International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

Strategic Posture and Organizational Agility of Manufacturing Firms in Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Dr. Macaulay Enyindah Wegwu
Lecturer, Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

Date of Submission: 10-01-2026 Date of Acceptance: 22-01-2026

Abstract
The study examined the relationship between strategic posture and organisational agility of manufacturing firms in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. The problem of the research hinged on lack of orientation on how to proactively respond to opportunities and threats which eventually has affected their adoption of inconsistent behavioural patterns, risk-taking, innovativeness, competitiveness, plan of action, structure, and resource commitment for the achievement of strategic goals. In proffering solution to this problem, the research was guided by four research questions and four research hypothses, As a consequence, strategic posture, which is the predictor variable was operationalised with proactiveness and risk-taking, while the criterion variable, which is organisational agility, was measured with response speed and operational flexibility. The survey study population comprises 495 employees of manufacturing firms in Balyesa State. A sample of 214 respondents was derived using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table. The primary data was obtained using a well-structured copies of questionnaire. The findings revealed that both proactiveness and risk-taking correlate with organisational agility. The study concluded that strategic posture relates to organisational agility of manufacturing firms in Bayelsa State. The study recommends enhancing proactivity and risk-taking for organisational agility.
Keywords: Strategic Posture,Proactiveness, Risk-Taking, Organizational Agility, Speed and Operational Flexibility

I. Introduction

Manufacturing companies, the hub of food production and job creativity, often face difficulty as they encounter continuous changes in work situations that are volatile, unpredictable, and ambiguous (VUCA). This volatile environment is the consequence of changes in needs, preferences, supply chain network processes, competition, technology, continuous regulatory changes and environmental risks. The high level of continuous change demands organisational agility. Organisational agility is the ability to observe changes and adapt swiftly to improve operational processes, enhances corporate survival and competitive advantage (Mrugalska & Ahmed, 2021). Nguyen et al. 2024 also define corporate agility as the capability to fleetly change structural, operational, and strategic processes in a volatile environment.

Agile organisations don't only react to shocks but also plan for them. Planning for the inevitable enables firms to leverage new opportunities and turn their weaknesses into strengths, enhances expedited product development, swifter delivery, and operational growth (Mrugalska & Ahmed, 2021; Ali, 2024). Organisations must be adaptable and flexible in their operations and services to take advantage of new trends that have a multiplier effect on productivity. Those who are not compliant to changes risk going through business failure. Production firms must be able to adapt quickly to changes in digital tools that tuned the production processes, embrace use of the Internet of Things (IoT), automation, knowledge of cyber-physical systems,which the foundation of industry 4.0 for the creation of intelligent environments where physical devices such as sensors, actuators, and machines are interconnected through digital networks to make autonomous or semi-autonomous decisions. According to Mrugalska and Ahmed (2021) the utilisation of Industry 4.0 technology improves production agility. Enhancing the usage of cloud computing, smart manufacturing processes, the Internet of Things (IoT), and other technologies aid many firms in dealing with volatility in supply chains and meet changing processes and client needs. It is only firms that are agile that has this dynamic trait to boost process flexibility,incorporate innovation, and minimise time-to-market.

Firm's agilities are often measured through strategic, operational and workforce agility. Bekos et al. (2025) suggest that agility on its own contributes to minimal improvements in

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

performance, however, the inclusive of strong marketing implementation skills, enhancing higher improvements and agility. However, supply chain agility has been observed to be significantly related with organisational success of manufacturing firms (Ali, 2024; Ofoegbu & Oloda, 2023). The agility of the F&B increases their responsiveness, operational efficiency, financial performance, customer satisfaction, and resilience, but the obvious fact of the required flexibility of the firms, shows that constraints and limitations are inevitable in their operations and services.

Although not all agility is advantageous, circumstances determine its efficiency and its effectiveness lies on the firms internal capabilities and external environmental factors (Bekos et al., 2025; Mrugalska & Ahmed, 2021). The success of firm's agility are often tested by the costs to keeping agile systems running, such cost includes adaptability costs cost of acquiring new technology and training, and turnover cost. Amidst circumstances, the firm must find a level ground between adaptability and stability. It is important for the F&B firms to acquire instruments that will enable them to be versatile while also making ensuring job role. The environment is volatile, unpredictable, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) as a result of fast changes in technology, changing consumer needs, global rivalry, and problems in the supply chain, this necessitate proactiveness, reactiveness, and defensiveness in pursuing opportunities and mitigating threats. Strategic posture indicates a company's strategic orientation and behavioral stance about its environment, encompassing its perception of change, readiness to adopt a proactive approach, and adaptability in resource allocation in responding to changes and challenges in its external environment (De Diego Ruiz et al., 2022).

Strategic posture provides a clear framework for strategic directions, facilitates adaptability and responsiveness, enhances competitive advantage through anticipating market trends, innovating ahead of competitors, and sustaining a unique market position, to effectively respond to environmental changes, technological disruptions, and customer demands and maintaining relevance in dynamic industries. The stategic posture shapes the firms**'** managerial choices and made them resilience to handle uncertainties and crises, as they tend to anticipate risks and prepare adaptive strategies (Alqahtaniet al., 2024). A progressive or entrepreneurial strategic posture encourages experimentation, learning, and investment in new opportunities, leading to business expansion. However, strategic posture is also required in organisations to foster a consistent mindset among employees and aligns behaviors and attitudes with the company's strategic orientation, organizational culture, and strategy (Tedeschi, et al., 2025). When the firm has steady posture, it improves stakeholder confidence and enhances long-term sustainability.

Bekos (2025) suggested that organisational agility enhance greater performance improvements when synergise with strategy orientations, as firms with agile procedures and intentional strategic positions are more stable, capable of adapting, enduring upheavals, taking advantage of opportunities. Despite several studies on strategic posture (Tedeschi,et al., 2025; Alqahtaniet al., 2024) and agility (De Diego Ruiz et al., 2022; Bekos et al., 2025; Mrugalska & Ahmed, 2021) respectively, there is a dearth of empirical study on the influence of strategic posture on manufacturing firms in Balyesa state. This study will bridge the observed gap in knowledge.

Statement of the Problem

Operational and environmental challenges and hierarchical and centralised decision-making slow managerial responsiveness and undermine agility, preventing rapid reconfiguration of operations when market or supply conditions change (Aruoren, 2021; KPMG Professional Services, 2023). These bureaucracies create long approval chains, which delay operational adjustments, slow down decision-making, and deter employee initiative, making it difficult for organisations to respond swiftly to market changes or customer needs and thus limiting their organisational agility. Most firms struggle to comprehend and accommodate the changes in market trends and resources, as well as the need to decentralise decision-making, which is a vital element of organisational agility (Bassey et al., 2023; Aruoren, 2021). Other major obstacles are regulatory and environmental challenges, financial constraints, weak leadership and strategic alignment, low adoption of Industry 4.0 technologies, limited uptake of Internet of things (IoT), automation. Inadequate information systems, data management, and outdated infrastructure restrict responsiveness, creating constraints in real-time monitoring and rapid reconfiguration of production systems, preventing firms from achieving the responsiveness required for organisational agility (Ben Ruben et al., 2023; Adeniran, 2024). There are also skills gaps and inadequate training that limit workforce flexibility (Rikala, 2024; International

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

Labour Organization [ILO], 2024), as many firms face shortages in technical and digital skills needed for agile manufacturing, and there is an absence of continuous upskilling programmes, which reduces workers' capacity to adapt to new processes and technologies.

Many firms often demonstrate insufficient agility to properly manoeuvre modern environmental volatility, spot chances and dangers, and quickly change their resources to respond by embracing faster new product launches, better customer service, and better operational performance (Nguyen, Le, & Nguyen, 2024; Teece, Peteraf, & Leih, 2016). When the firms are agile, it becomes easy to cut lead times and time-to-market, to stay competitive in markets where customer needs, tastes and preferences change frequently, and to be able to serve both local and

regional markets and take advantage of short-term changes in demand (Nguyen et al., 2024). Agility enhances the resilience of the supply chain and lessens the racing of agility initiatives, leading to fragmented or half-implemented changes (Nguyen et al., 2023). The effects of interruptions on the business, in addition to performance and responsiveness, lower firms' slowness to reconfiguration, sourcing, production and distribution in response to shocks (Cantele et al., 2023). Agility in supply-chain practices eases the adverse effect of supply-chain risk and enhances fast recovery during adversity (Jajja, Chatha, & Farooq, 2018; Pu et al., 2022). Having higher agility enhances better operational performance and recovery from challenges that result from shortages of raw material and shipping delays. When there is weak strategic leadership and poor alignment between strategy and operations, it results in poor prioritisation and resources (Resoul, 2024; Bah et al., 2024).

Many companies still have trouble with agility despite many initiated efforts to modernise processes and enhance leadership capabilities; enforcement is inconsistent, and problems persist. Restraints on agility include inadequate investment, capital, cultural barriers, poor communication, fragmented supplier networks, low digital literacy, and hierarchical decision-making structures (Aruoren, 2021; Bassey et al., 2023), and agility initiatives often fail to succeed in the absence of coordinated strategic orientation and supportive resources (Nguyen et al., 2024). This study aims to fill that gap by examining how a purposeful strategic posture can enhance organisational agility among manufacturing firms in Bayelsa State.

1.2 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between strategic posture and organizational agility of manufacturing firms in Balyesa State. The specific objectives are to:

i. Explore the relationship between proactiveness and response speed of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.
ii. Determine the link between proactiveness and operational flexibility of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.
iii. Assess the bond between risk-taking and response speed of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.
iv. Investigate the association between risk-taking and operational flexibility of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.

1.2 Research Questions

The following research questions were given in the study;

i. What is the association between proactiveness and response speed of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State?
ii. How does proactiveness relate to the operational flexibility of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State?
iii. How does risk-taking relate to the response speed of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State?
iv. What is the linkage between risk-taking and operational flexibility of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State?

1.3 Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were stated and tested in this study.

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between proactiveness and response speed of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between proactiveness and operational flexibility of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.

H_{03}: There is no significant relationship between risk-taking and response speed of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.

H_{04}: There is no significant relationship between risk-taking and operational flexibility of the manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.

II. Review of Literature

2.1 Conceptual Review

Strategic Posture

Strategic posture is a firm's strategic orientation toward its environment in terms of how

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

they proactively respond to opportunities and threats through their plan of action, structure, and resource commitments (Venkatraman, 1989; Ahmad & Yusoff, 2022). It refers to the consistent behavioural pattern an organisation adopts in pursuit of its strategic goals in terms of the degree of risk-taking, innovativeness, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness exhibited in its strategic decisions (Covin & Wales, 2019; Uchegbulam et al., 2023). The core dimensions of strategic posture are: proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking, and competitive aggressiveness. Strategic posture enhances adaptability, drives innovation, and improves competitiveness (Al-Harbi & Al-Khater, 2023; Ayinde & Akinlabi, 2024). It promotes aggressive pursuit of emerging opportunities and supports sustainability through integration of agile practices and turns strategic resilience into long-term goals. Proactiveness and risk-taking will be used as the dimensions of strategic posture in this study.

Proactiveness

Proactiveness is a forward-looking orientation policy that enables a firm to anticipate, plan for changes, and act on future market needs, technological trends, or environmental changes before competitors do (Covin & Wales, 2019; Ahmad & Yusoff, 2022). It is a firm posture that enhances the use of initiative, anticipation, and opportunity-seeking rather than being passive or engaging in reactive behaviour (Ayinde & Akinlabi, 2024). Proactive organisations imbibe the culture of not waiting for change to occur; instead, they are pacesetters as they initiate actions to shape their environment and influence outcomes in their favour. Being proactive, according to Ogundare & Van der Merwe (2024), involves surveying the environment, predicting future demands or problems, and proactively capitalising on emerging possibilities. Being proactive in manufacturing implies being ahead of the competition through investing in new technologies, new markets, and enhancing creative processes before the pressure to change them.

A proactive organisation carries out opportunity identification by constantly scanning their environment to detect emerging trends and customer demands. They are first movers, as they often launch new products, adopt innovations, or enter markets ahead of competitors. Proactive engagement in environmental scanning and forecasting, and they often rely on data analytics, customer insights, and scenario planning to predict changes. They are action-orientated and engage in continuous improvement through research and development. Ahmad et al. (2022) posit that proactive measures enhance resilience and stability and allow firms to continue performance despite economic risks. They also boost employee creativity and technological advancement to stay ahead.

Risk-Taking

Risk-taking is the willingness to commit resources to uncertain opportunities (Covin & Wales, 2019; Ahmad & Yusoff, 2022), putting oneself at risk of losing money to obtain a strategic advantage. Taking risks in a manufacturing firm could mean entering new markets, using new technology, or using new procedures that may not pay off. Corporate risks are often related to innovation performance, but engaging in disruptive risk without the right management skills can make innovation less effective (Zhang et al., 2021). Taking risks improves organisation when the managers are good and can lessen the bad effects of risk; however, there are limits to risks, as too many risks can hurt performance when not well thought out and there are no resources and funding for successful operation (Simamora, 2023; Corporate Risk-Taking, 2024). It encourages innovation and technological advancement, promotes quick adaptation to environmental and market disruptions, improves competitiveness by positioning the firm ahead of slower rivals and drives resilience, allowing firms to recover and learn from failed ventures. (Ahmad & Yusoff, 2022; Ayinde & Akinlabi, 2024)

Organisational agility

Organisational agility is the ability of a company to quickly notice, respond to, and adapt to environmental and internal changes and adjust to them while still doing well (Shams et al., 2021). Agility is the firm's ability to quickly change production, supply chains, and decision-making processes, which enhances its survival, flexibility, responsiveness, speed, creativity, and innovation while maintaining elasticity in processes and structure (Tallon, Queiroz, Coltman, & Sharma, 2023). It also involves changing production schedules, supply networks, and operations quickly in response to changes in the environment (Rahman et al., 2025). Agile manufacturing will adjust processes, resources and products to be more competitive when the economy is unstable (Alviani et al., 2024), as flexibility could enhance their survival.

Response Speed

Response speed is the firm’s capability to notice

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

changes in the environment and make and implement decisions rapidly in reaction to internal or external changes in it (Doz & Kosonen, 2020; Al-Harbi & Al-Khater, 2023). It is how rapidly a company notices changes in demand, supply chain problems, and competitiveness and then takes steps to adapt, including modifying production, changing the mix of products, or rerouting supply lines, and converting all threats to opportunities. In manufacturing, response speed reflects how quickly a firm recognises opportunities or threats, mobilises resources, and executes strategic or operational actions to maintain competitiveness and quickly redesigns a product, changes the capacity of a machine, or moves resources around quickly to avoid delays or quality problems in production (Rahman et al., 2025). Response speed is a measure of strategic and operational responsiveness in strategic organisations. The outcome shows the firm's ability to take fast decisions and translate them into adaptive actions (Nguyen et al., 2024).

Operational flexibility

Operational flexibility is the ability to change production, and operations work to fit changes in demand, supply, and technology, in terms of volume, product diversity, or process flow, with little cost or delay (Erol & Mansouri, 2020). It is the firm's capacity to adapt its production procedures, resources, and operations to changes in market demand, technology, or environmental circumstances (Nguyen & Tran, 2023; Ayinde & Akinlabi, 2024). Flexibility enhances swift reconfiguration of operations to meet client necessities, change production capacities, product variations, and delivery schedules without experiencing excessive cost or time drawbacks, manage supply chain interruptions, and enhance performance in uncertainty (Teece et al., 2020; Aruoren, 2021). Flexible operations make manufacturing organisations less bureaucratic and more agile. Lim et al. (2022) suggest that operational flexibility enhances firms' resilience, strengthening firms in dealing with change while still being efficient. For manufacturing companies in Bayelsa, operational flexibility may be the key to getting around problems with infrastructure and inconsistent policies.

2.2 Theoretical Review

The Dynamic Capabilities Theory (DCT),

The Dynamic Capabilities Theory (DCT), propounded by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen in 1997, creates a robust theory for comprehending the approaches by firms to achieve and preserve competitive advantage in speedily changing environments. The theory suggests that beyond having valuable resources, firms must produce dynamic ability-the capability to incorporate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address dynamic environmental conditions. These dynamic capabilities improve firms' ability to sense opportunities and danger, get hold of them through timely strategic activity, and modify processes to be adaptable and competitive.

The theory is applicable to the strategic posture and organisational agility of manufacturing firms for its provision of proactive, risk-taking, and adaptive strategic orientation schemes used in enhancing a firm's agility. In the manufacturing sector, strategic posture characterised by proactiveness, risk-taking, competitiveness and aggressiveness aligns with dynamic capabilities, which facilitate faster decision-making, process reconfiguration, innovation adoption and dynamic capabilities needed to foster organisational agility. DCT thus provides explanations on how firms can unceasingly sense environmental changes and respond with flexible strategies that improve operational efficiency, innovation, and long-term sustainability.

2.3 Empirical Studies

Alkandi and Helmi (2024) examine the influence of strategic agility on organisational performance. 300 managers from different companies listed in Saudi Arabia constitute the population. Structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to test the proposed model. Hypotheses were tested with IBM SPSS AMOS 29. The results revealed that strategic agility did not have a direct effect on operational performance (OP), but market orientation (MO) and innovation capabilities play a key role in this dynamic relationship and therefore forge critical connections. The results suggest an association between market orientation and innovation capabilities and performance. These findings contribute to the understanding of the importance of employing strategic MO and IC to improve OP in the Saudi industrial sector.

Kwasek et al. (2025) explore organisational agility and sustainable development of an organisation in the conditions of Economy 5.0. The survey study sample comprises 312 respondents. The findings reveal a significant relationship between agility and sustainable development strategy. Quick and accurate decision-making, strong identification of employees with the goals of the organisation and efficient communication have influenced their firm's performance. The study

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

suggests that enhancing organisational agility is essential for sustainable development and competitive advantage in the dynamic context of the Economy 5.0.

Ogbeta-Ogwu et al. (2025) examined strategic agility and organisational resilience within Nigeria's manufacturing sectors, using the mediating effects of innovation capability (IC) and market leadership orientation (MLO). Built on dynamic capability theory (DCT), this study employs a cross-sectional survey design. The target population was 46,750 middle- and senior-level managers. A multistage sampling approach, incorporating purposive and stratified random sampling, was used. A sample of 381 respondents was determined. Data were collected through structured questionnaires and analysed using structural equation modelling (SEM) to capture the complex interrelationships among the study variables. The findings show that innovation capability significantly influences strategic agility and operational performance. This study suggests prioritising robust innovation systems, continuous learning and process re-engineering to boost adaptive capacity.

III. Methodology

Research Design- the research adopted the non experimental research design otherwise known as quasi experimental research design or the cross-sectional survey, because the researcher did not have full control of the study elements.

Population for the study-- the accessible population comprised of 495 employees of manufacturing firms in Balyesa State.

Sample size determination- a sample size of 214 respondents was derived using krejcie and Morgan (1970) table.

Data collection method- the primary data was obtained using well-structured copies of questionnaire administered to the respondents.

Operational Measures of Variables- the independent variable, strategic posture, was operationalised using two dimensions proactiveness and risk-taking. Each construct was measured with a set of five statement items. Proactiveness was assessed with items such as: ("Our firm regularly initiates actions to which competitors respond") Similarly, risk-taking was measured with items such as: ("Our firm is willing to invest in high-risk projects that promise high returns"). "The criterion variable, organizational agility, was measured using two measures: response speed and operational flexibility . Response speed was assessed with statement items such as: ("Our firm quickly responds to unexpected market changes"), operational flexibility was measured with items such as: ("Our firm can easily adjust production volume to meet changes in demand.

Validity of Research Instrument-Face and content validity were used to determine the validity of the instrument used in this investigation.

Reliability of the research instrument- The reliability was determined using Cronbach's Alpha reliability level of 0.7 was used in the investigation. Values above 7.0 were considered composite reliable.

Method of data analysis- Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient statistical tool was used for the analysis.

IV. Results and Discussion

214 copies of structured questionnaire were distributed, but only 196(91.6%) copies were returned, and this constituted the valid copies of questionnaire. The hypotheses test was undertaken at a 95.5% confidence interval, and the decision rule was stated as below.

Where $P < 0.05$ = Reject the null hypotheses
Where $P > 0.05$ = Accept the null hypotheses

Table 1: Correlations between Proactiveness and the Dimensions of Organizational Agility

			Proactiveness	Response Speed	Operational Flexibility
Spearman's Rho	Proactiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.665**	.677**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	196	196	196
	Response Speed	Correlation Coefficient	.665**	1.000	.650**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	196	196	196

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

Operational Flexibility	Correlation Coefficient	.677**	.650**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
	N	196	196	196

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: SPSS Output, 2025.

Proactiveness and Response Speed: As shown in Table 1, the Spearman's rho value is 0.665 (p = 0.000), which is less than the significance threshold of 0.05. The coefficient of determination (r^2) is 0.442, implied that, 42.5% of the variation in response speed can be explained by proactiveness . Based on these findings, the null hypothesis (Ho1) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H02) is accepted. This indicates a strong significant and positive relationship between proactiveness and response speed.

Proactiveness and Operational Flexibility : Table 1 , column 6 also reveals a Spearman's rho value of 0.677(p = 0.000), which is below the alpha level of 0.05. The r^2 value of 0.458 suggests that 45.8% of the variance in operational flexibility is attributable to proactiveness .Consequently, the null hypothesis (Ho_2) is rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis. This confirms a strong and positive relationship between proactiveness and operational flexibility.

Table 2: Correlations between risk-taking and the Dimension of organizational agility

			Risk-Taking	Response Speed:	Operational Flexibility
Spearman's rho	Risk-Taking	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.635**	.645**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	196	196	196
	Response Speed	Correlation Coefficient	.635**	1.000	.615**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	196	196	196
	Operational Flexibility	Correlation Coefficient	.645**	.615**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	196	196	196

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: SPSS Output, 2025.

Risk-Taking and Response Speed: According to Table 2, column 5, the Spearman's rho value is 0.635 (p = 0.000), which is below the significance level of 0.05. The coefficient of determination (r^2) is 0.403, indicating that 40.3% of the variation in response speed is explained by risk-taking Given this result, the null hypothesis (Ho_3) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha_3) is accepted. This demonstrates a strong and significant positive relationship between risk-taking and response speed.

Risk-Taking and Operational Flexibility : As shown in table 2,column 6, the Spearman's rho value is 0.645 (p = 0.000), which is less than the 0.05 significance level. The r^2 value is 0.416 indicating that risk-taking accounts for 41.6% of the variation in operational flexibility . Based on this evidence, the null hypothesis (Ho_4) is rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis. This suggests that there is a strong significant and positive relationship between risk-taking and operational flexibility .

4.1 Discussion of Findings

The study findings show that all the dimensions of strategic posture (proactiveness and risk-taking) have significant and positive relationships with organisational agility among manufacturing firms in Bayelsa State, Nigeria.

The result of hypothesis one revealed a strong and positive relationship between proactiveness and response speed ($\rho = 0.665$, $p < 0.05$). This shows that manufacturing firms display a proactive disposition and respond swiftly to changes in clients' needs and demands, technological shifts, and competitive pressures.

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

Proactive firms foresee market trends and take early action rather than reacting to competitors' moves. Swift responses to environmental or market changes are influenced by the proactiveness in anticipating opportunities, identifying problems early, and taking initiative ahead of competitors. Proactive and risk-orientated behaviours are vital in enhancing a firm's adaptability and responsiveness to environmental changes. This aligns with Alkandi and Helmi (2024), who state that strategic agility relates to organisational performance.

The analysis of hypothesis two revealed a strong relationship between proactiveness and operational flexibility ($\rho = 0.677$, $p < 0.05$), suggesting that proactive firms enhance flexible systems and structures for modifying strategies and production processes effectively. This implies that proactive firms must be able to employ swift measures in their operations and strategies to changing preferences, market conditions, and technological advancements. Hence, proactiveness promotes adaptability through constant environmental scanning, creativity, and readiness for change. This result agrees with Bamel et al. (2020) that proactiveness enhances better handling of resources, processes and dynamic environmental demands.

The results of hypothesis three analysis demonstrated that risk-taking correlated positively to response speed ($\rho = 0.635$, $p < 0.05$). This implies that organisations that are ready to embrace deliberate risks make rapid strategic and operational decisions that promote innovation and encourage firms to respond decisively to environmental uncertainty. This finding is consistent with the Rasool et al. (2023) study that revealed that firms who decide to take risks are faster in responding to opportunities and disruptions.

The analysis of hypothesis four Shows a strong positive association between risk-taking and operational flexibility ($\rho = 0.645$, $p < 0.05$) to strengthen the idea that a risk-orientated culture influences structural and procedural flexibility. The management that fosters risk-taking, through experimenting and exploring new production techniques, can easily adapt operations to market fluctuations. This confirms the findings of Kantur (2020) that risk-taking heightens agility and the ability of the organisation to withstand uncertainty and enhances effective and efficient performance in a volatile environment. Overall, these findings emphasise that a strategic posture (proactiveness and risk-taking) significantly correlates with organisational agility.

V. Conclusion

The study explores the influence of strategic posture on the agility of the manufacturing firms in Bayelsa State. Proactiveness and risk-taking were used as the dimensions of strategic posture, while response speed and operational flexibility are used as the measures of organisational agility. The findings revealed that both proactiveness and risk-taking are significantly correlated with organisational agility. The study found that proactiveness enhances increased response speed and effective operational flexibility, as anticipating changes and using initiatives to foresee and act ahead of competitors can result in responding swiftly to market dynamics and market and environment volatility. Likewise, risk-taking was found to be associated with response speed and operational flexibility. The study concludes that strategic posture relates to organisational agility.

VI. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The management should strengthen their proactive orientation, monitoring market trends, customer preferences, and technological developments, to anticipate environmental changes and respond swiftly, thereby promoting operational agility and enhancing competitive advantage.
2. Proactive decision-making processes should be used to enhance particpation, creativity and swift identification of opportunities and threats to promote preparedness, improve response speed and enhance operational flexibility.
3. Calculated risk-taking culture should be encouraged through innovation, experimentation, and investment in new ventures to enhance swift response to market disruptions and adapt operations effectively.
4. Flexible operational systems should be enhanced to support agile operations.
5. The firms should promote a supportive and learning-oriented culture that rewards proactive behavior and responsible risk-taking.
6. Policy makers and industry regulators should provide incentives and capacity-building programs that encourage innovation and flexibility among manufacturing firms.

References

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 6, Issue 1, Jan.-Feb., 2026, pp: 156-166 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

[1]. Ahmad, N. H., & Yusoff, W. F. W. (2022). Strategic posture and firm performance: The mediating role of entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Business and Economics, 10*(1), 15–34.

[2]. Ahmad, S., Arshad, M., & Akhtar, N. (2022). Proactiveness and firm performance: Mediating role of dynamic capabilities in SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Strategy, 32*(3), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.53703/001c.34427

[3]. Al-Harbi, K., & Al-Khater, K. (2023). Strategic agility and firm resilience: The moderating role of strategic posture. *Sustainability, 15*(4), 2335. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15042335

[4]. Ali, W. W. (2024). Effect of supply chain agility on performance of manufacturing firms in Mombasa County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management, 11*(2), 1535–1545. http://dx.doi.org/10.61426/sjbcm.v11i2.2984

[5]. Alkandi, I., & Helmi, M. A. (2024). The impact of strategic agility on organizational performance: the mediating role of market orientation and innovation capabilities in emerging industrial sector. *Cogent Business & Management*, *11*(1), https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2396528

[6]. Alqahtani, N., Uslay, C., & Yeniyurt, S. (2024). *Strategic performance blueprint: Optimizing business performance through tailoring strategic postures to environmental and institutional contexts.* Journal of Strategic Marketing. https://doi.org/10.1080/26437015.2024.2309399

[7]. Alviani, D., Hilmiana, Widianto, S., & Muizu, W. O. Z. (2024). Workforce agility: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1376399. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1376399

[8]. Aruoren, E. E. (2021). Organizational structure as predictor of agility in organizations in Nigeria. *Himalayan Journal of Economics and Business Management, 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.47310/hjebm.2021.v02i01.020

[9]. Ayinde, A. E., & Akinlabi, B. H. (2024). Strategic posture and organizational agility of small and medium enterprises in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 16*(2), 45–58.

[10]. Bah, M. O. P., Sun, Z., Hange, U., & Edjoukou, A. J. R. (2024). Effectiveness of organizational change through employee involvement: Evidence from telecommunications and refinery companies. *Sustainability, 16*(6), 2524. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16062524

[11]. Bassey, D. N., Uwa, K. L., & Okurebia, S. (2023). Strategic agility and organizational performance in selected manufacturing firms in South-South Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Review, 11*(11), 72–95. https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Strategic-Agility.pdf

[12]. Bekos, G. S. (2025). Organizational agility and firm performance: The role of complementary capabilities. *Journal of Business Research, 173,* 114392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.114392

[13]. Bekos, G. S., Jaakkola, M., & Chari, S. (2025). Organizational agility and firm performance: The role of architectural marketing capabilities. *Industrial Marketing Management, 125*, 239–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2025.01.005

[14]. Cantele, S., et al. (2023). Supply chain agility and sustainability performance: A configurational approach to sustainable supply chain management practices. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 414*, 137493. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137493

[15]. Corporate risk-taking, innovation efficiency, and high-quality development: Evidence from Chinese Firms. (2024). *Systems, 12*(5), 154. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12050154

[16]. Covin, J. G., & Wales, W. J. (2019). Crafting high-impact entrepreneurial orientation research: Some suggested guidelines. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 43*(1), 3–18.

[17]. De Diego Ruiz, E., Larrañeta, B., Núñez, J., & Zamora, J. (2022). What drives strategic agility? Evidence from a fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 183*, Article 122007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122007

[18]. Erol, I., & Mansouri, S. A. (2020). Manufacturing flexibility: A review of the literature and framework for future research. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems, 54*, 225–

239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2019.12.001

[19]. Flexibility in manufacturing system design: A review of recent approaches from operations research. (2024). *European Journal of Operational Research, 315*(2), 413-441. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2023.08.050

[20]. International Labour Organization. (2024). *Nigeria Decent Work Country Programme III (2023–2027)*. https://www.ilo.org/

[21]. Jajja, M. S. S., Chatha, K. A., & Farooq, S. (2018). Impact of supply-chain risk on agility performance: Mediating role of supply-chain integration. *International Journal of Production Economics, 205*, 118–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2018.08.032

[22]. Jones, A. A., Uhd, J., Kabore, C. D., & Cornett, K. A. (2024). Breaking down silos in the workplace: A framework to foster collaboration. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice, 30*(6), E306–E311. https://doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0000000000002007

[23]. Khaw, K. W., et al. (2022). Reactions towards organizational change: A systematic review. *[PMC open access]*. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9006211/

[24]. KPMG Professional Services. (2023). *Manufacturing for prosperity I*. https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/ng/pdf/manufacturing-for-prosperity.pdf

[25]. Kumkale, İ. (2022). Organizational agility. In *Organizational mastery: The impact of strategic leadership and organizational ambidexterity on organizational agility* (pp. 37-52). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

[26]. Kwasek, A., Kocot, M., RADOWICKI, S., Kandefer, K., Szymańska, M., Soboń, D., & Trzaskowska-Dmoch, A. (2025). The Impact of Organizational Agility on the Sustainable Development of the Organization in the Context of Economy 5.0. *Sustainability*, *17*(15), 6907.https://doi.org/10.3390/su17156907

[27]. Lee, S. M., & Trimi, S. (2021). Innovation for creating a smart future. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 6*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2020.11.001

[28]. Lim, J. Y. K., Stratopoulos, T., & Wirjanto, T. (2022). Operational flexibility and firm resilience: Evidence from global supply chain disruptions. *International Journal of Production Economics, 247*, 108440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2022.108440

[29]. López-Muñoz, J. F., Vélez-Colón, L., & Aguilera-Caracuel, J. (2023). Proactiveness and sustainability: Examining the mediating role of organizational learning. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 32*(5), 2335–2348. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3372

[30]. McKinsey & Company. (2023). *The state of organizations 2023* (People & Organizational Performance practice). https://www.mckinsey.com/

[31]. Motwani, J., & Kataria, A. (2024). Organization agility: A literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 73*(3), 664–683. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-02-2023-0095

[32]. Mousavi, S., Bossink, B., & van Vliet, M. (2023). Risk-taking and innovation performance: The moderating role of strategic orientation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 194*, 122649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122649

[33]. Mrugalska, B., & Ahmed, J. (2021). Organizational agility in Industry 4.0: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability, 13*(15), Article 8272. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158272

[34]. Nguyen, T., Le, C. V., & Nguyen, M. (2024). The organisational impact of agility: A systematic literature review. *Management Review Quarterly, 74*(4), 995–1023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-024-00446-9

[35]. Ofoegbu, W. C., & Oloda, F. O. (2023). Supply chain agility and organizational performance of manufacturing firms in Rivers State. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, E-ISSN 2811-2466, P-ISSN 2384-6097*.

[36]. Ogbeta-Ogwu, M. E., & Chidi, E. N.(2025). Strategic Agility and Organisational Resilience: Evidence from Nigeria's Industrial Sectors.AKSU Journal of Administration and Corporate Governance, Volume 5, Issue 2, P-ISSN:2805-4083; E-ISSN: 2811-1981 https://doi.org/10.61090/aksujacog.2025.019

[37]. Ogundare, J. A., & Van der Merwe, S. (2024). The role of competitor orientation and proactiveness in competitive advantage for small- and medium-sized enterprises performance. *Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*

Management, 16(1), a786. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajesbm.v16i1.786

[38]. Rahi, S., Khan, M. M., & Alghizzawi, M. (2023). Organizational agility and response speed in the digital era: Evidence from emerging markets. *Journal of Business Research, 157*, 113551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113551

[39]. Rahman, M. K., Hossain, M. A., Piprani, A. Z., Abdullah, A. R., et al. (2025). Impact of tech-driven integration, flexibility, and ambidexterity on supply chain integration and performance in manufacturing firms: Moderating role of uncertainty and agility. *Future Business Journal, 11,* Article 72. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-025-00488-9

[40]. Rikala, P. (2024). Understanding and measuring skill gaps in Industry 4.0. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change.* (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.xxxxxx

[41]. Shams, S. R., Vrontis, D., Belyaeva, Z., Ferraris, A., & Esposito, M. (2021). Organizational agility: A conceptualization, scale development, and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research, 123*, 660–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.046

[42]. Simamora, A. J. (2023). Firms performance, risk taking and managerial ability. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 72*(3), 789-808. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2021-0172

[43]. Tallon, P. P., Queiroz, M., Coltman, T., & Sharma, R. (2019). Information technology and the search for organizational agility: A systematic review with future research possibilities. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28*(2), 218–237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2018.12.002

[44]. Tallon, P. P., Queiroz, M., Coltman, T., & Sharma, R. (2023). Information technology and the dynamics of organizational agility: Insights from a systematic literature review. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 32*(1), Article 101683. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2023.101683

[45]. Tedeschi, S., Marzi, G., Balzano, M., & Costa, G. (2025). *Managerial insights on investment strategy in cybersecurity: Findings from multi-country research. arXiv preprint* arXiv:2505.11549. https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.11549

[46]. Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review, 58*(4), 13–35. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13

[47]. U.S. Department of State. (2024). *2024 Investment climate statements: Nigeria.* https://2021-2025.state.gov/reports/2024-investment-climate-statements/nigeria/

[48]. Uchegbulam, P., Akinyele, S. T., & Olufemi, B. (2023). Strategic posture and performance of manufacturing SMEs in Nigeria: The moderating role of environmental turbulence. *Journal of African Business, 24*(1), 92–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2022.2091562

[49]. World Bank. (2024). *Nigeria Development Update* (October 2024). World Bank Group. https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria/publication/nigeria-development-update-ndu

[50]. Zafar, N. (2023). Supply chain agility: A review. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies, 3*(3), 235-238.

[51]. Zhang, J., Ma, Y., & Wang, Y. (2021). Entrepreneurial risk-taking and firm performance: The moderating role of institutional environment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 38*(2), 495–517. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-019-09692-8