



Board Management Process and Performance of Selected Manufacturing Firms in Delta State

ASHIWE, Rita Ifelunwa

Department of Business Administration, Delta State University, Abraka

ONWUSAH Chuks Emmanuel

Delta State University Business School, Asaba. Delta State University, Abraka

Date of Submission: 14-02-2026

Date of Acceptance: 27-02-2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined board management process and performance of selected manufacturing firms in Delta State. The objectives of the study were to examine the effect of board composition and structure, governance and compliance strategy planning and oversight, and board engagement and development on organisational performance. Four research questions and hypotheses were raised to guide the study. Questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection. Descriptive survey design was adopted with a population and sample size of 269 and 159 using Krejcie and Morgan Table for sample size determination. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis; the research questions were answered using mean, while the hypotheses were tested using multiple regressions at significant level of 0.05 in SPSS version 25. The findings showed that, there is a significant effect of board composition and structure on performance; there is a significant effect of governance and compliance on performance; there is a significant effect of strategic planning and oversight on performance; and there is a significant effect of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State. It was concluded that dynamics of board management process is essential for effective organisational performance. Board management process formalise strategic decision making process, aid enough diversity, aligned succession planning with the organization's long-term goals, and enable compliment among board members. The study recommended among others that board members should sustain enough diversity (skills, perspectives, experiences) to govern effectively and align succession planning with the organization's long-term goal

essential for effective organisational performance. Jielynn (2025) argues that good performing boards management are more likely to engage in enterprise risk review, board refreshment activities, and crisis management scenario planning. However, these high-performing boards are not made by accident. They come from a lot of effort in terms of getting the right people, creating the right processes, board composition, good governance, compliance, strategic planning, oversight, engagement, development, building the right dynamics and culture. Jielynn (2025) argues that board management process refers to the act of oversight and governance of an organization by its board of directors. This often involves setting strategic direction, upholding transparency and accountability, financial reporting, audit oversight, stakeholder engagement. and representing the interests of shareholders. Zhu, Wang and Bart (2016) postulate that board management process is a determinant of organizational performance. It improves the quality of decisions. A board with good elements of management process in its strategic role is more effective in its actions; which plays an important part in the organization's value creation; and board effectiveness positively influences organizational performance. Ernst and Young (2023) highlight the determining factors and their significant roles of well-managed boards in driving organizational performance to include: board composition, roles and responsibilities, board dynamics, board composition and structure, governance and compliance, strategic planning and oversight, and board engagement and development among others. From which the current study will focused on the effects of board composition and structure, governance and compliance, strategic planning and oversight, and board engagement and development on organisational performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

A high performing board is a determinant of organizational success. The significant part is the dynamics of board management process, which is

Board composition and structure is essential for effective governance, which need a dynamic mix of skills, expertise, and experience to effectively oversee organisation's activities (Sharon,



2025). Corporate governance and compliance are critical components in the management and administration of businesses (Akinsola, 2023). It is a framework of policies and guidelines that inform organization's conduct, decision-making and practice. It is built upon key principles such as: accountability, transparency, fairness and responsibility (Chen, 2023). Strategic planning and oversight means looking at board's current and future needs, considering the tenure of existing directors, and planning for smooth transitions (Sharon, 2025). Board engagement relates to the amount of attention directors pay to components of the strategy formation, ranging from the formulation to the implementation of strategy and its development is able training and acquisition of necessary skills for managerial purpose (Judge and Talaulicar, 2017).

Focusing on key elements of board management process, organisations can unlock benefits such as enhanced risk management, increased investor confidence, and sustainable profitability (Jielynne, 2025). Studies have considered that the board plays an important role in value creation for the organization, and board management process appears to be an antecedent of organizational performance (Crow and Lockhart, 2016; Watson and Ireland, 2021). More specifically, board management process contributes to the establishment of strong strategic foundation. As well as being conducive to reaching sales and profit goals through the close monitoring of strategy implementation, directors help develop better long-term strategies. The ability to adopt effective board management process help the organization to do better than its competitors (Liao, San & Tsang, 2021). By performing well in its control and service tasks, a board supports top management in anticipating threats to the organizational future and ensures the organization displays socially and environmentally responsible behavior (Federo and Saz-Carranza, 2018; Nekhili, Boukadhaba & Nagati, 2021). As a matter of fact, boards are taking into consideration a wide range of stakeholders, not just the shareholders but also customers, employees, and suppliers (Desender et al., 2020). Effective board management process translate into value creation for the organization, including an improvement in its financial and non-financial results (Shin and You, 2020).

A good management process is essential to organizational performance. Board of directors and top management adopt strategies management process that offers clear responsibilities and duties to everyone within organization, to fits overall goal

(Federo and Saz-Carranza, 2018). The board review internal and external issues and make corrective actions when necessary; defining the parameters to be measured and determine progress by measuring the actual results versus the plan. Board of directors also monitors internal and external issues which enable reaction to any substantial change in organization's environment. If they determine that the strategy is not moving toward organizational goal, they take corrective actions. Any organization's managements that are inactive will lack the above responsibilities which could cause the damage of a business. Thus the reason for this study which investigated board management process and performance of selected firms in Delta State.

Statement of the Problem

Boards with better dynamics and processes, as well as those that execute core activities more effectively, report stronger financial performance at the companies. Although it is challenging for a board to successfully manage all of its increasing duties, in those companies where board management are seen as a priority where dynamics and processes are actively nurtured, increases in performance.

There is no successful organization without good board management process. Board of directors and executive officers adhered to set of policies and guidelines to monitor and meet critical needs and organization's goal. Non adherence ruins business integrity, investment and projected profitability. This is why board members and executive officers have to strive, to growth and develop their organization using the best intelligence, strategies and tools. The board of director set goals to clarify organization's vision by defining both short- and long-term objectives, identify the process of how to accomplish objective and customize working process for employee; in order to produce a mission statement that explains aims to stakeholders. The Top-executives formulate a strategy by reviewing information to determine what resources an organization currently has that can assist in achieving set objectives and goals; identify any places where the organization will need to hire outside help; prioritise organization's difficulties base on how important they are to organization's success; thereafter formulate strategy and develop alternative approaches.

The board of directors has the responsibility for supporting and monitoring managerial decisions so that all perspectives are considered, but doing so requires appropriate composition and structure, governance and compliance, strategic planning and oversight, board



engagement and development. Thus, the reason for the current study titled “board management process and performance of selected manufacturing firms in Delta State”

Objective of the Study

- i. To examine the effect of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State;
- ii. To ascertain the effect of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State;
- iii. To determine the effect of strategic planning and oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State;
- iv. To assess the effect of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

Research Questions

- i. What are the effects of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State?
- ii. What are the effects of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State?
- iii. What are the effects of strategic planning and oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State?
- iv. What are the effects of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State?

Hypotheses of the Study

H₀₁: There is no significant effect of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

H₀₂: There is no significant effect of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

H₀₃: There is no significant effect of strategic planning and oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

H₀₄: There is no significant effect of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Conceptual Review

Board Management Process

The boards are persons who have been legally empowered to act on behalf of an entity. The person(s) may be employed to represent a client in negotiations and other dealings with third

parties. The person(s) may be given decision-making authority. The Board include executive Officers, director and top managers of a firm (Arslan, 2018). According to Zhu et al. (2016), board management process is a determinant of organizational performance. It improves the quality of decisions. Jielynne (2025) argues that board management process refers to the act of oversight and governance of an organization by its board of directors. Shakri, Yong and Xiang (2025) posit that diverse and well-composed boards offer firms access to valuable resources, including expertise, networks and external influence. These resources can strengthen the firm’s strategic capabilities, enabling it to capitalize on growth opportunities, manage risks and thereby enhance performance. In markets where firms have strong board diversity and governance structures, board management process may be especially beneficial, as it provides firms with a broader foundation for sustained profitability. They further stated that Institutional theory further suggests that CG compliance improves firm legitimacy and transparency, particularly in emerging or transitional markets.

Strategic decision making is a critical skill chief executive officers and board of director need for effective leadership. The outcome of a leader’s choices significantly affects employees, clients, the market, and the success of an organization. Developing such skill requires a combination of knowledge, experience and intuition (George, Walker, & Monster, 2019). It also requires a process to help define problem and select the right course of action. The method for a successful decision making process includes: intent (goal-setting), strategy formation, strategy implementation, strategy evaluation and strategy monitoring.

Strategic decision is vital for the health and survival of firm, it gives a competitive advantage; assist in pursuing knowledge and skills that are necessary for organization’s future; assist in solving problems that require time and resources to handle; improving performance of organization; and plays a critical role in the management of an organization. Strategic decisions are used in the planning process in which managers settle on what goals organization will follow and what resources would best be implemented to achieve those goals (Ghosh & Lusch, 2020). Ibrahim (2017) said that the main objective of strategic management decision process is, matching long-term goals with short-term ones. Also, this decision-making process aligns these goals with the mission and vision of an organization, which takes into account a bigger picture and solidifies organization’s future. That is to say, the



role of the mission and vision of strategic management decisions process is to give an organization a clear guide in the decision-making process and ensure that the decisions made are in line with the goals. The decision-making process includes deciding on objectives, resources, and capabilities to be developed and the key actions needed to achieve these objectives in the context of all the relevant internal and external circumstances. Executive officers and board members usually make these decisions by involving a substantial commitment of organizational resources which have long-term effects (Sushil, 2018; Willy, 2018; Alisa, 2017).

The strategic management approach entails more than just following a set of guidelines and policies. Corporate Governance Agents (Executives officers and board members) use strategic management approach to look at business/issues from a philosophical standpoint. Executive officers and board members first plan strategically, then put that strategy into action. When everyone in the company understands the strategy, the strategic management process works best. The stages of the process are strategic intent, strategy formation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation (Ntara, 2021).

Board Composition and Structure and Organisational Performance

More specifically, board composition enable organization to better structure and formalize its strategic decision-making process. Through a well-established board decision-making culture, organization gives a formal structure to the board's operation, respective roles of the board and top management, and the way the board influences and supports strategic decisions (Zhu et al., 2016). When the division of work between the board and top management is more clearly defined, better information circulation that improves the decision-making process. In other words, a more formal, structured decision-making process improves the quality of strategic decisions, and thus contributes to board effectiveness (Muqaddas et al., 2019).

One way to ensure board of director work in harmony is to set a concrete structure that assigns tasks and responsibilities to all members. This allows them to 'own' their specialist area and the role that they play individually and as part of the collective. Each member should understand what is expected of them, including in their preparation for meetings, their contribution to those meetings and the actions they take afterwards to carry out the work of the board.

According to Muqaddas, Muhammad and Imtiaz (2019), studies have examined the relationship between board composition and structure; the results shown that beside financial indicators, board of directors' composition explicates financial distress.. According to another study, higher ratio of independent directors in the board is more effective for avoiding bankruptcy in case distress has been identified. There is a negative relationship between independent directors and financial distress of the firms in the study (Muqaddas et al., 2019).

The literature on the board composition of financially distressed companies shows that imposition of board members produces delusion of organization which becomes cause of financial distress of firms. Business enterprises and other societal organizations are transforming themselves into truly ecological decision-making structures of collegial control and responsibility to make the firms financially healthy (Tarus & Ayabei, 2016).

Governance and Compliance and Organisational Performance

Governance and compliance can improve market transparency and boost investor confidence. Shakri et al. (2025) indicated a significant positive association between corporate governance compliance and firm performance. However, their results suggest that the influence of corporate governance compliance on firm performance diminishes with higher debt levels. They found positive relationship between corporate governance compliance and firm performance in New Zealand featuring the shareholder-oriented.

Governance and compliance can serve as a valuable criterion for investment decisions (Bhagat & Bolton, 2019), helping them identify well-governed firms with balanced debt structures. Effective governance and compliance frameworks provide such mechanisms, enhancing transparency and accountability, which are crucial for reducing agency problems, reduce agency costs, as it limits managerial tendencies toward over-investment and risky ventures that are inconsistent with shareholders' goals, reduces the need for debt-related discipline mechanisms by curbing management's excesses. When governance and compliance is robust, investor confidence improves, increasing access to equity financing, which lowers reliance on debt. Conversely, weak governance and compliance may drive firms to rely on debt financing, as investor confidence diminishes in such environments (Shakri et al., 2025). More so, governance and compliance helps safeguard



shareholder interests by curbing managerial discretion, ensuring that decisions align with shareholder goals. Though, Aluchna and Kuszewski (2020) suggest that high compliance costs could initially hinder profitability, especially where resources are directed toward compliance rather than immediate business growth.

Strategic Planning and Oversight and Organisational Performance

An effective strategic planning and oversight enables an organization to perform relatively well in regards to competition in the industry. Strategic planning is a key component of strategic management and it entails formulating and implementing strategic decisions. Firms are faced by numerous challenges in regards to strategic planning as well strategy implementation which adversely affect their service delivery (Muhsin et al., 2020). Strategic planning and board oversight are designed to reduce agency costs, promote accountability and mitigate suboptimal decisions that could harm firm performance (Shakri et al., 2025). Thus, contribute to higher profitability by aligning management's actions with firm value maximization.

For an organization to enhance its financial and strategic performance it should engage in sound strategic planning through preparation of long term goals and objectives. Muhsin et al. (2020) also stated that proper deployment of strategic planning aids the development of clear organisation's mission and vision statements as well as objectives which enhances performance. Hence, strategic planning is key for organization success and survival. Ndosu and Mokaya (2018) argue that sound, strategic planning enhances the performance of public institutions in Tanzania. In Kenya, Sasaka (2016) investigated the strategic management practices within state corporations and found that strategic planning practices contribute to the operational efficiency of state corporations.

Strategic planning and oversight prioritise taking advantage of existing gaps and opportunities in the environment as the cornerstone of heightened performance. It is essential in boosting the performance and service delivery (Nzuki, 2017). Efficient strategic planning practices enhance organizational internal efficiencies by exhibiting their strengths and taking advantage of existing gaps and opportunities and neutralizing the threats that exists in the environment. Kabiru, Theur, and Misiko (2018) muse that effective strategic planning and oversight contributes immensely on the service delivery of state corporations.

The adoption of sound strategic planning practices in engendering high organizational performance is suggested by numerous studies. For instance, Kwamboka and Iravo (2018) focused on NGOs in Kenya and how they adopt strategic planning practices so as to enhance their performances in relation to competition in the industry. In the same breath, in the work of Muhsin et al. (2020), it was zeroed in on how strategic planning practices are utilized in the public sector, more specifically how they contribute to the performance of the Public Service Commission of Kenya.

Board Engagement and Development and Organisational Performance

Improving the quality of the organization's decision-making process, board engagement and development enable organization to capitalize on directors' expertise. Engagement and development are importance for effective governance (Cumming and Leung, 2021). Expertise is one of the essential requirements for being a director (Mooney et al., 2021). From a cognitive perspective, Zhu et al. (2016) observes that strategic decision-making will improve with the expertise directors bring to the organization. This is because board engagement and development makes maximum use of expertise by requiring directors to make a significant contribution to strategy implementation. Motivated directors who consider strategy important will share and deploy their expertise more intensely, and in doing so improve board effectiveness and organisational performance. Erajessvarie and Shamila (2018) postulate that, engagement has become a very controversial topic in the recent years and garnered the interest of many due to its impact on organisational performance and long-term sustainability of the organisation. Board engagement is integral in driving organisational success as engaged boards are motivated and strive to achieve organisational goals and objectives. The economic climate propagates many organisations to consider retrenchments, restructuring, and continuous improvement in pursuit of profitability and sustainability (Wellins and Bernthal, 2015). To remain competitive in the market, organisations must encourage positive employee engagement as a strategic tool to attain a competitive advantage for the organisation

Studies have shown that board engagement and development influence organisational performance (Devi, 2017; Wellins and Bernthal, 2015; Kazimoto, 2016; Alagaraja and Shuck, 2015). According to Erajessvarie and Shamila (2018), Board



engagement and development has a positive influence on organisational performance, stating that the more engaged boards are, the better the organisation performs and has a positive influence on performance outcomes such as productivity, profitability, employee retention, safety and customer loyalty. In the same vein, Devi (2017) argued that organisations could improve various business functions by using board engagement as a strategic tool. Wellins and Bernthal (2015) posited that board engagement encourages employees to be driven and perform exceptionally to improve levels of productivity, profitability, the delivery of superior products or services and the better utilisation of organisational resources. Alagaraja and Shuck (2015) argued that a state of engagement is only realised through the organisation's ability to drive alignment at all levels namely, individual, team, intergroup and organisational levels.

To ensure board engagement, organisations must provide training and career development, as this will build confidence in their work abilities and improve their levels of engagement (Erajesvarie & Shamila, 2018). When an organisation fails to consider people development as a strategic tool, it can lead to the derailment of both the individual and the business. Organisations' must ensure that there are career development plans for all employees, thus identifying the stretch and challenge in the current role and a roadmap of future roles, thus taking care of developmental opportunities to suit individual aspirations and needs. Sterling (2016) indicated that board development is a primary driver of employee happiness and emphasised that during the transition

phase into a new job, managers must build strong working relationships with employees, taking full consideration of their successes, strengths and needs.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted descriptive survey design. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The population of the study is 269 employees, which comprised of all employees of four selected firms namely: Vintex Aluminum Asaba (36), Zitronix Engineering Limited, Warri (76), Exclusive Solar Systems Limited Ughelli (65) and Life Flour Mill Sapele (92), in Delta State. The sample size is 159, derived from the total population using the Krejcie and Morgan Table for sample size calculation (See Appendix B). The instrument for data collection was questionnaire designed. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis. The research questions were answered using simple percentage and mean. The hypotheses were tested using multiple regressions via SPSS 25 at a significant level of 0.05. The model of multiple regressions.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Analysis of Data and Interpretation

159 copies of the questionnaire were distributed but 150 copies were retrieved which shows 94% retrieval rate. The research questions were answered using simple percentage and mean while the hypotheses were tested using multiple regressions in SPSS 25 at a significant level of 0.05.

Demographical Data of Respondents

Table 1: Sex of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Male	95	63
Female	55	37
Total	150	100

Source: Field survey, 2025

Table 1 show that, 95(63%) of the respondents were male while 55(37%) of the respondents were female.

Table 2: Age of Respondents

Variable (years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Below 30	26	17
30-40	44	29
41-50	58	38
Above 50	22	15
Total	150	100

Source: Field survey, 2025



Table 2 show that, 26(17%) of the respondents were below 30 years, 44(29%) of the respondents were between 30-40 years, 58(38%) of the respondents were between 41-50 years while 22(15%) of the respondents were above 50 years.

Table.3: Educational Background of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
FSLC	14	9
NCE/OND	50	33
HND/BSC	76	51
M.Sc./Ph.D	10	7
Total	150	100

Source: Field survey, 2025

Table 3 indicated that 14(9%) of the total respondents were FSLC holder, 50 (33%) respondents were NCE/OND holder, 76(51%) of the total respondents were HND/B.Sc. holder while 10 (7%) of the total respondents were M.Sc./Ph.D holder.

Answering of Research Questions

The mean value below 2.5 is considered as rejected while the mean value equal 2.5 and above is considered as “accepted”.

Research Question 1

What are the effects of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State?

Table 4: Effects of Board Composition and Structure on Performance

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	STDEV	Remark
1.	My firm formalize strategic decision-making process	50 (33%)	65 (43%)	16 (11%)	19 (13%)	2.97	23.92	Accepted
2.	My board has enough diversity (skills, perspectives, experiences) to govern effectively	64 (43%)	31 (21%)	43 (29%)	12 (8%)	2.98	21.79	Accepted
3.	My firm’s board succession planning and recruitment efforts aligned with the organization’s long-term goals	65 (43%)	52 (35%)	23 (15%)	10 (7%)	3.15	25.38	Accepted
4.	My firm’s board members complement each other’s expertise.	70 (47%)	62 (41%)	9 (6%)	9 (6%)	3.29	33.07	Accepted
GRAND TOTAL						3.15	26.04	Accepted

The means responses to items 1 – 4 in Table 4 are 2.97, 2.98, 3.15 and 3.29 respectively; with a grand mean and standard deviation of 3.15±26.04 Base on this analysis, board composition and structure formalize strategic decision making process, aid enough diversity (skills, perspectives, experiences) to govern effectively, aligned succession planning with the organization’s long-term goals, and enable compliment among board members.

Research Question 2:

What are the effects of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State?

Table 5: Effect of Governance and Compliance on Performance

S/N	STATEMENT	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	STDEV	Remark
5.	My firm is transparent and investors’ confidence are	73 (49%)	43 (29%)	30 (20%)	4 (3%)	3.23	8.69	Accepted



	boosted							
6.	My reduce agency costs and risky ventures that are inconsistent with shareholders' goals.	75 (50%)	61 (41%)	5 (3%)	9 (6%)	3.35	35.72	Accepted
7.	My firm increases access to equity financing, which lowers reliance on debt.	61 (41%)	53 (35%)	25 (17%)	11 (7%)	3.09	23.46	Accepted
8.	My firm safeguards shareholders' interests.	60 (40%)	70 (47%)	16 (11%)	4 (3%)	3.24	32.39	Accepted
GRAND TOTAL						3.23	30.06	Accepted

The means responses to items 5 – 8 in Table 5 are: 3.23, 3.35, 3.09, and 3.24 respectively; with a grand mean and standard deviation of 3.23±30.06. Base on this analysis, governance and compliance enable transparency, boost investors' confidence, reduce agency, reduce risky venture, increase access to equity financing, lower reliance on debt, and safeguards shareholders' interest.

Research Question 3:

What are the effects of strategic planning and oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State?

Table 6: Effect of Strategic Planning and Oversight on Performance

S/N	STATEMENT	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	STDEV	Remark
9.	My firm perform relatively well in regards to competition in the industry.	45 (30%)	80 (53%)	10 (7%)	15 (10%)	3.03	32.27	Accepted
10.	My firm promotes accountability and mitigates suboptimal decisions that could harm firm performance.	75 (50%)	60 (40%)	11 (7%)	4 (3%)	3.37	35.29	Accepted
11.	My firm align management's actions with firm value maximisation, which lead to higher profitability	75 (50%)	65 (43%)	8 (5%)	2 (1%)	3.42	37.83	Accepted
12.	My firm's board aids the development of clear organisation's mission and vision statements as well as objectives.	72 (48%)	50 (33%)	12 (8%)	16 (11%)	3.19	28.63	Accepted
GRAND TOTAL						3.25	33.51	Accepted

The means responses to items 9 – 12 in Table 6 are 3.03, 3.37, 3.42 and 3.19 respectively; with a grand mean and standard deviation of 3.25±33.51. Base on this analysis, strategic planning and oversight enable successful competition in an industry, promotes accountability, mitigates suboptimal decisions that could harm firm performance, align management's actions with value maximization, aid development of clear organisation's mission and vision statements as well as objectives.



Research Question 4:

What are the effects of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State?

Table 7: Effect of Board Engagement and Development on Performance

S/N	STATEMENT	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	STDEV	Remark
13.	My firm's board members participate effectively during meetings.	55 (37%)	60 (40%)	15 (10%)	20 (13%)	3.00	23.27	Accepted
14.	My firm's board committees have clear roles and responsibilities.	70 (47%)	35 (23%)	26 (17%)	19 (13%)	3.04	22.63	Accepted
15.	My firm's board members are resources and source of support.	35 (23%)	96 (64%)	13 (9%)	6 (4%)	3.07	40.91	Accepted
16.	My firm's board communicate clearly and openly to ensure understanding.	80 (53%)	40 (27%)	13 (9%)	17 (11%)	3.22	30.73	Accepted
GRAND TOTAL						3.08	29.39	Accepted

The means responses to items 13 – 16 in Table 7 are 3.00, 3.04, 3.07 and 3.22 respectively; with a grand mean and standard deviation of 3.08±29.39. Base on this analysis, board engagement and development enable board members' participation during meetings, assign clear role to board committees, motivate board members to be resources and source of support to organisation, enable open and clear board's communication to ensure understanding.

Test of Hypotheses

The hypotheses are tested using multiple regressions in SPSS 25.

OUTPUT OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS IN SPSS 25

Table 8: Model Summary

r	r ²	Adjusted r ²	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
0.801	0.832	0.533	0.12428	0.145

The r value of 0.801 in Table 8 represents the Pearson correlation. This implies that there is a strong correlation across the variables since the value of r (0.801) tends to 1.

The r² value of 0.832 (Table 8) is known as the coefficient of determination. This implies that, 83% of the variation in organisational performance can be explained the independent variables.

Table 9: ANOVA

	"Sum of Squares"	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2.143	4	0.714	46.251	0.000
Residual	1.792	116	0.015		
Total	3.935	119			

Table 9 shows that there is a significant relationship between the independent variable; since the sig value (0.000) is lesser than 0.05



Table 10: Coefficient

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T		Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2.772	0.129		16.958	0.000		
CS	0.432	0.034	0.426	5.623	0.010	0.683	1.465
GC	0.191	0.045	0.046	0.646	0.012	0.776	1.289
PO	0.382	0.041	0.397	5.322	0.021	0.704	1.420
ED	0.284	0.033	0.251	2.351	0.013	0.521	1.222

The individual Sig-value/p-value in Table 10 indicates whether or not each of the independent variables is statistically significant. Therefore,

Hypothesis One

There is no significant effect of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

The Sig-value of board composition and structure (0.010) in Table 10 indicates that, there is a significant effect of board composition and structure on performance, since the Sig-value (0.010) is lesser than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that, there was no significant effect of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State, is rejected. This implies that there is a significant effect of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State. This finding supports the finding of Muqaddas et al. (2019) who shown that board composition and structure enable better information circulation that improves the decision-making process.

For every additional effort of improving Board Composition and Structure, Organisational Performance is expected to increase by 0.432 (Table 10) assuming other independent variables remain constant.

Hypothesis Two

There is no significant effect of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

The Sig-value of governance and compliance (0.012) in Table 10 indicates that, there is a significant effect of board composition and structure on performance, since the Sig-value (0.012) is lesser than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that, there was no significant effect of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State, is rejected. This implies that there is a significant effect of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State. This finding supports the finding of Shakri et al. (2025) who indicated a

significant positive association between corporate governance compliance and firm performance.

For every additional effort of improving Governance and Compliance, Organisational Performance is expected to increase by 0.191 (Table 10) assuming other independent variables remain constant.

Hypothesis Three

There is no significant effect of strategic planning oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

The Sig-value of strategic planning and oversight (0.021) in Table 10 indicates that, there is a significant effect of board composition and structure on performance, since the Sig-value (0.021) is lesser than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that, there was no significant effect of strategic planning and oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State, is rejected. This implies that there is a significant effect of strategic planning and oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State. This finding supports the finding of Ndosu and Mokaya (2018) who ascertained that sound strategic planning enhances the performance of public institutions in Tanzania.

For every additional effort of improving Strategic Planning and Oversight, Organisational Performance is expected to increase by 0.382 (Table 10) assuming other independent variables remain constant.

Hypothesis Four

There is no significant effect of board engagement on development on performance of selected firms in Delta State.

The Sig-value of board engagement and development (0.013) in Table 10 indicates that, there is a significant effect of board composition and structure on performance, since the Sig-value (0.013) is lesser than 0.05. Therefore, the null



hypothesis which stated that, there was no significant effect of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State, is rejected. This implies that there is a significant effect of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State. This finding supports the finding of Erajessvarie and Shamila (2018) who said that board engagement and development better the organisation performs and has a positive influence on performance outcomes such as productivity, profitability, employee retention, safety and customer loyalty.

For every additional effort of improving of Board Engagement and Development, Organisational Performance is expected to increase by 0.284 (Table 10) assuming other independent variables remain constant.

The coefficient for the intercept (Table 10) means the expected Organisational Performance (OP) when Board Composition and Structure (CS), Governance and Compliance (GC), Strategic Planning and Oversight (PO), and Board Engagement and Development (ED) are not improved (at 0 states) is 2.772

V. Findings

The finding from the analysis of hypothesis one revealed that, there is a significant effect of board composition and structure on performance of selected firms in Delta State. Board composition and structure formalize strategic decision making process, aid enough diversity (skills, perspectives, experiences) to govern effectively, aligned succession planning with the organization's long-term goals, and enable compliment among board members.

The finding from the analysis of hypothesis two revealed that, there is a significant effect of governance and compliance on performance of selected firms in Delta State. Governance and compliance enable transparency, boost investors' confidence, reduce agency, reduce risky venture, increase access to equity financing, lower reliance on debt, and safeguards shareholders' interest.

The finding from the analysis of hypothesis three revealed that, there is a significant effect of strategic planning and oversight on performance of selected firms in Delta State. Strategic planning and oversight enable successful competition in an industry, promotes accountability, mitigates suboptimal decisions that could harm firm performance, align management's actions with value maximization, aid development of clear

organisation's mission and vision statements as well as objectives.

The finding from the analysis of hypothesis four revealed that, there is a significant effect of board engagement and development on performance of selected firms in Delta State. Board engagement and development enable board members' participation during meetings, assign clear role to board committees, motivate board members to be resources and source of support to organisation, enable open and clear board's communication to ensure understanding.

VI. Conclusion

The dynamics of board management process is essential for effective organisational performance. Good performing board management are more likely to engage in enterprise risk, composed, developed with good governed, strategic planning and oversight. From the findings of this study, board management process significantly affects organisational performance. It formalise strategic decision making process, aid enough diversity, aligned succession planning with the organization's long-term goals, and enable compliment among board members. It also enable transparency, boost investors' confidence, reduce agency, reduce risky venture, increase access to equity financing, lower reliance on debt, and safeguards shareholders' interest.

Recommendations

1. Board members should sustain enough diversity (skills, perspectives, experiences) to govern effectively and align succession planning with the organization's long-term goals.
2. Top management and directors should maintain transparency to boost investors' confidence and safeguards shareholders' interest.
3. Board of directors should sustain strategic planning and oversight to enhance successful competition in an industry and mitigates suboptimal decisions that could harm firm performance.
4. Board members should maintain and cultivate the act to actively participate during meetings and act as resources to organisation.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Akinsola O. K. (2023). Corporate Governance and Compliance in Nigerian Businesses. Retrieved from:



- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381120441_Corporate_Governance_and_Compliance_in_Nigerian_Businesses
- [2]. Alagaraja, M. and Shuck, B. (2015) Exploring Organizational Alignment-Employee Engagement Linkages and Impact on Individual Performance: A Conceptual Model
- [3]. Aluchna M. & Kuszewski T. (2020), "Does corporate governance compliance increase company value? Evidence from the best practice of the board", *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, Vol. 13 No. 10, p. 242.
- [4]. Arslan M. Y. (2018). Corporate Governance and Strategic Leadership. Evaluation of Sir Adrian Cadbury's key legacy of a "comply or explain" approach to corporate governance. Retrieved from: <https://www.grin.com/document/427656>
- [5]. Bhagat, S. and Bolton, B. (2019), Corporate governance and firm performance: the sequel, *Journal of Corporate Finance*, **58**(1): 142-168.
- [6]. Chen J. (2023). Corporate Governance Definition: How It Works, Principles, and Examples. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corporategovernance.asp>
- [7]. Crow P. R. & Lockhart J, C. (2016) How boards influence business performance: developing an explanation. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal* **37**(8): 1022–1037.
- [8]. Crow, P.R. & Lockhart, J.C. (2016). "How boards influence business performance: developing an explanation", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, **37**(8):1022-1037.
- [9]. Cumming D. & Leung T. Y. (2021). Board diversity and corporate innovation: regional demographics and industry context. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* **29**(3): 277–296.
- [10]. Devi, S. (2017). Impact of employee engagement on organizational performance: A study of select private sector. IMS Business School Presents Doctoral Colloquium – 2017
- [11]. Ekundayo, K. (2018). Effect of motivation on sales force performance in Guinness Nigeria Plc and MTN in South - East, *Nigeria. Journal of Advertising and Communication*, **10** (6), 34-52.
- [12]. Erajeshvarie P.& Shamila S. (2018). *The Impact of employee engagement on organisational performance – a case of an Insurance Brokerage company in Gauteng*. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, **20**(6): 66-76
- [13]. Federo R. & Saz-Carranza A. (2018) A configurational analysis of board involvement in intergovernmental organizations. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* **26**(6): 414–428.
- [14]. Jielynne B. (2025). Best Practices for Board Management in 2025. Retrieved from: <https://www.azeusconvene.com/articles/board-management-best-practices>
- [15]. Kwamboka P. K. & Iravo M. A. (2018). Influence of Strategic Planning on Performance of Non-Governmental Organizations in Kenya: A Case of One-Acre Fund Agriculture Project In Bungoma County, Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, **8**(11): 395-414
- [16]. Liao C. H, San Z. & Tsang A. (2021) Board reforms around the world: the effect on corporate social responsibility. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* **29**(5): 496–523.
- [17]. Mooney A., Brown J. & Ward A. (2021) The effects of director tenure on monitoring and advising: new insights from behavioral governance and learning theories. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* **29**(5): 479–495.
- [18]. Mostepaniuk A. (2017). Corporate Governance. Retrieved from: <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/56244>
- [19]. Muhsin, H. H., Mandere, E. N. & Onyango, R. O. 3(2020). Effect of strategic planning practices on performance of state corporations in kenya: a case of agricultural finance corporation. *The Strategy Business and Change Journal of Management*, **7**(7): 789-808
- [20]. Muqaddas K., Muhammad K. and Imtiaz A. (2019). Board composition and size, firm ownership and performance. *IOS Press*, **37**(4): 45-58
- [21]. Ndosi, A.J., & Mokaya, S. O. (2018). The Role of Strategic Planning in The Performance of Public Institutions in Tanzania: A case of Tanzanian National Parks. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, **3**(5): 180-184.



- [22]. Ntara c. (2021). Strategic Decision Making. Retrieved from: <https://study.com/learn/lesson/strategic-decision-making-management-process.html>. Indeed
- [23]. Nzuki, B. M. (2017). Strategic planning practices and organizational performance of SANDOZ GmbH, Kenya. Unpublished MBA project) University of Nairobi.
- [24]. Sasaka, S.P. (2016). Effect of Strategic Management Practices on the Performance of CSR at State Parastatals in Kenya. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology: Juja, Kenya.
- [25]. Shakri, I.H., Yong, J. & Xiang, E. (2025), Does capital structure mediate the relationship between corporate governance compliance and firm performance? Empirical evidence from Pakistan. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-08-2023-0315>
- [26]. Sharon C. (2024). 5 Key Elements of a Board Performance Review. Retrieved from: <https://www.geniusboards.co.uk/resources/insights/5-key-elements-of-a-board-performance-review/>
- [27]. Shin T. & You J. (2020) Changing words: how temporal consistency in a CEO's use of language toward shareholders and stakeholders affects CEO dismissal. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* **28**(1): 47–68.
- [28]. Sterling, L. (2016). Internal Hires Need Orientation Too. *Harvard Business Review*
- [29]. Wellins, R.S. and Bernthal, P. (2015). Employee Engagement: The Key to Realizing Competitive Advantage
- [30]. You Y., Srinivasan S., Pauwels K. & Joshi A. (2020) How CEO/CMO characteristics affect innovation and stock returns: findings and future directions. *J Acad Mark Sci* **48**(1):1229–1253.
- [31]. Zhu, H., Wang, P. & Bart, C. (2016). Board Processes, Board Strategic Involvement, and Organizational Performance in For-profit and Non-profit Organizations. *J Bus Ethics* **136**(1): 311–328.