International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

Strategic Vigilance, Ambidexterity and Performance of FMCG in Lagos: Management Style Moderation

Osibodu, I. I[1], Adefulu, A. D.[2], and Nwankwere, I. A[3]
[1&2]*Department of Business Administration and Marketing, School of Management Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun state, Nigeria.*

Date of Submission: 04-05-2025 Date of Acceptance: 15-05-2025

Abstract
The fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) manufacturing sector faces persistent challenges in profitability, market share, sales volume, and competitive advantage, often linked to inadequate adoption of strategic vigilance and organizational ambidexterity. While prior research has explored these factors in developed economies, empirical evidence on their impact within developing countries, particularly in the FMCG manufacturing context, remains limited. This study addresses this gap by examining how strategic vigilance and ambidexterity influence firm performance, with management style as a moderating variable with focusing on selected FMCG companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. Hence, this study investigated the effect of strategic vigilance, ambidexterity and performance moderated by management style of selected FMCG companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. The study adopted the positivist research philosophy, the deductive research approach and the survey research design. The population of the study was 12,618 management staff from five selected FMCG companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. using Cochran's formular, a sample size of 485 respondents was determined. The study adopted simple random sampling technique to select respondents. Data was collected using a structured and validated questionnaire with Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for constructs ranging from 0.71 to 0.82. A response of 100% was recorded. Data were analysed using descriptive and inferential (multiple and hierarchical regress) statistics at 0.05 significance level. The findings revealed that strategic vigilance and ambidexterity had statistically significant effect on organisational performance when moderated by management style (β = -0.038, t = -4.913, $\Delta R2$ = 0.019, ΔF = 24.133, $p<0.05$.). The study concluded that strategic vigilance and ambidexterity significantly enhance organizational performance, when moderated by management style. The study recommends that management of FMCGs manufacturing companies should adopt strategic vigilance and ambidexterity, while aligning them with an effective management style, to maximize performance and competitiveness.

Keywords: Ambidexterity, Competitive advantage, Management style, Market share, Organisational performance, Profitability, Sales volume, Strategic vigilance

I. Introduction

Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) manufacturing companies face significant performance challenges characterized by declining profitability, market share, sales volume, and competitive advantage (Dolinski et al., 2024). These challenges have become increasingly pronounced across global markets (Alnoori & Al-Janabi, 2022). According to Deloitte (2023), global EBIT margins for FMCG firms decreased significantly from 10.2% in 2019 to 8.1% in 2023. European manufacturers have been particularly affected by energy price volatility, experiencing margin compression to 7.5% (Eurostat, 2023). In the Americas, FMCG manufacturing companies reported a 12% decline in net profits during 2022 (IBISWorld, 2023). Concurrently, Asian manufacturers have struggled with raw material cost fluctuations, resulting in a 15% profit reduction across key markets including India and China (McKinsey, 2023).

Market share erosion is another critical issue, with NielsenIQ (2023) reporting that 23% of FMCG brands in Europe and 18% in North America lost over 5% market share to private labels and digital-native competitors. Sales volume growth has also stagnated, with global volumes rising just 1.9% in 2023, down from 4.3% in 2021 (Euromonitor, 2024), as consumers traded down to cheaper alternatives amid cost-of-living crises. Competitive advantage in the FMCG sector is increasingly tied to agility and

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

innovation, yet many firms lag in these areas. In Europe, only 30% of FMCG companies have successfully implemented AI-driven demand forecasting, contributing to overstocking and waste (BCG, 2023). American firms, while more advanced digitally, face stiff competition from DTC (direct-to-consumer) brands, which captured 25% of the U.S. market in 2023 (Statista, 2024). In Asia, price sensitivity and fragmented retail landscapes have made it difficult for multinationals to maintain dominance, with local brands gaining 8% market share in Southeast Asia in 2022 (Bain & Company, 2023). Africa's FMCG sector, though growing at 5.8% (World Bank, 2023), grapples with distribution inefficiencies, resulting in 20% product waste (PwC, 2023).

Performance challenges vary across key African markets. In Egypt, FMCG profitability fell to 7% in 2023 (CAPMAS, 2023), while sales volumes dropped 4% amid inflationary pressures (Kantar, 2023). South Africa's FMCG sector grapples with energy crises and logistics bottlenecks, leading to a 10% decline in operational efficiency (Stats SA, 2023). Nigeria's competitive landscape is shifting, with local brands like Dangote and BUA gaining 12% market share in staples (Taylor, 2024), but manufacturers face hurdles like high production costs (30% above regional averages) and distribution inefficiencies, causing 20% product waste (PwC, 2023). Across these markets, digital adoption remains low only 25% of African FMCGs use advanced analytics (McKinsey, 2023) hindering competitive advantage. in Nigeria, multinational FMCGs lost 15% market share to indigenous competitors between 2020 and 2023 (NielsenIQ, 2023). Sales volume growth has also stagnated; while Africa's FMCG sector grew at 5.8% annually (World Bank, 2023), Nigeria and South Africa saw volumes rise by just 2.3% and 1.8%, respectively, in 2023 (Euromonitor, 2024), constrained by shrinking consumer wallets and operational inefficiencies.

The interplay between performance in fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) manufacturing companies, strategic vigilance, organizational ambidexterity, and management style is critical for sustaining competitive advantage in dynamic markets. Strategic vigilance, as highlighted by Altarawneh (2023) and Karima & Zohra (2021), enables firms to proactively monitor and respond to environmental changes, ensuring adaptability to market shifts and emerging risks. Organizational ambidexterity, which balances exploration (innovation) and exploitation (efficiency), is essential for FMCG firms to simultaneously drive growth and optimize operations, as emphasized by Zebarjad & Rezaei (2023). However, the effectiveness of these strategic approaches is heavily influenced by management style; Udin (2023) argues that transformational and adaptive leadership styles enhance the integration of vigilance and ambidexterity, fostering a culture of agility and continuous improvement. Together, these elements create a synergistic framework where strategic vigilance identifies opportunities and threats, ambidexterity enables dual innovation and operational excellence, and management style ensures alignment and execution, ultimately driving superior organizational performance in the FMCG sector.

Despite the growing body of research on firm performance, there remains a critical gap in understanding how strategic vigilance and organizational ambidexterity interact to drive firm performance, particularly within the Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) sector in Nigeria. Prior studies have largely focused on either strategic vigilance or ambidexterity in isolation, neglecting their combined effect on firm performance (Taylor, 2024). Additionally, research has not sufficiently explored the moderating role of management style in shaping this relationship, leaving a gap in knowledge on how management style influence strategic adaptability and decision-making in dynamic market environments (Bekinbo et al., 2021). While existing literature has highlighted the effect of strategic vigilance and organizational ambidexterity on firm performance, it has primarily been examined in developed economies, making it imperative to investigate its relevance in Nigeria's FMCG sector, where firms face volatile economic conditions and intense competition (Mutisya & Obonyo, 2023). Furthermore, limited empirical evidence exists on how firms integrate ambidexterity with strategic

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

vigilance to enhance long-term performance, particularly under different leadership frameworks (Ramdan et al., 2021). This study addressed these gaps providing valuable insights into optimizing management practices for sustainable competitive advantage in Nigeria's FMCG industry.

II. Review of Literature

2.1 Organisational Performance

Organizational performance refers to the comprehensive assessment of a firm's effectiveness in achieving its strategic objectives and maintaining sustainable competitive advantage (Moumin, 2024; Altarawneh, 2022). Contemporary scholars conceptualize performance as a multidimensional construct that encompasses both financial indicators (e.g., profitability, revenue growth) and non-financial measures (e.g., market share, innovation capability, and stakeholder satisfaction) (Abdel-Aty & Deraz, 2022; Abdullah & Sadiq, 2023). Adim and Maclayton (2021) emphasize that true organizational performance extends beyond short-term financial outcomes to include long-term sustainability and adaptive capacity in dynamic business environments. This holistic perspective recognizes that effective performance measurement must account for both operational efficiency and strategic preparedness for future challenges.

Al-khawaldah et al. (2022) expanded the conceptualization of organizational performance to incorporate resilience and strategic agility as critical components. Asri and Abdul-Moshin (2020) argue that high performance requires organizations to balance competing demands optimizing current operations while simultaneously innovating for future success. This dual perspective aligns with Bozic and Poola's (2023) assertion that excellent performance demands simultaneous excellence in exploitation (refining existing capabilities) and exploration (developing new competencies). Alhawamdeh (2021) further enriches this definition by incorporating corporate social responsibility and ethical governance as integral elements of sustainable organizational performance, particularly in today's stakeholder-driven business environment. Together, these perspectives present organizational performance as a dynamic, multifaceted construct that evolves with changing business paradigms and societal expectations (Alnoori & Al-Janabi, 2022). In view of the various definition in literature discussed, the researcher defines organisational performance as the degree to which an organisation meets or exceeds expectations in terms of financial, operational, and strategic outcomes.

2.2 Strategic Vigilance

Strategic vigilance refers to an organization's proactive ability to monitor, interpret, and respond to environmental changes to maintain competitive advantage. Bekinbo and Opara (2021) describe it as a systematic approach to scanning internal and external factors that could influence strategic decisions. Altarawneh (2023) emphasizes that strategic vigilance involves continuous intelligence gathering on competitors, market trends, and emerging risks to enhance decision-making. Zuochun (2023) asserts that organizations that adopt strategic vigilance are better positioned to anticipate disruptions and leverage opportunities. Similarly, Dawood and Abbas (2018) highlight the role of strategic vigilance in reducing uncertainty by aligning organizational strategies with dynamic market conditions.

In a broader context, Shahbandi and Farrokhshad (2019) argue that strategic vigilance integrates risk management, foresight, and adaptability to improve resilience. Abdel-Aty and Deraz (2022) highlight its importance in turbulent business environments, where organizations must remain agile to sustain growth. Yunita et al. (2023) and Fadhil et al. (2021) underscore the significance of real-time data analytics and digital transformation in enhancing strategic vigilance capabilities. Park et al. (2020) and Mahmood et al. (2020) link strategic vigilance to knowledge management and innovation, ensuring that organizations stay ahead of industry shifts. Furthermore, Ayodele et al. (2020) and Karima and Zohra (2021) emphasize the role of leadership in fostering a culture of vigilance, encouraging employees to engage in continuous learning and strategic foresight to maintain organizational sustainability. Conclusively, in view of the various definition in literature above, the researcher defines strategic vigilance as the

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

organisational commitment to staying informed about emerging technologies and industry disruptions that may affect the business.

2.3 Ambidexterity

Ambidexterity in an organizational context refers to the ability of firms to simultaneously explore new opportunities while exploiting existing resources and capabilities to maintain competitive advantage. Muis and Isyanto (2022) describe ambidexterity as a dynamic capability that enables organizations to balance short-term efficiency with long-term adaptability. Watering et al. (2022) emphasize that achieving ambidexterity requires structural and contextual mechanisms that allow organizations to innovate while maintaining operational excellence. Hani (2023) highlights the role of leadership in fostering an ambidextrous culture, where firms encourage both incremental improvements and radical innovations.

Furthermore, Zebarjad and Rezaei (2023) argue that ambidexterity enhances organizational resilience, allowing firms to navigate uncertain environments more effectively. Alshaer (2020), Chang and Gotcher (2020), and De-Almeida-Guerra and Campos (2022) collectively assert that ambidexterity is essential for sustaining business performance in rapidly evolving markets. Their studies suggest that firms capable of balancing exploration and exploitation are more likely to achieve sustained growth, innovation, and competitive positioning. In view of the various definition in literature above, the researcher defines ambidexterity as the ability of an organisation to foster a culture that encourages both experimentation and efficiency in its pursuit of strategic goals.

2.4 Management Style

Management style refers to the distinctive way in which managers lead, make decisions, and interact with their employees to achieve organizational goals. Cakir and Adiguzel (2020) define management style as a combination of leadership behaviors, communication patterns, and decision-making approaches that influence employee motivation and organizational effectiveness. Udin (2023) emphasizes that management styles vary based on organizational culture, industry demands, and leadership philosophy, affecting employee satisfaction and performance. Similarly, Pembi et al. (2023) argue that an adaptive management style is essential for responding to dynamic business environments, ensuring flexibility and resilience in organizational operations. Torlak et al. (2019) further highlight that effective management styles promote collaboration, innovation, and efficiency within teams.

Additionally, Iqbal et al. (2021) assert that transformational and participative management styles contribute significantly to employee engagement and productivity. Budur and Demir (2019) suggest that management styles should align with organizational values and workforce expectations to foster a positive work environment. Sabran et al. (2022) highlight the role of cultural and situational factors in shaping managerial approaches, while Udin (2021) and Taylor (2024) stress the importance of balancing authority and flexibility to achieve sustainable business success. Overall, the choice of management style directly impacts organizational performance, employee well-being, and long-term competitiveness. Based on the various definitions in the literature, the researcher defines management style as the distinctive manner in which managers approach and execute their roles, encompassing their decision-making processes, leadership approaches, communication methods, and interactions with employees. It reflects the attitudes, behaviors, and practices that manager employ to guide, motivate, and influence their teams, ultimately shaping the organizational culture and affecting overall performance

2.5 Strategic Vigilance, Ambidexterity, Performance, and Management Style

Asri and Abdul-Moshin (2020) study showed that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a positive effect on management style, Preda (2014) study discovered that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a significant impact on management style, Schnellbächer and Heidenreich (2020) study revealed that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a significant

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

influence on management style, Gómez-Prado et al. (2022) study found out that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a positive impact on management style, Corroboratively, Aripin et al. (2022) study indicated that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a significant impact on management style, Furthermore, the study of Bekinbo et al. (2021) showed that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a positive impact on management style.

Mutisya and Obonyo (2023) study discovered that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a positive effect on management style, Ramdan, et al (2021) study revealed that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a significant impact on management style, Tahmasebifard (2018) study found out that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a positive influence on management style, and also, the study of Huynh (2020) indicated that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a significant influence on management style, Jalali and Jaafar (2019) study discovered that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a significant effect on management style, and also, Park et al. (2020) study revealed that strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organisational performance had a positive impact on management style.

2.6 Theoretical Review

This study is grounded in Resource-Based Theory (RBT) and Ambidexterity Theory (AMBT), which collectively provide a robust foundation for analyzing firm performance in dynamic markets. Resource-Based Theory (RBT), pioneered by Wernerfelt (1984) and advanced by Barney (1991), asserts that sustained competitive advantage derives from a firm's heterogeneous, valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources. Scholars such as Garcia et al. (2013) contend that strategic resource allocation enables firms particularly in fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) manufacturing to outperform rivals by optimizing internal capabilities. However, critiques by Priem & Butler (2001) and Muhammad et al. (2020) highlight theoretical limitations, including tautological reasoning and ambiguous empirical measures of sustainability. Despite these debates, RBT remains instrumental in explaining how FMCG firms leverage unique resources to enhance performance, particularly when moderated by adaptive management styles.

Complementing this perspective, Ambidexterity Theory (AMBT), introduced by Duncan (1976) and expanded by March (1991) and O'Reilly & Tushman (1996), posits that organizational success hinges on balancing exploration (innovation) and exploitation (operational efficiency). Proponents such as Ferreira et al. (2021) and Ramdan et al. (2021) demonstrate its efficacy in volatile markets, where firms must simultaneously innovate and optimize processes. Critics, however, argue that the theory underestimates implementation challenges, including resource allocation trade-offs (Muhammad et al., 2020). Nevertheless, AMBT offers critical insights for FMCG manufacturers, where strategic vigilance proactive environmental scanning and ambidextrous capabilities are vital for sustaining market share and profitability amid rapid industry shifts. By integrating RBT and AMBT, this study investigates how strategic vigilance and ambidexterity collectively influence FMCG performance, with management style serving as a key moderator. The research addresses a critical gap in emerging economies, where empirical evidence on these dynamics remains sparse, and provides actionable strategies for firms navigating competitive and resource-constrained environments.

III. Methodology

This study adopted a positivist research philosophy, a deductive approach, and a survey research design to examine the effect of strategic vigilance and ambidexterity on organizational performance moderated by management style. The target population consisted of 12,618 management staff from selected FMCG manufacturing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria, including PZ Cussons Nigeria Plc, Flour Mills of Nigeria Plc, Cadbury Nigeria Plc, Nestlé Nigeria Plc, and Olam OK Foods, Nigeria. Using Cochran's formula, a sample size of 485 respondents was determined, and participants

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

were selected through simple random sampling representing approximately 0.001 of the total population included in the study. The achieved response rate aligns with established research standards, as Dolinski et al. (2024) consider it appropriate for survey-based studies. Additionally, Johnson and Wislar (2012) suggest that response rates exceeding 60% are generally accepted in social science research, reinforcing the validity and reliability of the collected data. Data were collected via a structured and validated questionnaire, with key variables assessed using a six-point Likert scale ranging from 6 (very high) to 1 (very low). Respondents provided ratings on various items related to strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, organizational performance, and management style, offering valuable insights into the dynamics of FMCG manufacturing firms.

3.1 Operationalization of Variables

In this study, the first independent variable (X_1) is strategic vigilance, which is assessed through four key dimensions: technological vigilance, environmental vigilance, competitive vigilance, and marketing vigilance. The second independent variable (X_2) is ambidexterity, measured through its two core components: exploratory ambidexterity and exploitative ambidexterity. The dependent variable (Y) is organizational performance, evaluated using four critical indicators: profitability, market share, sales volume, and competitive advantage. Additionally, the moderating variable (Z) is management style (Z_1), which influences the relationship between the independent, dependent and moderating variables. The relationships between these variables are mathematically represented in the equations below.

Variable Identification

The functional model for the study variables are denoted in the equations below:

Y = Dependent Variable

X1, X2 = Independent Variable

Z = Moderating Variable

Y = Organisational Performance (OP)

X1 = Strategic Vigilance (SV)

X2 = Ambidexterity (ABDX)

Z = Management Style (MS)

$Y = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$

Where:

Y = Organisational Performance (OP)

y_1= Firm Profitability (FP)

y_2= Market Share (MS)

y_3= Sales Volume (SVL)

y_4= Competitive Advantage (CA)

$X1 = (x_{1a}, x_{1b}, x_{1c}, x_{1d})$

Where:

X1 = Strategic Vigilance (SV)

x_1a = Technological Vigilance (TV)

x_1b = Environmental Vigilance (EV)

x_1c = Competitive Vigilance (CV)

x_1d = Marketing Vigilance (MV)

$X2 = (x_{2a}, x_{2b})$

Where:

X2 = Ambidexterity (ABDX)

x_2a = Exploratory Ambidexterity (ELA)

x_2b = Exploitative Ambidexterity (ETA)

Regression Model

The model formulated for each of the hypotheses are written as:

$Y = f(X_1, X_2 * Z)$

$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X1 + \beta_2 X2 + (Z) + \varepsilon i$

$OP = \beta_1 + \beta_1 SV + \beta_2 ABDX + (MS) + \varepsilon i$ ---------- Eqn1

Where:

β_0 - β_1 = Coefficient of the independent variables for the objective

β_0 = constant of the equation or constant term

$\beta_0 - \beta_1$ = Parameters to be estimated

εi = error term

IV. Data interpretation and Discussion of Findings

A total of 485 questionnaires were administered and successfully retrieved. data analysis, test of hypothesis, data interpretation and discussion of findings were carried out. In testing the hypothesis of this study, a three-step hierarchical

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

regression approach was employed to assess the moderating effect of management style on the relationship between strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, and organizational performance. In Step 1, the composite index of strategic vigilance and ambidexterity (independent variables) was regressed on organizational performance (dependent variable). In Step 2, the model was expanded to include management style (moderating variable). Finally, in Step 3, an interaction term (strategic vigilance × management style) was introduced alongside the original variables to test for moderation effects.

The regression outputs were analyzed to determine significant changes in R-squared values, which would indicate the presence of a moderation effect. Specifically, moderation occurs if the beta coefficient of the interaction term is statistically significant, confirming that management style influences the strength of the relationship between strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, and organizational performance. The results of this analysis are presented in Tables 1a–c.

Table 1a:
Model Summary of *Hierarchical Regression on the Moderating effect of management style on the relationship between strategic vigilance and ambidexterity and organisational performance*

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.702a	.493	.492	1.88653	.493	470.583	1	483	.000
2	.776b	.602	.600	1.67388	.109	131.512	1	482	.000
3	.788c	.621	.619	1.63510	.019	24.133	1	481	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity, Management Style

c. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity, Management Style, Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity*Management Style

Source: Researcher's Findings, 2025

Table 1b:
Anova of *Hierarchical Regression on the Moderating effect of management style on the relationship between strategic vigilance and ambidexterity and organisational performance*

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1674.797	1	1674.797	470.583	.000b
	Residual	1718.988	483	3.559		
	Total	3393.784	484			
2	Regression	2043.277	2	1021.639	364.626	.000c
	Residual	1350.507	482	2.802		
	Total	3393.784	484			
3	Regression	2107.800	3	702.600	262.795	.000d
	Residual	1285.985	481	2.674		
	Total	3393.784	484			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity

c. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity, Management Style

d. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity, Management Style, Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity*Management Style

Source: Researcher's Findings, 2025

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

Table 1c:
Coefficients of *Hierarchical Regression on the Moderating effect of management style on the relationship between strategic vigilance and ambidexterity and organisational performance*

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	4.933	.931		5.296	.000
	Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity	.778	.036	.702	21.693	.000
2	(Constant)	4.572	.827		5.529	.000
	Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity	.478	.041	.432	11.605	.000
	Management Style	.325	.028	.427	11.468	.000
3	(Constant)	-16.261	4.317		-3.767	.000
	Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity	1.326	.177	1.197	7.483	.000
	Management Style	1.261	.192	1.653	6.552	.000
	Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity*Management Style	-.038	.008	-1.817	-4.913	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance						

Source: Researcher's Findings, 2025

In step one, Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity were regressed on organisational performance of fast-moving consumer goods manufacturing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. The findings in Table 1(a) show the result of hierarchical regression analysis for Model 1 when only Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity were regressed on organisational performance, the model showed (R = 0.702, R^2= 0.493, AdjustedR^2 = 0.492, p = 0.000<0.05, R^2 Δ = 0.493). These indicate that Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity account for 49.3% of the variability in organisational performance. Furthermore, Table 1c shows beta coefficient, β is 0.778, p<0.05 when Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity is in the model. These results indicate that for every unit increase in Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity, on organisational performance of fast-moving consumer goods manufacturing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria increased by 0.778. The overall model was also significant ($F_{(1,483)}$= 470.583, p<0.05) as evident from Table 1(b).

The introduction of the moderator (management style) in Model 2 significantly improves the effect of Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity (R= 0.776, R^2 = 0.602, Adjusted R^2 = 0.600, p=0.000<0.05, R^2 Δ= 0.109). This means that Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity and management style explained about 60.2% of the variation in organisational performance as against 39.8% changes that occurs when only Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity was regressed against organisational performance. The F value is statistically significant ($F_{(2,482)}$= 364.626, p<0.05) that the influence of the independent variable and the moderator (management style) were significant in the model as seen from Table 1c. In addition, Table 1(c) shows the beta coefficients of Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity (β = 0.478, p<0.05) and management style (β = 0.325, p<0.05); that is for every unit increase Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity and management style, organisational performance increases by 0.478 and increases by 0.325 respectively.

Model 3 of the hierarchical regression analysis showed how the moderating effect of management style affect the relationship between Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity and organisational performance. The results in Table 1c (Model 3) provides values of co-efficient of multiple correlation, r = 0.788 and a co-efficient of determination, R^2 = 0.621 when Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity and organisational performance was moderated by management style, this shows increase in the r value of 0.776 and an R^2 of 0.602 when the interacting term had not been introduced into the model. However, the co-efficient of multiple correlations (0.788) reveals that a very strong relationship exists between the independent variable, the moderating variable and the dependent variable, and the co-efficient of determination indicates that

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

about 62.1% variance in organisational performance is jointly explained by the Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity, management style, while other factors not studied in this research work contributes the remaining 37.9%.

Model 3 results under change statistics reveal that the R^2 change was 0.019 showing and increase (R^2 Δ = 0.019) when the interaction term (Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity *management style) was added. The change was statistically significant at p= 0.000 (p-value<0.05). The results show statistically significant relationship between Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity, organisational performance, and the interaction term ($F_{(3,481)}$= 262.795, p<0.05). Table 1(b) reveals the F statistics changed from 364.626 to 262.795 ($F\Delta$ = 101.831) showing a decrease when interaction term was added. The F ratio shows that the regression of strategic vigilance and ambidexterity, management style, and organisational performance of the fast-moving consumer goods manufacturing companies is statistically significant.

The results in Model 1 Table 1(b) (for step one) show statistically significant regression coefficients for strategic vigilance and ambidexterity (β=0.778, p<0.05) indicating that there is a linear dependence on between strategic vigilance and ambidexterity and organisational performance. In Model 2, strategic vigilance and ambidexterity and management style was statistically significant [strategic vigilance and ambidexterity (β = 0.478, p<0.05) and management style (β = 0.325, p<0.05)]. In Model 3, strategic vigilance and ambidexterity, management style and the interaction effect were not statistically significant [strategic vigilance and ambidexterity (β = 1.326, p<0.05); management style (β = 1.261, p<0.05].

The interaction term beta coefficient, β was -0.038 meaning that for every unit change in interaction term, organisational performance decreases by 0.038. Further, the interaction term showed a negative effect (β = -0.038, p<0.05) but it was statistically insignificant. The results suggest that management style has a statistically insignificant moderating effect on the relationship between strategic vigilance, ambidexterity and organisational performance of the fast-moving consumer goods manufacturing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. The confirmed regression equation from the results is stated as follows:

OP = -16.261 + 1.326V&A + 1.261MS - 0.038(SV&A*MS) –----------Eqn.
Where:
OP = Organisational Performance

SV&A = Strategic Vigilance and Ambidexterity
MS = Management Style
SV&A*MS= The interaction of strategic vigilance & ambidexterity and management style
The results indicate that management style has statistically significant effect on the relationship between strategic vigilance, ambidexterity and organisational performance. Based on these findings, the null hypothesis (H_0) which states that Strategic vigilance dimensions, ambidexterity dimensions and organisational performance are not significantly moderated by management style was rejected. `

4.2 Discussion

The findings from the hierarchical regression analysis confirmed that management style significantly moderates the relationship between strategic vigilance, ambidexterity, and organizational performance in FMCG manufacturing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. This implies that the effectiveness of strategic vigilance and ambidexterity in driving organizational performance is highly dependent on the management style adopted. These results align with studies by Preda (2014) and Schnellbächer & Heidenreich (2020), which highlight the pivotal role of management style in shaping strategic initiatives and organizational outcomes. Furthermore, Aripin et al. (2022) validated that suitable management styles enhance the effectiveness of strategic vigilance in improving firm performance. The study underpins these observations by demonstrating that effective management approaches are instrumental in translating strategic vigilance and ambidextrous capabilities into tangible business benefits.

International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management (IJHSSM)
Volume 5, Issue 3, May-June, 2025, pp: 139-152 ISSN: 3048-6874
www.ijhssm.org

The moderating effect of management style is further supported by Gómez-Prado et al. (2022), who found that transformational and participative leadership styles strengthen the relationship between strategic vigilance and organizational performance. Similarly, Bekinbo et al. (2021) confirmed that democratic management styles enhance the impact of ambidexterity on performance metrics. The current study reinforces these findings within the Lagos FMCG sector, showing that management style is a crucial determinant of how effectively strategic vigilance and ambidexterity translate into improved firm performance. The results revealed an increase in explained variance from 49.3% to 62.1% when management style was introduced as a moderator, emphasizing its substantial influence. However, conflicting perspectives from Huynh (2020) and Jalali & Jaafar (2019) suggest that management style does not always significantly moderate this relationship, highlighting the potential impact of contextual and industry-specific factors.

From a theoretical standpoint, this study is anchored in Resource-Based View (RBV) and Ambidexterity Theory. RBV (Wernerfelt, 1984) emphasizes the strategic importance of internal capabilities such as management styles in achieving competitive advantage**.** The study's findings reinforce RBV's premise that organizational resources must be effectively managed to yield performance benefits. Likewise, Ambidexterity Theory (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2013) asserts that balancing exploratory and exploitative strategies requires adaptive leadership. The study strengthens this perspective by demonstrating how different management styles influence the success of ambidextrous practices in FMCG firms. By establishing the significant moderating effect of management style**,** this research provides actionable insights for FMCG companies seeking to optimize strategic vigilance and ambidexterity through effective leadership approaches.

V. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study investigated the effect of strategic vigilance and organizational ambidexterity on performance outcomes within Nigeria's FMCG sector, with particular emphasis on the moderating influence of management style. The empirical results demonstrated statistically significant positive relationships, confirming that both strategic vigilance (encompassing technological, environmental, competitive, and marketing dimensions) and ambidexterity (balancing exploration and exploitation) substantially enhance organizational performance. Crucially, management style emerged as a pivotal moderating factor, amplifying these effects when aligned with adaptive leadership approaches. These findings reinforce Resource-Based Theory (RBT) by validating the performance-enhancing value of unique organizational capabilities, while also supporting Ambidexterity Theory (AMBT) in demonstrating the competitive necessity of dual innovation-efficiency competencies in dynamic markets.

FMCG manufacturers should institutionalize strategic vigilance systems through continuous environmental scanning and competitive intelligence platforms to anticipate market shifts. Simultaneously, firms must cultivate ambidextrous capabilities by structurally separating exploratory R&D units from operational teams while maintaining integrated strategic oversight. Leadership development programs should emphasize adaptive management styles that flexibly balance control and empowerment, as the study confirms these practices optimize the performance benefits of vigilance and ambidexterity. Regulatory bodies like Nigeria's Manufacturers Association (MAN) could facilitate sector-wide adoption through policy frameworks incentivizing capability-building investments and knowledge-sharing platforms.

Future studies should explore: cross-industry applications of this framework in non-FMCG sectors with differing innovation cycles, longitudinal designs to assess sustainability of performance impacts, and cultural moderators of Hofstede's dimensions that may influence management style effectiveness in emerging African markets. Quantitative comparisons between family-owned vs. multinational FMCGs could further contextualize implementation challenges. Researchers might also investigate digital

transformation as an emergent dimension of strategic vigilance in Industry 4.0 contexts, given its growing relevance to manufacturing competitiveness.

References

[1]. Abdel-Aty, Y., & Deraz, H. (2022). The mediating role of organisational agility on the relationship between environmental uncertainty and innovation in hotels. *Journal of the Faculty of Tourism and Hotels-University of Sadat City*, 6(2/1), 33-54. https://doi.org/10.1422/8474532

[2]. Abdullah, M., & Sadiq, Z. A. (2023). Technological vigilance as a tool to achieve organisational excellence in airports. *Social and Human Sciences*, 3(4), 839-867. http://dx.doi.org/10.00613/bpre8274

[3]. Adim, V., & Maclayton, I. (2021). Strategic sensitivity and corporate responsiveness of fast-moving consumer goods companies in Rivers State, Nigeria. *Journal of Strategic Management*, 6(*1*), 46-62. https://doi.org/10.47672/jsm.769

[4]. Al-Khawaldah, R., Al-zoubi, W., Alshaer, S., Almarshad, M., ALShalabi, F., Altahrawi, M., & Al-Hawary, S. (2022). Green supply chain management and competitive advantage: The mediating role of organisational ambidexterity. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 10(*3*), 961-972. http://dx.doi.org/10.5267/j.uscm.2022.2.017

[5]. Alhawamdeh, M. M. M. (2021). Relevance of strategic planning process, organisational ambidexterity organisational capabilities and decision-making style hotels performance. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(3), 1503-1514. https://doi.org/10.47750/CIBG.2021.27.03.201

[6]. Alnoori, A. A., & Al-Janabi, A. A. (2022). The role of marketing vigilance in crisis management. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(*6*), 7725-7732. https://doi.org/10.3926/25057363

[7]. Alshaer, S. A. (2020). The effect of strategic vigilance on organisational ambidexterity in Jordanian commercial banks. *Modern Applied Science*, 14(*6*), 82-89. https://doi.org/10.5539/mas.v14n6p82

[8]. Altarawneh, R. M. (2022). The effect of strategic vigilance on organisational excellence the mediating role of strategic foresight. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 18(*3*), 53-63. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v18n3p52

[9]. Aripin, Z., Suganda, U. K., & Kusumah, A. Z. (2022). Marketing intelligence: Innovation ability to anticipate global competition. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 11(*1*), 328-339. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v11i1.1589

[10]. Asri, D. A. A. M. & Abdul-Moshin, M. B. A. (2020). Competitive intelligence practices and organisational performance link: A review. *Universiti Teknologi Mara Cawangan Perlis Jurnal Intelek*, 15(*2*), 101-115. http://dx.doi.org/10.24191/ji.v15i2.311

[11]. Ayodele, W., Onuoha, B. C., & Eke, B. C. (2020). Strategic orientation and organisational health of manufacturing companies in Rivers State. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 7(*2*), 29-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.36713/epra5286

[12]. Bain and Company (2023). Soft recovery in China's FMCG sector; growing interest in health, value, and exclusive products. Accessed on October 3, 2024, from https://www.bain.com/about/media-center/press-releases/2023/soft-recovery-in-chinas-fmcg-sector-growing-interest-in-health-value-and-exclusive-products

[13]. Barney, J. B. (1991). Organization resources and sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(*1*), 99-120.

[14]. BCG. (2023). *Digital Transformation in European FMCG*.

[15]. Bekinbo, L., & Dumo Nkesi Opara, D. N. O. (2021). Market intelligence and organisational performance of telecommunication forms in Rivers State. *BW Academic Journal*, 9(*2*), 13-17. Retrieved from https://bwjournal.org/index.php/bsjournal/article/view/462

[16]. Bozic, V. & Poola, I. (2023). Measuring organisational performance. *Researchgate.* 1-17. Doi: 10.13140/fg.2.2.20225.12642. Accessed on August 10, 2024, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369281495_Measuring_organizational_performance/link/64f9682f05a98c1b63f7e753/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7InBhZ2UiOiJwdWJsa9.

[17]. Budur, T., & Demir, A. (2019a). Leadership effects on employee perception about CSR in Kurdistan Region of Iraq. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 5(*4*). 184-192.

[18]. Cakir, F.S. & Adiguzel, Z. (2020). Analysis of leadership effectiveness in organisation and knowledge sharing behaviour on employee and organisation. *Sage Open Journal*, 10(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244040914634
[19]. CAPMAS. (2023). *Egyptian Economic Indicators*.
[20]. Chang, K. & Gotcher, D.F. (2020). How and when does co-production facilitate eco-innovation in international buyer-supplier relationships? The role of environmental innovation ambidexterity and institutional pressures. *International Business Review*, 29(*5*). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2020.101731
[21]. Dawood, F. S., & Abbas, A. F. (2018). The role of strategic vigilance in the operational performance of the banking sector: Field research in a sample of private banks. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 10(*21*), 1-18. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335389475
[22]. De-Almeida-Guerra, R. M., & Campos S, I. L. (2022). Dimensions of ambidexterity and organisational performance of Brazilian exporting companies. *Internext: Revista Electrônica de Negócios Internacionais da ESPM*, 17(*3*) 364-381. https://doi.org/10.18568/internext.v17i3.668
[23]. Deloitte. (2023). *Global FMCG Performance Report*.
[24]. Dolinski, D., Grzyby, T. Kulesza, W., Blaszczyk, P., Laska, D., Liebersbach, F., Redkiwicz, D., & Strzelczky, L. (2024). We are looking for people like you: Ne technique of social influence as a tool for improving response rate in surveys. *Social Influence*, 1(19), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2024.2316348
[25]. Duncan, R., B. 1976. The ambidextrous organisation: Designing dual structures for Innovation. *The Management of Organization Design*, 1(*1*), 167–188.
[26]. Euromonitor. (2024). *FMCG Sales Volume Data*.
[27]. Euromonitor. (2024). *Global FMCG Sales Volume Trends*.
[28]. Eurostat. (2023). *European Industry Trends*.
[29]. Fadhil, A. H., Hasan, M. F., Abdullah, A., Amanah, A. L., & Qandeel, A. M. (2021). The role of strategic consciousness in enhancing the strategic vigilance. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(*6*), 965-978. https://doi.org/10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.082
[30]. Ferreira, M. N., Henrique, S., Cavalcante, A., Araujo, F., Maria, C., & Viana, G. (2021). The effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on explorative and explorative strategies of pharmaceutical industries in Brazil. *International Journal of Business*, 8(*3*), 165-180. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.62.2021.83.165.180
[31]. Garcia, M., Hildago, A., & Rodriguez, D. (2013). Responsible diversification: knowing enough about diversification to do it responsibly: motives, measures and consequences. *Annals Universitatis Apulensis Series Oeconomica*, 1(*15*), 19-33.
[32]. Gómez-Prado, R., Alvarez-Risco, A., Cuya-Velásquez, B. B., Arias-Meza, M., Campos-Dávalos, N., Juarez-Rojas, L., & Yáñez, J. A. (2022). Product innovation, market intelligence and pricing capability as a competitive advantage in the international performance of startups: Case of Peru. *Sustainability*, 14(*17*), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710703.
[33]. Hani, S. I. M. B. (2023). The role of strategic vigilance as an entrance to achieving the strategic leadership in Saudi Universities. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Science*, 7(*1*), 140-150, https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.H011222
[34]. Huynh, Q. L. (2020). Impacts of environmental responsibility and performance on organisational performance: Importance of environmental performance. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 10(*6*), 100-108. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.9955
[35]. IBISWorld. (2023). *FMCG Market Analysis: Americas*.
[36]. Igbal, Z.A., Abid, G., Arshard, M., & Ashfaq, F. (2021). Impact of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership on thriving at work: The moderating role of conscientiousness. *European Journal of Investigation in Health Psychology and Education*, 11(*3*), 667-685. Doi:10.3390/ejihpe11030048
[37]. Jalali, A., & Jaafar, M. (2019). The role of proactiveness as a mediatore between organisational-stakeholders relationship and SMEs performance. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 54(*3*), 34-54.

https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.54.3.24

[38]. Johnson, T. P., & Wislar, J. S. (2012). Response rates and nonresponse errors in surveys. *International Journal of Clinical Medicine*, *6*(7), 1805-1806. http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2012.3532

[39]. Kantar Worldpanel (2023). Navigating tough times: Strategies for FMCG brands to thrive in Kenya. *Kantar*. Accessed on August, 2, 2024, from https://www.kantar.com/inspiration/fmcg/growth-becomes-harder-for-fmcg-brands-in-kenya

[40]. Karima, K., & Zohra, D. (2021). The impact of strategic vigilance on e-management in the national railway transport company (SNTF). *Journal of Information Technology Management*, 13(*2*), 202-230. https://dorl.net/dor/20.1001.1.20085893.2021.13.2.11.6

[41]. Mahmood, Z., Faris, A. & Al-Daha, J.M. (2020). The bling spots management and its effect in achieving the strategic vigilance. *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, 51(*2*), 573-557. https://doi.org/10.36872/LEPI/V51I2/301117

[42]. March, J.G. (1991) Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(*1*), 71–87. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2634940

[43]. McKinsey. (2023). *Asia-Pacific Consumer Goods Outlook*.

[44]. McKinsey. (2023). *Digital Transformation in African FMCG*.

[45]. Moumin, I. (2024). Organisational performance: A comprehensive literature review of modern models and approache. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 20(4), 1-5

[46]. Muhammad, H. K., El Talla, A. S., Mazen, J. S., & Abu-Naser, S. S. (2020). Strategic sensitivity and its impact on boosting the creative behavior of Palestinian NGOs. *International Journal of Academic Accounting, Finance and Management Research (IJAAFMR)* 4(*5*), 80-102. https://doi.org/10.1002/7397223_8474

[47]. Muis, I. & Isyanto, P (2021). Market orientation, transformational leadership, partnership effect on organisational performance: A competitive advantage as a mediator. *Binus Business Review*, 12(*3*), 263-277. https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v12i3.7284

[48]. Mutisya, P. M., & K'Obonyo, P. (2023). Joint effect of organisational ambidexterity, design and environmental dynamism on performance of large manufacturing firms in Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 5(*2*), 89-102. https://www.ajoeijournals.org/sys/index.php/ajoei/article/.../

[49]. NielsenIQ. (2023). *Market Share Dynamics in FMCG*.

[50]. NielsenIQ. (2023). *Nigeria Market Share Analysis*.

[51]. O'Reilly, C. A., III, and M. L. Tushman. (2013). Organizational Ambidexterity: Past, Present, and Future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27 (*4*): 324–338. doi:10.5465/amp.2013.0025.

[52]. Park, Y., Pavlou, P. A., & Saraf, N. (2020). Configurations for achieving organisational ambidexterity with digitization. *Information Systems Research*, 31(*4*), 1376-1397. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2020.0950

[53]. Pembi, S., Ikemefuna, M., Kibikiwa, G. M., & Zoakah, J. D. (2023). Conflict in Organisations: An Examination of Its Types, Sources, Effects and Management Strategies. *Organization and Human Capital Development*, 2(*1*), 53–65, https://doi.org/10.31098/orcadev.v2i1.1231

[54]. Preda, G. (2014). organisational ambidexterity and competitive advantage: Toward a research model. *Management & Marketing-Craiova*, (1), 67-74. https://doi.org/10.2014/58386.637

[55]. Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. (2001). Is the resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research? *Academy of management review*, 26(*1*), 22-40. Doi:10.2307/259392

[56]. PwC. (2023). *Africa FMCG Trends Report*.

[57]. PwC. (2023). *Supply Chain Challenges in Africa*.

[58]. Ramdan, M. R., Abdullah, N. L., Isa, R. M., & Hanafiah, M. H. (2021). Organisational ambidexterity within supply chain management: A scoping review. *LogForum*, 17(*4*), 531-546. http://dx.doi.org/10.17270/J.LOG.2021.618

[59]. Sabran, S., Ekowati, V.M.; Supriyanto, A.S., (2022). The interactive effects of leadership styles on counterproductive work behavior: An examination through multiple theoretical lenses. Qual. *Access Success*, 23(*188*): 145-153.

[60]. Schnellbächer, B., & Heidenreich, S. (2020). The role of individual ambidexterity for

organisational performance: examining effects of ambidextrous knowledge seeking and offering. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 45(*5*), 1535-1561. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-020-09781-x

[61]. Shahbandi, M. & Farrokhshad, H. (2019). organisational performance measurement based on competitive intelligence and strategic flexibility in food industry: Kalleh diary company in Iran case study. *Journal of Research in Marketing*, 11(*1*), 868-877. http://dx.doi.org/10.19012/esf.2019.v883

[62]. Statista. (2024). *U.S. DTC Market Growth*.

[63]. Stats SA. (2023). *South Africa Manufacturing Sector Report*.

[64]. Tahmasebifard, H. (2018). The role of competitive intelligence and its sub-types on achieving market performance. *Cogent Business and Management*, 5 (*1*), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1540073

[65]. Taylor, K. (2024). Six strategies to improve change agility. *Evergreen Leadership*. Accessed on October 4, 2024, from https://evergreenleadership.com/2024/01/11/six-strategies-to-improve-your-change-agility/

[66]. Torlak, N. G., & Kuzey, C. (2019). Leadership, job satisfaction and performance links in private education institutes of Pakistan. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *68*(2), 276-295. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2018-0182

[67]. Udin, U. (2023). Leadership styles and their associated outcomes: A bibliometric review using VOSviewer. *International Journal of Human Capital in Urban Management*, *8*(4), 443-456.

[68]. Watering, R.V., Makaker, P., & Dennehy, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence ambidexterity, adaptive transformation capability and their impact on performance under tumultuous times. *Springer Nature Switzerland*, I3(*E*), 25-37. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15342-6_3

[69]. World Bank. (2023). *Africa Pulse Report*.

[70]. World Bank. (2023). *African Economic Outlook*.

[71]. Yunita, T., Sasmoko, S., Bandur, A., & Alamsjah, F. (2023). organisational ambidexterity: The role of technological capacity and dynamic capabilities in the face of environmental dynamism. *Heliyon*, 9(*4*), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e14817

[72]. Zebarjad, K., & Rezaei, G. (2023). Analyzing the relationship between competitive intelligence activities and ethics with sustainable competitive advantage and capabilities of technology commercialization. *International Journal of Ethics and Society*, 4(*4*), 53-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.52547/ijethics.4.4.8

[73]. Zuochun, W. (2023). An empirical study of competitive intelligence activities, knowledge management processes and innovation performance. *International Journal of Science and Business*, 21(*1*), 83-96. https://doi.org/10.58970/IJSB.2078