with particular emphasis on the Dora refinery in Baghdad. This refinery, a significant player in Iraq's energy sector, has a rich history in advanced oil, petrochemical, and fuel-related technologies. The study holds valuable scientific implications for strategic management, especially in understanding how SA impacts OE and its essential dimensions. Strategic and organizational directions related to business, performance improvement, quality, production excellence, investment opportunities, and facing emergency threats and potential environmental disturbances. It aimed to study and analyse the interrelationship and influence between the variables and dimensions of the research model in the MRC, as well as seeking to root the strategic contents and concepts of the two main research variables, especially in this company with conclusions presented methodology followed. The descriptive analytical approach was followed by employing a questionnaire distributed to a random sample of 54 managers at MRC in Baghdad, and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program was used for the purpose of extracting results and revealing the levels of relationship and influence between the two variables. It is an important contribution to narrowing and bridging the knowledge and performance gap between the strategic directions and the modern theoretical foundations of the research variables on the one hand, and the actual and performance events in MRC. The knowledge gap is represented in the theoretical contents that are embodied in the principles and foundations of the study's two main variables, the SA and OE, through flexibility of movement, SS, unity of leadership and fluidity of resources on the one hand, in exchange for achieving sustainable competitiveness within the framework of PQ, CS and improving performance in the MRC in Baghdad on the other hand. One of the most prominent conclusions reached by the study is the significant role of strategic agility in enhancing OE, and the close relationship between them. It revealed the clear impact of SA on OE and confirmed the effective role of the company's leadership and organizations in general in developing and improving performance in order to achieve excellence. It contributed to deepening knowledge and informing the company's managers and drew their attention to the role of SA, its implications, and its important role in improving performance and advancing OE.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 analyses the methodology. Section 4 presents the results. Section 5 discusses the results of the research, and Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The cognitive literature review encompasses various studies exploring the study variables, seeking

theoretical and methodological implications and significant conclusions. For instance, Doz and Kosonen (2010) addressed environmental challenges by altering business models to enhance organizational resilience. This involved developing three key capabilities — SS, RL, and flexibility — to counter environmental disturbances. The study analyzed companies like Nokia, Easy Group, HP, and Kone, evaluating their adaptations to emerging variables. This literature review helps identify the gap between theoretical approaches and practical applications in confronting environmental challenges. The study presented some proposals and concrete leadership measures that enable organizations to develop their capabilities and capabilities necessary to accelerate the transformation of models and processes for the purpose of achieving the necessary SA to face developments, challenges and emergencies, and to upgrade its business models to a high level of SA. Our study used the model of this study as a scale that included the dimensions of SA referred to Reed (2021). The environmental disturbances calm the relationship between the company's age and SA, and the age of the company and environmental disturbances calm the relationship between SA and the company's performance.

A study of Sari and Ahmad (2022) aimed to show the extent of the impact of entrepreneurial leadership on the SA and competitiveness of small and medium enterprises in Indonesia, and to examine SA as a mediating factor in the relationship of entrepreneurial leadership with government support for medium and small companies during the corona pandemic, using the descriptive analytical approach. The sample dealt with the senior owners in 190 companies. The study adopted the questionnaire as a data collection tool and the partial least squares (PLS) analysis method through the smart-PLS program. The paper came out with results, the most important of which is the possibility of enhancing the competitive capabilities of those companies through SA, and that entrepreneurial leadership and government support greatly affect the competitive capabilities of medium and small companies, considering SA as a mediating factor, and that there is a significant impact of the leaders' characteristics and behaviour on the SA and strategic capabilities of those companies. Kale et al. (2019) investigated the mediating role of SA in the relationship between absorptive capacity and company performance among Turkish residence institutions. The study used a descriptive-analytical methodology, surveying 190 valid questionnaires collected from a sample of Turkish residence companies. It concluded that post-acquisition has no effect on performance, while post-use directly impacts performance. Both acquisition and use dimensions positively affect SA, which, in turn, positively influences company performance. Given the unprecedented contemporary environmental changes, attention has shifted towards strategic agility and flexibility (Tarba et al., 2023). Managers are focusing on breaking limitations to achieve OE and superior performance by maximizing resource investment (Gupta et al., 2020). Organizations leverage mechanisms for OE and knowledge management models to achieve sustainable supply chain flexibility and coordination for innovative

performance dynamics (Mangla et al., 2020). Regarding OE, Aldalimy et al. (2019) aimed to demonstrate the role of strategic alignment, encompassing governance, infrastructure, partnership, and skills, in achieving OE through agility. They surveyed 120 directors from industrial organizations in northern Jordan using a quantitative approach, emphasizing the significance of training, organizational development, career development, and employment in achieving excellence. Similarly, Shirvani and Iranban (2013) investigated the impact of OE on workforce productivity in the Parsiyan oil field operations. Their case study involved 73 randomly selected employees, highlighting dimensions like leadership, strategy, employees, companies, resources, operations, and customers. Strategic competitiveness and leadership were identified as influential indicators for human force productivity. The literature review, particularly studies like Al-Jedaiah and Albdareen (2020), Doz and Kosonen (2010), contributed to enriching the theoretical framework. This study adopted standardized models and dimensions of SA and OE within its questionnaire, emphasizing their significance in contemporary strategic management to address environmental complexities for achieving high OE levels. The study proposes further exploration into these variables and is structured around two main hypotheses.

H1: There is a significant effect of strategic agility in its dimensions on organizational excellence in its dimensions.

A report from the Hague University (as cited in Rigby et al., 2015) highlighted that the existing production system lacked guarantees for performance improvement in the face of global competition in the 21st century. The report emphasized the necessity for a new production system based on SA to meet emerging competitive factors. SA, defined as adaptability, flexibility, and agility, allows organizations to interact with variables and adapt to environmental influences (Sherehiy et al., 2007). It plays a crucial role in enhancing organizational performance through innovation and information technology utilization (Ravichandran, 2018). SA enables companies to respond to market changes by strategically leveraging information technology (Lowry & Wilson, 2016) and making quick decisions to capitalize on opportunities and enhance performance. Additionally, it contributes to creating a sustainable competitive advantage by addressing market conditions, especially those related to new technologies and their challenges (Lungu, 2020). Studies emphasize the importance of SA in developing organizational strategy (Al-Taie & Mahibes, 2011; Pichel & Müller, 2021). The strategic goal of organizations is to enhance competitive advantage by adapting through agile processes and investing in time resources. After implementing the Deming wheel model in 1951, the Japanese administration achieved significant advancements in productivity and superiority over American industries. Subsequently, the adoption of the Ouchi-Z theory in 1981 by Japanese management influenced Western management, emphasizing strategic OE (Porter & Tanner, 2012). This evolution led to the concept of excellence, transitioning from


quality standards to a higher qualitative level, notably marked by the development of the Malcolm Baldrige Award in the late 1980s, which crystallized the first specific model for OE. The 1990s witnessed the introduction of other models like the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) Excellence Award (Breja et al., 2016), focusing on leadership, transformation, operational and strategic performance, and creating sustainable value (Barnawi, 2022). OE is characterized by high coordination among organizational elements, efficient operations, meeting customer and stakeholder expectations, and achieving distinguished outputs (Nenadál et al., 2018). Excellence depends on regulators who are required to sustain strategic success, and development, and achieve sustainable competitive advantage by providing guarantees to adapt to emergency changes while coping with and facing potential disruptions in the future (Mohammed & Al-Zeidi, 2022). OE also represents a vital new phase of the quality stages that was inaugurated by Japan and then followed by Western countries in the upgrading of organizations and their success in setting standards and programs that guarantee continuous improvement and the development of technologies and strategies that flow in this direction. Also, OE is a package of practices and innovations to reach high performance (Calvo-Mora et al., 2016). One of the most important requirements for building OE is focusing on the customer and managing operations in a consistent manner within the framework of continuous development of performance and operations. According to Harrington (2005) and Uygur and Sümerli (2013), excellence is a comprehensive approach to performance development based on five tools or elements: senior project management, operations management, change management, resource management, and knowledge and expertise management. OE is of crucial importance to the strategic success of organizations. It allows them and their stakeholders to achieve an advanced level of excellence and sustainable competitive advantage. Therefore, it has become necessary for organizations, especially their human resources and senior management, to follow the approach of SA and agility for the purpose of achieving OE, rapid adaptation, and keeping pace with changes (Goodstein et al., 1994). Achieving rapid industrialization and high performance involves integrating technologies with organizational structure, culture, and adaptability to dynamic variables (Ashrafi et al., 2005). SA aligns with 21st-century strategic directions, allowing rapid identification of opportunities and resource-building (Sambamurthy et al., 2003). SA emphasizes swift response, sensing environmental variables, and leveraging information technology systems to diagnose and promptly address requirements (Queiroz et al., 2018). It surpasses traditional strategic planning, showcasing rapid adaptability to environmental changes (Prange & Hennig, 2019). Interest in SA grows due to organizations' flexible and rapid movement, continuously adapting to add value and sustain competitive advantage (Mavengere, 2013; Junniet al., 2015). Moreover, SA facilitates the creation of innovative business models to add

value and thrive in the international business environment, emphasizing quality processes and outstanding performance (Tsourveloudis & Valavanis, 2002; Hlehel & Shalaka, 2022), also it is a criterion for responding to environmental variables in order to achieve high performance (Hagen et al., 2019; Harraf et al., 2015) defined it as the ability to direct and coordinate resources effectively and successfully. The importance of SA lies in being an important and effective tool in raising organizations' capabilities to deal with environmental challenges and variables, as it highlights its importance through the ability to diagnose and invest in opportunities through strategic environmental analysis (Sajdak, 2015).

3. METHODOLOGY

The analytical descriptive approach was used to complete the study, and a questionnaire was prepared for collecting information from the MRC, based on the models and dimensions that were indicated related to the independent variable SA according to Doz and Kosonen (2010) and the dependent OE according to Al-Jedaiah and Albdareen (2020) as well as Shirvani and Iranban (2013) (Table 1). Interviews were conducted with an intended sample of managers in the MRC, and 60 questionnaires were distributed for this purpose, from which 54 questionnaires were retrieved and were valid for statistical analysis, on which calculations were conducted by the SPSS to test the hypothesis and the relationship and influence, and stand on the results based on the analytical descriptive approach. The field study was conducted at MRC for the period from July 15 to August 15, 2023. One of the most important alternative methods that can be used is to study the case by conducting field follow-up, conducting interviews with managers, and reviewing some of the company's records. However, we preferred to distribute the questionnaire because of the sensitivity of the work and the situation of the petroleum company.

Table 1. Questionnaire scale: Variables and dimensions

<i>Independent variable x</i>	<i>Dimensions</i>		<i>Reference</i>
Strategic agility 	x1	Strategic sensitivity	Doz and Kosonen (2010)
	x2	Leadership unity	
	x3	Resources liquidity	
<i>Dependent variable y</i>	y1	Customer satisfaction	Al-Jedaiah and Albdareen (2020), Shirvani and Iranban (2013)
Organizational excellence	y2	Technology dissemination	
	y3	Product quality	
	y4	Competitiveness	

Source: Authors' calculation.

4. RESULTS

The following is a detailed explanation of the research sample response and its descriptive data related to the research variables.

4.1. The independent variable: Strategic agility

Table 2 presents the overall descriptive statistics concerning the primary independent variable *SA*. The standard deviation and coefficient of variation (C.v.), with values of 0.346 and 0.097 respectively, validate the research sample's level of interest in the *SA* within the organization. These findings indicate that the respondents' responses in this dimension lean towards agreement. This pattern is also evident in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the independent variable *strategic agility*

Variable	Std. dev.	Mean	C.v.
SA	0.346	3.563	0.097

Source: Authors' calculation

SA was measured in three dimensions (*SS*, leadership unity (*LU*), and *RF*). The response of the research sample is explained in detail as follows.

4.1.1. Strategic sensitivity

Table 3 pertains to the general descriptive statistics concerning the *SS* dimension. The table presents an arithmetic mean with α value of 3.664 out of 5. The standard deviation and coefficient of difference, recorded as 0.473 and 12.9 respectively, affirm the research sample's level of interest in the *SS* within the company. These findings indicate that the intensity of the sample's responses in this dimension leans towards agreement.

Table 3. Statistics for the strategic sensitivity

No.	Strategic sensitivity	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
1.	The company is reviewing its course and previous experience to develop plans.	3.468	0.785	0.226
2.	The company is keen to anticipate the needs of the market.	3.781	0.758	0.200
3.	The company is looking forward to launching new business models.	3.685	0.863	0.234
Total: Strategic sensitivity		3.664	0.473	0.129

Source: Authors' calculation.

When it comes to the research points, point 2 attained the highest arithmetic mean, standing at 3.781, placing it within the high category. The responses to this point also exhibited acceptable consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.758 and α coefficient of difference of 20.0. On the other hand, point 1 recorded the lowest arithmetic mean, amounting to 3.468, which still falls within the high category. The answers to this point also displayed acceptable consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.785 and α coefficient of variation of 22.6.

4.1.2. Leadership unity

Table 4 refers to the general descriptive statistics related to the *LU* dimension. The table reflects a

total arithmetic mean with a value of 3.735 out of 5, which refers to the agree option, which is a good value, with good consistency in the answers, and is confirmed by the value of the standard deviation and coefficient of variation, respectively 0.584 and 15.6. As for the research points, point 6 achieved the highest arithmetic mean of 4.053, i.e., within the high category, and with average harmony with the answers, as the standard deviation and the coefficient of difference reached 0.746 and 15.6, respectively. As for point 5, it achieved the lowest mean 3.468 within the moderate category, with acceptable consistency with the answers, as the standard deviation and the coefficient of variation were 0.856 and 24.6, respectively.

Table 4. The descriptive statistics of the total leadership unity

No.	Leadership unity	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
4.	Senior management encourages putting forward opinions and dialogue with employees.	3.685	0.746	0.202
5.	Senior management works in a team spirit with employees.	3.468	0.856	0.246
6.	The senior management clearly explains to the employees the mission of the organization and its future vision.	4.053	0.746	0.184
Total: Leadership unity		3.735	0.584	0.156

Source: Authors' calculation.

4.1.3. Resource liquidity

Table 5 provides the general descriptive statistics related to the *RL* dimension. The table presents an arithmetic mean with a value of 3.609 out of 5, indicating agreement as the predominant option, which is a positive result. The responses also exhibit good consistency, as evidenced by the standard deviation and coefficient of variation values, which are 0.538 and 14.9 respectively. Regarding the individual research points within this dimension,

point 9 achieved the highest arithmetic mean, reaching 3.685, categorizing it within the high category. The responses to this paragraph showed moderate consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.849 and α coefficient of difference of 23.0. In contrast, point 7 obtained the lowest mean, amounting to 3.569, placing it within the moderate category. Nevertheless, the responses to this point still demonstrated acceptable consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.863 and α coefficient of variation of 24.1.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of the resource liquidity

No.	Resource liquidity	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
7.	The company supervises, organizes and manages its various resources with ease and transparency.	3.569	0.863	0.241
8.	The company provides multiple and flexible business models for work and investment.	3.574	0.678	0.189
9.	The company supports communication and exchange of information between departments and units to develop performance.	3.685	0.849	0.230
Total: Resource liquidity		3.609	0.538	0.149

Source: Authors' calculation.

4.2. Dependent variable: Organizational excellence

Table 6 presents the general descriptive statistics related to the main respondent or dependent variable *OE*. The table displays a total arithmetic mean with α value of 3.785 out of 5, indicating that the respondents tend to select the "agree" option, which is a positive outcome. The responses also exhibit good consistency, as evidenced by the standard deviation and coefficient of difference values, which are 0.386 and 0.102 respectively. These findings confirm the research sample's level of interest in *OE* within the company, and overall, indicate that the respondents' responses in this dimension lean towards agreement.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics of the dependent variable *organizational excellence*

Variables	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
Organizational excellence	3.785	0.386	0.102

Source: Authors' calculation.

OE was measured across four dimensions (*CS*, *TD*, *PQ*, *competitiveness*), and the response of the research sample is explained in detail as follows.

4.2.1. Customer satisfaction

In terms of the individual research points within the *CS* dimension, point 11 achieved the highest arithmetic mean, reaching 3.864, categorizing it within the high category. The responses to this point showed moderate consistency, with α standard deviation of 0.753 and α coefficient of difference of 19.4. On the other hand, point 10 obtained the lowest mean, amounting to 3.542, placing it within the moderate category. The responses to this point still demonstrated acceptable consistency, with α standard deviation of 0.784 and α coefficient of variation of 22.1.

Table 7. Descriptive statistics of customer satisfaction

No.	Customer satisfaction	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
10.	Senior management constantly evaluates and learns about customer satisfaction.	3.542	0.784	0.221
11.	The company prepares rules and standards for measuring customer satisfaction.	3.864	0.753	0.194
12.	The company obtains accurate information about the market and the surrounding environment based on an advanced and always updated vital information base.	3.849	0.894	0.232
Total: Customer satisfaction		3.751	0.473	0.126

Source: Authors' calculation.

4.2.2. Technology dissemination

Table 8 provides the general descriptive statistics related to the *TD* dimension. The table displays an arithmetic mean with a value of 3.826 out of 5, indicating that respondents tend to select the "agree" option, which is a positive outcome. The responses also exhibit a high level of consistency, as supported by the low standard deviation and coefficient of variation values, which are 0.384 and 10.0 respectively.

Looking at the individual research points within this dimension, point 14 achieved the highest arithmetic mean, reaching 4.052, categorizing it within the high category. The responses to this point showed moderate consistency, with α standard deviation of 0.748 and α coefficient of difference of 18.4. In contrast, point 13 obtained the lowest mean, amounting to 3.574, still falling within the high category. The responses to this point demonstrated acceptable consistency, with α standard deviation of 0.895 and α coefficient of variation of 0.250.

Table 8. Descriptive statistics of the technology dissemination

No.	Technology dissemination	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
13.	The company is constantly keen to update the technology used in its units and production lines.	3.574	0.895	0.250
14.	The company works to develop its technologies and keep up with the technological development related to its business.	4.052	0.748	0.184
15.	The company continuously evaluates and evaluates its technological system.	3.853	0.784	0.203
Total: Technology dissemination		3.826	0.384	0.100

Source: Authors' calculation.

4.2.3. Product quality

Table 9 provides the general descriptive statistics related to the *PQ* dimension. The table shows an arithmetic mean with a value of 3.818 out of 5, indicating that respondents tend to select the “agree”

option, which is a positive outcome. The responses also exhibit little dispersion, as evidenced by the standard deviation and coefficient of variation values, which are 0.457 and 11.9 respectively. This suggests a relatively high level of agreement among the respondents in this dimension.

Table 9. Descriptive statistics for the product quality

No.	Product quality	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
16.	The company cares and measures the quality of its products and services provided to customers on a regular basis.	4.019	0.674	0.167
17.	Product quality improvement programs are linked to the organizational excellence policy and strategy in the organization.	3.747	0.674	0.179
18.	The company is keen to collect information related to its products and after-sales services.	3.689	0.848	0.229
Total: Product quality		3.818	0.457	0.119

Source: Authors' calculation.

Point 16 achieved the highest arithmetic mean of 4.019, placing it within the high category. The responses to this point showed average consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.674 and α coefficient of difference of 16.7. On the other hand, point 18 obtained the lowest mean, which was 3.689, categorizing it within the moderate category. The responses to this point exhibited acceptable consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.848 and α coefficient of difference of 22.9.

4.2.4. Competitiveness

Table 10 displays general descriptive statistics for the competitiveness dimension. It shows an arithmetic mean with a value of 3.803 out of 5, indicating that respondents tend to select the

“agree” option, which is a positive outcome. The responses also demonstrate good consistency, as supported by the standard deviation and coefficient of difference values, which are 0.584 and 15.3, respectively. In terms of the individual research points within this dimension, point 19 achieved the highest arithmetic mean, reaching 4.041, categorizing it within the high category. The responses to this point showed moderate consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.684 and α coefficient of difference of 16.9. On the other hand, point 20 obtained the lowest mean, which was 3.684, falling within the moderate category. The responses to this point still demonstrated acceptable consistency, with a standard deviation of 0.695 and α coefficient of difference of 18.8.

Table 10. Descriptive statistics for competitiveness

No.	Competitiveness	Mean	Std. dev.	C.v.
19.	The company measures its competitive advantage in the market on a regular basis.	4.041	0.684	0.169
20.	The organization evaluates and reviews its market share and customer attraction signals on an ongoing basis.	3.684	0.695	0.188
21.	The company seeks differentiation in its products and offers multiple varieties of them to the market.	3.684	0.895	0.242
Total: Competitiveness		3.803	0.584	0.153

Source: Authors' calculation.

4.2.5. Hypotheses of regression

In this subsection, the analysis aims to assess the extent of the influence of the independent variable *SA* on the dependent variable *OE* using simple linear regression. The effect of the main independent variable *SA* on the primary responding variable *OE* was found to be highly significant, with a p-value below the 0.01 significance level, as indicated by the calculated F-value of 52.257. This value significantly exceeds the tabular F-value, which was set at 7.06 for a significance level of 0.01. Additionally, the coefficient of determination R^2 was determined to be 0.39, indicating that the variable

SA explains 39% of the variance in *OE*. Furthermore, the value of the coefficient β was calculated as 0.639. This signifies that a one-unit change in the independent variable *SA* leads to a substantial change of 58.6% in the dependent variable *OE*. These results provide strong support for accepting *H1*. Therefore, the regression model can be summarized as follows:

$$OE = 1.479 + 0.639 SA.$$

The results of the impact of *SA* on *OE* can be summarized in the following Table 11.

Table 11. Results of the effect of SA on OE ($n = 54$)

Variable		Organizational excellence					
		α	β	F	t	Sign. level	R ²
SA	Strategic sensitivity	2.546	0.382	57.4**	6.463	0.000	30%
	Leadership unity	2.42	0.363	60.4**	6.646	0.000	41%
	Resource flexibility	2.68	0.363	30.6**	4.636	0.000	27%
Total: Strategic agility		1.47	0.639	52.2**	5.895	0.000	39%

Note: $F = 7.06$, sign. level = 0.01.

Source: Authors' calculation.

The above results in Table 11 allow the acceptance of the hypothesis *H1*, which states that there is a significant impact relationship of SA on OE. Especially since the t-test here is equal to 5.895, with a significance of 0.000, which is less than the level of significance of 0.01, and this means the proof and validity of the significant role of SA promote OE.

5. DISCUSSION

The results and indicators of the arithmetic mean, and standard deviations indicate the intensity of the sample's answers and their compatibility in the axis of SA, as well as its dimensions of SS, LU and RF, which confirms its importance and effectiveness in the movement of the company and its unified leadership and efficient use of resources with ease and high response to variables. The same situation in terms of the intensity of answers and compatibility with regard to OE and its dimensions of CS, TD, PQ and competitiveness, as it indicates the company's great keenness to spread modern technologies to achieve PQ with the aim of CS and access to a high level of strategic competitiveness, and this embodies the role. The actor of SA in promoting OE clearly indicates the building and crystallization of a sober and effective administrative model in this company for the close relationship, solid support and clear influence between SA and its dimensions on the one hand and OE on its dimensions on the other hand to develop performance, improve PQ, achieve CS and competitive advantage sustainable.

6. CONCLUSION

The study revealed a significant role of SA in promoting and assigning OE, and the close relationship between them, which confirms the importance of SA and its dynamic effectiveness, as well as the role and effectiveness of the company's leadership and organizations in general in improving business, develop performance and quality, achieve CS, and achieve OE. The SS, as shown by the context of the study, is a fundamental and vital pillar of the dynamic movement of the

organization and its active role. It establishes its capabilities to sense changes explore and diagnose opportunities and threats in order to improve PQ and performance and build a sustainable competitive advantage. The obvious impact of SA in OE means the large organization's ability to invest in the liquidity of vital resources, mobilize and redistribute them, and their high ability to use them easily and efficiently in the completion of their work and the development of their products. The study contributed to deepening the knowledge of the company's leadership and managers, informing them, and drawing their attention and interest in the role of the company SA, its rich dimensions and contents, and its great role in advancing the company's wheel and its effectiveness forward, developing its capabilities and its rapid response to environmental changes in order to avoid risks and threats, and then invest opportunities and achieve a high level of strategic competitiveness and OE. Achieving and confirming the role of SA and its tangible impact in upgrading the organization to a high level of OE in performance, work and competitive advantage, which allowed the development and construction of a studied management model that draws the close relationship between the two main variables and the dimensions of each for the purpose of improving performance and developing products, and with the aim of reaching OE. The study faced many obstacles and determinants, the most important of which are the expansion of the company's area, the expansion of its sites, the difficulty of distributing, collecting and retrieving the questionnaire, and the well-known routine administrative difficulties that impede communication with managers. Add to this the difficulties and obstacles of financing and the expenses of the various related activities and the movements of the researchers in distributing the questionnaire, completing the study, collecting its sources, reviewing it, and the requirements for its publication. This paper is of particular importance for future research as it is vitally relevant to the sharpness and distinction of performance and products and dealing with it from the perspective of agility, strategic sensitivity and resource fluidity.

REFERENCES

- Abdulzahra, A. N., Al-Shiblawi, G. A. K., Flayyih, H. H., Elaigwu, M., Abdulmalik, S. O., Talab, H. R., & Audu, F. (2023). Corporate governance towards sustainability performance quality: A case of listed firms in Malaysia. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, 8(4), Article 22882. <https://doi.org/10.55267/iadt.07.14051>
- Aldalimy, M. J. H., Al-Sharifi, A. K. H., & Bannay, D. F. (2019). Strategic alignment role in achieving the organizational excellence through organizational dexterity. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 54(6). <https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.54.6.41>

- Al-Jedaiah, M. N., & Albdareen, R. (2020). The effect of strategic human resources management (SHRM) on organizational excellence. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 18(4), 49-58. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.18\(4\).2020.05](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.18(4).2020.05)
- Al-Taie, A. H., & Mahibes, H. A. (2011). 360 degree reverse feedback/comparative analytical study for a sample of managers and heads of departments in the Central Electricity Department and the General Directorate of Water and Sewerage. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 17(63). <https://doi.org/10.33095/jeas.v17i63.989>
- Ashrafi, N., Xu, P., Sathasivam, M., Kuilboer, J.-P., Koelher, W., Heimann, D., & Waage, F. (2005). A framework for implementing business agility through knowledge management systems. In *Proceedings of the Seventh IEEE International Conference on E-Commerce Technology Workshops* (pp. 116-121). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CECW.2005.2>
- Barnawi, M. B. O. (2022). Organizational excellence models failure and success factors of organizational excellence and challenges mitigation. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 10(6), 2915-2938. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2022.106144>
- Breja, S. K., Banwet, D. K., & Iyer, K. C. (2016). Towards sustainable excellence: Strategic analysis of Deming Prize winning companies. *The TQM Journal*, 28(3). <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-09-2012-0070>
- Calvo-Mora, A., Navarro-García, A., Rey-Moreno, M., & Periañez-Cristobal, R. (2016). Excellence management practices, knowledge management and key business results in large organisations and SMEs: A multi-group analysis. *European Management Journal*, 34(6), 661-673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.06.005>
- Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 370-382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.006>
- Goodstein, J., Gautam, K., & Boeker, W. (1994). The effects of board size and diversity on strategic change. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(3), 241-250. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250150305>
- Gupta, S., Drave, V. A., Dwivedi, Y. K., Baabdullah, A. M., & Ismagilova, E. (2020). Achieving superior organizational performance via big data predictive analytics: A dynamic capability view. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 90, 581-592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.11.009>
- Hagen, B., Zucchella, A., & Ghauri, P. N. (2019). From fragile to agile: Marketing as a key driver of entrepreneurial internationalization. *International Marketing Review*, 36(2), 260-288. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-01-2018-0023>
- Harraf, A., Wanasika, I., Tate, K., & Talbott, K. (2015). Organizational agility. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 31(2), 675-686. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v31i2.9160>
- Harrington, H. J. (2005). The five pillars of organizational excellence. *Handbook of Business Strategy*, 6(1), 107-114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08944310510557116>
- Hlehel, M. S., & Shalaka, T. K. (2022). Environmental sensing and its role in achieving strategic agility analytical descriptive research in the Iraqi South Oil Company. *Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4, 34-44. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358293402_Environmental_sensing_and_its_role_in_achieving_s_strategic_agility_Analytical_descriptive_research_in_the_Iraqi_South_Oil_Company
- Junni, P., Sarala, R. M., Tarba, S. Y., & Weber, Y. (2015). The role of strategic agility in acquisitions. *British Journal of Management*, 26(4), 596-616. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12115>
- Kale, E., Aknar, A., & Başar, Ö. (2019). Absorptive capacity and firm performance: The mediating role of strategic agility. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 78, 276-283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.09.010>
- Lowry, P. B., & Wilson, D. (2016). Creating agile organizations through IT: The influence of internal IT service perceptions on IT service quality and IT agility. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 25(3), 211-226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2016.05.002>
- Lungu, M. F. (2020). The influence of strategic agility on firm performance. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence*, 14(1), 102-110. <https://doi.org/10.2478/picbe-2020-0011>
- Mangla, S. K., Kusi-Sarpong, S., Luthra, S., Bai, C., Jakhar, S. K., & Khan, S. A. (2020). Operational excellence for improving sustainable supply chain performance. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 162, Article 105025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105025>
- Mavengere, N. B. (2013). Information technology role in supply chain's strategic agility. *International Journal of Agile Systems and Management*, 6(1), 7-24. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJASM.2013.052209>
- Mohammed, R. M., & Al-Zeidi, N. J. A. (2022). Knowledge sharing and its role in organizational excellence. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, 12(2), 105-118. <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i02.006>
- Nazir, S., & Pinsonneault, A. (2012). IT and firm agility: An electronic integration perspective. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 13(3), 150-171. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/jais/vol13/iss3/2/#:~:text=DOI%3A%2010.17705/1jais.00288>
- Nehme, A. A., Hasan, A. M., Al-Janabi, A. S. H., Al-Shiblawi, G. A. K., Salman, M. D., Ayyed, H., Hasan, M. F., Al-Taie, A. H., Altaie, B., Ali, S. I., Zghair, N. G., Wahhab, R., Flayyih, H. H., Khudhair, M., Al-Saedi, A. H., Al-Ibraheemi, S. R. A. A., & Jawad, K. K. (2023). The impact of COVID-19 on football club stock integration and portfolio diversification. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología Del Ejercicio y El Deporte*, 18(5), 562-567. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34067.66086>
- Nenadál, J., Vykydal, D., & Waloszek, D. (2018). Organizational excellence: Approaches, models and their use at Czech organizations. *Quality Innovation Prosperity*, 22(2), 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.12776/qip.v22i2.1129>
- Overby, E., Bharadwaj, A., & Sambamurthy, V. (2006). Enterprise agility and the enabling role of information technology. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(2), 120-131. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000600>
- Pichel, K., & Müller, A. (2021). Strategility — A challenging alliance. In S. Pfeiffer, M. Nicklich, & S. Sauer (Eds.), *The agile imperative* (pp. 139-154). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73994-2_7
- Porter, L., & Tanner, S. (2003). *Assessing business excellence* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080493930>
- Prange, C., & Hennig, A. (2019). From strategic planning to strategic agility patterns. *Journal of Creating Value*, 5(2), 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394964319867778>

- Queiroz, M., Tallon, P. P., Sharma, R., & Coltman, T. (2018). The role of IT application orchestration capability in improving agility and performance. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 27(1), 4-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2017.10.002>
- Ravichandran, T. (2018). Exploring the relationships between IT competence, innovation capacity and organizational agility. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 27(1), 22-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2017.07.002>
- Reed, J. H. (2021). Strategic agility and the effects of firm age and environmental turbulence. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 14(2), 129-149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-07-2020-0178>
- Rigby, D. K., Berez, S., Caimi, G., & Noble, A. (2015). *Agile innovation*. Bain & Company. https://corporateagility.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/bain_brief_agile_innovation.pdf
- Sajdak, M. (2015). The compilation of operational and strategic agility for ensuring the highest efficiency of company operations. *Ekonomia i Zarządzanie*, 7(2). <https://bazawiedzy.ue.poznan.pl/info/article/UEP4b9e0dce12f14b658909878b526794b9/>
- Sambamurthy, V., Bharadwaj, A., & Grover, V. (2003). Shaping agility through digital options: Reconceptualizing the role of information technology in contemporary firms. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(2) 237-263. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036530>
- Sari, S. A., & Ahmad, N. H. (2022). Connecting the dots: Linking entrepreneurial leadership and strategic agility towards SME competitiveness. *Vision*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629221091658>
- Sharma, M., & Kodali, R. (2008). Development of a framework for manufacturing excellence. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 12(4), 50-66. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13683040810919962>
- Sherehiy, B., Karwowski, W., & Layer, J. K. (2007). A review of enterprise agility: Concepts, frameworks, and attributes. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 37(5), 445-460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2007.01.007>
- Shirvani, A., & Iranban, S. J. (2013). Organizational excellence performance and human force productivity promotion: A case study in South Zagros Oil and Gas Production Company, Iran. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 3010-3015. <https://european-science.com/eojnss/article/view/1734>
- Tarba, S. Y., Frynas, J. G., Liu, Y., Wood, G., Sarala, R. M., & Fainshmidt, S. (2023). Strategic agility in international business. *Journal of World Business*, 58(2), Article 101411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2022.101411>
- Tsourveloudis, N. C., & Valavanis, K. P. (2002). On the measurement of enterprise agility. *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic Systems*, 33, 329-342. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015096909316>
- Uygur, A., & Sümerli, S. (2013). EFQM excellence model. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(4), 980-993. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sevgi-Suemerli-Sariguel-3/publication/326040333_Efqm_model/links/6098f6c3299bf1ad8d8e2acb/Efqm-model.pdf
- Yildiz, T., & Aykanat, Z. (2021). The mediating role of organizational innovation on the impact of strategic agility on firm performance. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 17(4), 765-786. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WJEMSD-06-2020-0070>