



# STRATEGIC ORIENTATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH OF MANUFACTURING COMPANY IN RIVERS STATE

**Worluchem Ayodele**

*Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt Business*

**B. Chima Onuoha**

*Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt*

**Best C. Eke**

*Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt*

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra5286>

## ABSTRACT

*The study empirically examined strategic orientation and organizational health of a manufacturing company in Rivers State. Data for the study were primarily sourced with the use of questionnaire. Strategic orientation was captured with strategic vigilance, strategic flexibility and environmental dynamism, while organizational health was captured using resource utilization and goal focus. In testing the hypotheses, the data were collected and analyzed using the non-parametric method, Kendall's. From the result of the study, it was discovered that strategic vigilance has the potential to significantly influence an organization's resource utilization while strategic vigilance can significantly influence the goal focus of an organization. Furthermore, it was also discovered that strategic flexibility has the potential to significantly influence an organization's utilization of resources while strategic flexibility can significantly influence the goal focus of an organization. It was also unraveled that environmental dynamism does not significantly motivate the relationship between orientation and organizational health. Based on the result of the study, the following recommendations are made; organization should work to improve vigilance with regards to the environment of business and come up with new insight or ideas on how to appropriately allocate available resources and exhaustively utilize same to the benefit of the organization. Furthermore, organizational dynamism should be sought after by manufacturing organizations as it enhances the ability to increase productivity, profit, and ensure organizational health.*

## INTRODUCTION

Organizational health is an organization's ability to function effectively, to cope with change appropriately, and to grow from within which results in high performance. In the case of any industry, sound organizational health could cause the needed change. organizational health could enhance various organizations to blend with (their) environment thereby establishing certain form of harmony and good working

relationship among its stakeholders (Mohsen, Mohammad, Naghi and Afsouran, 2014). To the manufacturing industry, organizational health could create a harmonious working relationship among workers therein. A healthy organization has a greater probability or potential to growing sustainably, irrespective of the turbulence and dynamism encountered in the industry (Aydan, Burcu and Didem, 2013). The need for organizational health in the



manufacturing industry cannot be overemphasized, no wonder, Yiannis and Kyriakos (2014) noted that organizational health is a key element needed for an organization to thrive. One of the ways in which an organization could achieve sound health is to be strategically orientation.

Strategic orientation on the other hand, tend to give a supportive base for competitive advantage by capitalizing on new innovations. When new technological advancement is made, an industry that exhibit high level of strategic orientation, especially the manufacturing industry is able to quickly take advantage of such change. Strategic orientation endears the various firms to strategically respond to modifications in the business environment. One major significance of strategic orientation to manufacturing industry is empowering various manufacturing firms produce goods at lesser production costs using latest innovation to their advantage Kwon, Ryu and Park (2018) stated that, strategic orientation is what keeps firms ahead of its competitors. As the name suggests, it alerts firms of changes in the industry; such as change in customer taste, activities of competitors, market trends. Thus, preparing the organization for future contingencies (Saed and Khaled, 2017).

Taking this down to the Nigeria economy, over the past few years, the manufacturing industry has been the strategic industry responsible for significantly improving the economy's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The manufacturing industry was fast becoming the backbone of the Nigerian economy, creating job opportunities, infrastructural facilities, and general increase in the standard of living. However, a recent trend observed in the manufacturing industry has left the economy in a consistent deteriorating state (Abdullah, 2009). Today, the manufacturing industry has been under continuous pressure to reduce its operating cost and improve product delivery speed, at the same time sustaining its quality. The manufacturing cost, which was thought to be excellent, just few years ago, is just not good enough now. The Nigerian manufacturing industry is saddled with poor infrastructural development which has slowed down the production of certain goods (Oyewole, 2004). As argued by Sangosanya (2011), the inadequate government support for industrializing small and medium enterprises in the manufacturing business has created an obstacle for the manufacturing industry to thrive. Notwithstanding the high cost of acquiring industrial machine and equipment, the government still give so little or no assistance to manufacturing industry. As a result, the industry is burdened by the need to provide its own finance, equipment as well as the raw materials needed. Nevertheless, these may be quite expensive or not readily available for the

continuous operations of the manufacturing activities based on which many manufacturing firms in Nigeria came to a closure between the years of 2000 and 2008. The problems confronting the Nigeria manufacturing industry has also risen from the incessant demand of Nigerians for imported products. It is difficult to continue production even when there is no market for the produced goods. Therefore, the study is aimed at examining strategic orientation and organizational health of a manufacturing company in Rivers State.

## HYPOTHESES

**Ho<sub>1</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic vigilance and resource utilization of the manufacturing industry in Rivers State.

**Ho<sub>2</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic vigilance and goal focus of the manufacturing industry in Rivers State.

**Ho<sub>3</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization of the manufacturing industry in Rivers State.

**Ho<sub>4</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic flexibility and goal focus of the manufacturing industry in Rivers State.

**Ho<sub>5</sub>** Environmental dynamism does not significantly motivate the relationship between orientation and organizational health of the manufacturing industry in Rivers State.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The organization is designed to meet stated objectives by maximizing profits and create value. Pagano and Schivardi (2003) gave an idea that we can really distinguish the organization only by taking consideration of administrative structure compensations as well as expenses. Pagano and Schivardi (2003) seminal contribution give thought that organizations are established because of friction in the price mechanism. The survival prospects of new organization's will depend on their learning ability with regards to the environment, strategic choices, and available resources. Pagano and Schivardi (2003) created a representation in which organizations is made up of a number of individuals making a decision; many of the decision makers will have various objectives. The organization as a connection: the boundaries of the organization fall solely on the kind of activities it carries out and how these activities fit with other organization.

The theory does not make a difference between general public and organization-level transactions (Pagano and Schivardi, 2003), because the theory says that the general public and the organization only differ in the nature of the agreement. The object to the notion that things done within the organization are handled or



control by authority, and correctly lay out the role of agreements as a vehicle for voluntary exchange. Michael and William (1976) maintained that, the theory of organization growth is an opportunity to bring together innovative approaches in a bid to pave way for the needed technological change. They noted that a firm is seen as the ownership of or the property rights to a firm. This theory pin-points that those former post transaction costs (costs of monitoring, measuring), which can be reduced by ex-ante statements (Pagano and Schivardi, 2003). (subject to) Constant improvement in size is therefore an extremely vital events in firm demography (Wissen, 2002).

### **Strategy Orientation**

Strategic orientation is the ability to link the long-range vision of Indigenous self-determination to daily work, ranging from a simple understanding to a sophisticated awareness of the full impact of thinking and actions. Njeru, Bwisa and Kihoro (2012) opined that strategic orientation could add value to any business substantially. In an exact manner, strategic orientation shows to recognize opportunity as the ability to pinpoint the market changes and their impact on the establishment. Orientation as a process helps entrepreneurs to be aware of modifications and fluctuations that happen around them (Njeru, Bwisa and Kihoro, 2012). Strategic orientation represents the capability of managers to produce previously unrealized potential worth in the procedure of identifying and developing brand new ideas (Jintong, Michele and Lowell, 2012). Gaglio and Katz (2001) opined that entrepreneurial orientation includes distinctive information-processing skills that aid the utilization of any form of business models designed to make the business grow.

Kirzner (2008) is of the opinion that, strategic orientation can potentially aid entrepreneurs to be aware of changes within where they operate. Strategic orientation and the development of creative - cognition to enable any individual to organise and interpret statistics in various industries of knowledge linked to the development of new opportunities say's (Jintong, Michele and Lowell, 2012). Strategic orient people have more known fact on mental models (Gaglio and Katz, 2001). McMullen and Shepherd (2006) argue that strategic orientation is fast becoming an entrepreneurial behaviour in which a person who is conscious of his environment act to seize and utilize opportunities. Strategic orientation is defined as an ability to notice, without search, opportunities that have hitherto been overlooked. Strategic orientation can be seen as a sense to uncover the events and trends in the industry (Kirzner, 2008). Strategic orientation provides managers or producers with a maximum aptitude to make use of knowledge to pinpoint and interpret facts

in different knowledge domains linked to the creation of new opportunities (Jintong, Michele and Lowell, 2012). Strategic orientation includes creative and artistic action and may impact the type of dealings for the future (Tang, Kacmar and Busenitz, 2012; Kirzner, 2008). Strategic vigilance when coordinated among business levels keeps a calm on routine inertia, which assists the firms to break down its institutionalized technological procedures and explores new alternatives. Strategic vigilance could be seen as many opportunities used by several firms for its own interests and acknowledge the difficulties and assess them and, the firm's ability to act toward limiting them. Strategic vigilance shows a particular type of dynamic ability that allows firms to realize a competitive advantage in turbulent markets. Strategic vigilance has been generally applied by strategy scholars to reduce firm's abilities to give answers to plenty demands from dynamic competitive environments. organizations aspire to achieve strategic vigilance, most often defined as the ability to identify innovation opportunities, commit resources to new courses of action, or reverse unproductive resource deployment.

### **Organizational Health**

Organizational Health is an organization's ability to function effectively, to cope with change appropriately, and to grow from within which results in high performance. Accordingly, the ideology behind organizational health, was first put forward in 1969 by Matthew Miles, in which a simulation was established in the environments of schools (Miles, 1969). Organizational Health has the capability of any firm to blend to its surroundings, establish a certain amount of balance and harmony among its employers and realize its set goals (Korkmaz, 2006; Turingan, 2002). Organizational health is defined as the capability of an organization to have a regular impact with its surroundings and cite certain improvement of such capabilities (Sharifi and Agasi, 2010). A healthy organization is a context in which employees tend to stay with and show effective presence (Mahmoudi, 2005). Any firm or establishment with a certain level of organizational health has a surrounding that seeks to encourage organizational performance and assist its employee well- being to enable the firm to achieve its goals (Bevans, Bradshaw, Miech and Leaf, 2007). Organization health is explained as a connection with the health and wellbeing of the workers and the system entirely. Scholars have arrived at a conclusion that organizational health is the ability of an organization to keep a certain amount of balance and calmness for the expansion of organizational health (Hoy and Miskel, 2005). Organizational health has been explained as, the organization's ability to successfully adapt to their surroundings, and establish harmony among its



employers and to achieve its set target (Chauvin, 2010). Organizational health is an organization's ability to function effectively, to cope adequately, to change appropriately and to grow from within (Hill, 2003). organizational health perspective acknowledges that a worker's well-being and organizational performance are determined by both individual and organizational performance (Murphy and Cooper, 2003).

In particular, organizational health looks at a certain concept that studies the worker's welfare and organization effectiveness together. If any of the employers of the social system are left out of the entire procedure, unhappiness will be present, resulting in a decreasing of the organizational health of the institution (Hoy and Miskel, 2005). Organizational health has considerable effect on each system in terms of physical, psychological, safety, belonging, valuing the wisdom, exert, and personality of shareholders' aspects (Hoy and Miskel, 2005). An organization that is healthy overcomes the treats pose from external forces and directs its forces to main realization of target of the organization (Mirkalamli and Malekinia, 2008).

Armstrong (2005) lay's out that management of human resource is composed of procedures that promote mutuality in terms of goals, influence, respect, rewards and responsibility. It is geared towards providing quality service and to optimize the profitability (Tezera and Yadesa, 2017). They observed that resources should be utilized in such an exact manner that workers obtain the greatest possible compensation from their capabilities and the workers receive both materials and psychological rewards. Resource utilization involves creating the structure of any organization by ensuring the positions given match the skills of people hired for the task (Torrington, 2005). Aswathapa (2008) on a similar note, opined that, an employee's personal objectives are to be met if employers are to be held down, retained and encouraged. Raymond (2003) noted that, it is quite very important to realize the set goals of the organization with not just acquisition but also the utilization of the proper quality and quantity material resource used to achieve service.

Torrington (2005) insisted that, handling of resourceful people, requires a non-stop re-balancing between attaining the human aspiration of the employees and reaching the strategic and financial wants of the set business. Material resource management is always there to all types of organization, it is normal, because no organization can exist or survive without it (Tezera and Yadesa, 2017). Keitany, Daniel and Salome (2014) have their opinions that resources management is an instrument to optimize performance in reaching client service requirements at the same time ensuring to gain profitability by reducing

costs and making the proper use of available resources. Resource utilization is a managerial function that provides assistance for managers to hire, pick from the best, educate them on the culture of the firm, and develop members for the firm (Aswathapa, 2008). Material resource management is identified to be that, procedure of management, which coordinated, supervises and excites the assignments associated with the continuous movement of materials to, though, and exit of an organization in a combined fashion (Datta, 2004). Attention mostly is given to resources department then important issues arise with salary shortages, excess freight, and physical inventory losses.

### Goal Focus

A goal should be attainable, which means that an individual has a realistic chance of achieving the goal (Sebastian, 2015). A goal either personal or the organization's own can be explained as the intellectual representation enveloping the linking of means to required outcomes. Process focus is the extent to which an individual attends to the sections of the goal that are linked to the means, whereas goal focus is the level to which a worker attends to the sections of outcomes and ramification of goal pursuit (Freund et al., 2012). Mussweiler and Strack (2000) found that providing an individual a challenging goal going against an easy goal on an attention duty or an intelligence test enhances production, but left other individuals questioning their concentration capabilities and in general intelligence. Performance goal is an object that refers to the pleasure of reaching an exact standard of proficiency on a given assignment, usually within a range set time. Barsky (2007) argues that goal focus setting interferes with honorable decision making by trying to make it harder for workers to recognize honorable problems and easier for them to rationalize behaviors that are not honorable.

A goal-focused manager lays out the goals and explains the province responsibilities for his or her followers (Colbert and Witt, 2009). They discovered that goals anticipate both result and provides a better satisfaction than a measure of wants for achievement. Consequently, goal-focus provides a citation point against which employers can live up to their satisfaction (utility) by dividing their performance into gains, when the target goal is realized, and losses, when performance falls below the set goals (Falk and Knell, 2014; Koch and Nafziger, 2011; Gómez-Miñambres, 2012). As goal-focus setting increases acquired motivation, it can harm fundamental motivation – appealing in a task for its own sake (Freund et al., 2012). Goal focus are made up of means and ends, they sometimes act as channels for new knowledge and arrange its information in terms of means and ends (e.g., Woike, Lavezzary, and Barsky, 2001). The act of



goal setting is a needed competency section for individuals associated with the learning-to-learn talents, individuals need to interact in close-up learning (William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, 2013). We define goal-focused leadership as leaders who manifest practices and policies to communicate the organizational goals and align followers' effort with these goals (Colbert and Witt, 2009).

Sebastian (2015) pointed to the issue of management theorists and practitioners broadly agree that goals should be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timed (SMART). Locke and Latham (2006) claim, so long as a person is committed to the goal, has the requisite ability to attain it, and does not have conflicting goals, there is a positive, linear relationship between goal difficulty and task performance. Goals have been regarded as building blocks for the realization of a variety of developmental duties and their realization is most likely to booster long-term patterns of successful development (Freund and Riediger, 2006). Schunk (2003) explains that individuals make use of goals to show explicit their actions, and assess their growth, and push their own learning over time. The goal-focused leader also sets the direction and clarifies the goals for the employee which allows the employees to perform well (Colbert and Witt, 2009).

By setting goals, leaders may produce a decadent treadmill in which workers are encouraged by external means (targets, compensation, etc.) and not by the intrinsic importance of the job itself (Garcia-Zamora, Gonzalez-Benito and Munoz-Gallego, 2013). Goals ingrain life with understanding and administer structure and direction. Employers work harder and carry out duties better because they are more encourage with those difficult goals. Workers responded to the goals by increasing their output and decreasing their on-the-job leisure activities (Sebastian, 2015). Locke and Latham (2006), when the goals are specific, it provides a clear, unambiguous, and objective means for assessing the employee performance.

### **Environmental Dynamism**

Environmental dynamism describes the rate and instability of changes in a firm's external environment (Dess and Beard, 1984). Across industries there are significant differences in terms of the impacts of environmental characteristics on firms. Environmental dynamic capabilities, entails the creation of new operational abilities and are resulting as a very important source of sustainable advantage competitively (Zahra et al., 2006). Perez-Luno, Wiklund, Cabrera (2011) defined the environmental dynamism as the extent of unpredictability or environmental uncertainties surrounding a business enterprise. Environmental dynamism is defined as the

extent of frequency of change in technology, demand and competition (Freel, 2005). He suggested that environmental dynamism is made up of continuous upgrade in technology, general public desire and other firms regarded as competitors and is a surrounding condition underlying uncertainty and more risk. Firms operating in dynamic environments are most likely to make a profit from creation of a new product innovation than firms operating in constant surroundings (Zahra et al., 2006). Freel (2005) noted that, environmental dynamism is a reaction gotten by the elaboration and fluctuation of the exchange in the environment. He opined that a large level of degree of disturbance in the surroundings will bring out innovation by creating an organization more alert of 'cues' to innovate. However environmental dynamism is seen to be the uncertainty of future advancement or occasions (Seyed, 2012). Environmental dynamic capabilities are resting extensively on brand new knowledge rather than on existing knowledge as environmental dynamism increases (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000).

Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) also found that environmental dynamism controlling effect is outsourcing and organization performance. Environmental dynamism highlights the rate and unpredictability of evolving in an organization's external surroundings (Freel, 2005). Garcia-Zamora, González-Benito and Muñoz-Gallego (2013) discovered that environmental dynamism can control the strategic decision procedure and firm performance. Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) regarded environmental dynamism as a speed of package adapting, the evolving frequency of client's preference and operational surroundings. Environmental dynamism is regarded as the rate of change (Freel, 2005). Garcia-Zamora, González-Benito and Muñoz-Gallego (2013), classified environmental dynamism into: exactly which is made up of hostility and rivalry in regards to competition; and general which focuses on market, competition and technological turbulence.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The research design employed for the study is quasi-experimental design. While the cross-sectional research design was used since the research has to do with diverse locations and because the study is a descriptive study, and being a detailed analysis of a selected number of cases involving the analysis of interrelationships among several variables. The target population for the study comprises of managers, supervisors, and foremen of all the manufacturing firms in Rivers State. Out of the entire registered and licensed manufacturing firms in Rivers State, only 15 were studied which make up our



accessible population. Hence the accessible population is 107 managers, supervisors, and foremen drawn from the 15 manufacturing firms. The sample size (S) was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan table, which amounted to 86 managers, supervisors, and foremen as the minimum sample size (S) from a population size (N) of 107 managers, supervisors, and foremen which was selected using probability sampling. Meanwhile,

Bowley’s (1926) proportional allocation technique was used to allocate responders for the sample size for each of the firm.

In testing the hypotheses, the data were collected and analyzed using the non-parametric method, Kendall’s. This was used since the investigation involves relationship testing for binary variables (Zikmund, 2003).

### Hypotheses Testing Distribution and Retrieval of Questionnaire

Questionnaire	Number Distributed	Number Returned and Used
Frequency	86	100%
Percentage	81	94%

Source: Research Survey, 2020.

A total of 86 (100%) were distributed and retrieval of distributed copies recorded a success of 81 (94%) copies; thereafter, copies were examined and cleaned for errors, missing values and blank sections.

### Bivariate Data Analysis

In this section, data results for the analysis and tests for

#### Correlations

		Strategic Vigilance	Resource Utilization
Strategic Vigilance	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.295
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001
	N	81	81
Resource Utilization	Correlation Coefficient	.295	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.
	N	81	81

Source: SPSS Output, 2020.

		Strategic Vigilance	Goal Focus
Kendall's tau_b	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.276
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001
	N	81	81
Strategic	Correlation Coefficient	.276	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.
	N	81	81

Source: SPSS Output, 2020.



Table with 4 columns: Variable, Statistic, Strategic Flexibility, Resource Utilization. Rows include Kendall's tau\_b for Strategic Flexibility and Resource Utilization with Correlation Coefficient, Sig. (2-tailed), and N values.

Source: SPSS Output, 2020.

Table with 4 columns: Variable, Statistic, Strategic Flexibility, Goal Focus. Rows include Kendall's tau\_b for Strategic and Goal Focus with Correlation Coefficient, Sig. (2-tailed), and N values.

Source: SPSS Output, 2020.

The section examines the relationship between the dimensions of the predictor variable (Strategic orientation) and the measures of the criterion (Organizational health) which constitutes the objective of the study. A total of five null (hypothesis one to hypothesis five) bivariate relationships are tested in this section using the Kendall's tau statistical technique at a 95% confidence interval. The decision rule is set at a critical region of p > 0.05 for acceptance of the null hypothesis and p < 0.05 for rejection of the null hypothesis.

Relationship between strategic vigilance and resource utilization

Reveals that there is a significant relationship between strategic vigilance and resource utilization (where rho = .295 and p =0.001) hence we find that strategic vigilance is associated with resource utilization and based on the decision rule of p < 0.05 for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between strategic vigilance and resource utilization.

Relationship between strategic vigilance and goal focus

Ho2 Strategic vigilance has no significant relationship with goal focus data reveals that there is a significant relationship between strategic vigilance and goal focus (where rho = .276 and p = 0.001) hence we find that strategic vigilance is associated with goal focus and based on the decision rule of p < 0.05 for null

rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between strategic vigilance and goal focus.

Relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization

Ho3 There is no significant relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization. It was discovered that there is a significant relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization (where rho = .398 and p = 0.000) hence we find that strategic flexibility is associated with resource utilization and based on the decision rule of p < 0.05 for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization

Relationship between strategic flexibility and goal focus

Ho4 Strategic flexibility has no significant relationship goal focus. It was revealed that there is a significant relationship between strategic flexibility and goal focus (where rho = .328 and p =0.000) hence we find that strategic flexibility is associated with goal focus and based on the decision rule of p < 0.05 for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that there is a significant relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization.



**Resource Utilization**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Urban	11	72.0	34.0
Rural	4	72.0	-34.0
Total	15		

**Test Statistics**

	Facility type
Chi-Square	32.111 <sup>a</sup>
Df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 72.0.

The study made use of the chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistical tools to ascertain whether or not the location of the manufacturing firms in Rivers State affect the resource utilization of the sampled manufacturing firms. The null hypothesis tested is that the location of the manufacturing firm in Rivers State does not affect the efficient utilization of resources against the alternative that it does. From the table above, the chi-square test statistics of 32.111 has a probability value of 0.000. We therefore reject the null hypothesis, as location does affect resource utilization.

**Goal Focus**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Urban	11	3.0	-1.0
Rural	4	3.0	1.0
Total	15		

**Test Statistics**

	Tertiary
Chi-Square	.667 <sup>a</sup>
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.414

a. 2 cells (100.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 3.0.

In similar vein, we extend the analysis of this paper to evaluating the effect of location on the goal focus of firms in the manufacturing industry in Rivers State. We test the null hypothesis of no significant influence against the alternative of significant influence. The result of the test carried out using the Chi-square test approach gives a test statistics of 0.667 with a probability value of 0.414. We therefore fail to reject the null hypothesis, as location is not a moderating factor in the achievement of the goal of the manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

**DISCUSSION ON FINDINGS**

**Ho<sub>1</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic vigilance and resource utilization of manufacturing industry in Rivers State

1. It was found that strategic vigilance has the potential to significantly influence an organization’s resource utilization.

The outcomes led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, and the alternative stating that there is a significant relationship between strategic vigilance and resource utilization of manufacturing industry was accepted. Based on the result, it was concluded that strategic vigilance is a part of the overall risk management strategy involved in utilizing resources. The findings agree with that Aswathapa (2008) observed that resource utilization is a managerial function that provides assistance for managers to hire, pick from the best, educate them on the culture of the firm, and develop members for the firm. Thus, enhancing vigilance that will help utilize the resources required for this purpose.

**Ho<sub>2</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic vigilance and goal focus of manufacturing industry in Rivers State

2. It was found that strategic vigilance can significantly influence the goal focus of an organization. The outcomes led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, and the alternative stating that there is a significant relationship between strategic vigilance and goal focus of manufacturing industry was accepted. The result showed that strategic vigilance is a perfect pattern that enables organizations painstaking focus on its corporate goals.

The outcome agrees with the study Woike, Lavezzary and Barsky (2001) which observed that goal focus is made up of means and ends that sometimes act as channels for new knowledge and arrange its information in terms of means and ends. Thus, a goal focused organization is one that is vigilant about its strategies, policies and environment.

**Ho<sub>3</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization of manufacturing industry in Rivers State





3. It was found that strategic flexibility has the potential to significantly influence an organization's utilization of resources.

The outcomes led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, and the alternative stating that there is a significant relationship between strategic flexibility and resource utilization of manufacturing industry was accepted. Based on the result, it was concluded that lack of reflexivity has been interpreted as a cause of underutilization of organizational resources. The outcome is in consonance with the study of Zhou et al. (2008) which pointed out that strategic flexibility is an exact kind of complementary organizational capability that can assist the firm to achieve the full utilization of its vital resources.

**Ho<sub>4</sub>** There is no significant relationship between strategic flexibility and goal focus of manufacturing industry in Rivers State.

4. It was found that strategic flexibility can significantly influence the goal focus of an organization.

The outcomes led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, and the alternative stating that there is a significant relationship between strategic flexibility and goal focus of manufacturing industry was accepted. The result concluded that goal focused organizations are those that can be flexible enough to incorporate environmental changes into the organizations developed strategy, focused on attaining its corporate goal. The outcome is in consonance with the study of Garcia-Zamora, Gonzalez- Bento and Munoz-Gallego (2013) which viewed that goal setting encourages managers to produce a decadent treadmill in which workers are encouraged by external means (targets, compensation, etc.) and not by the intrinsic importance of the job itself.

**Ho<sub>5</sub>** Environmental dynamism does not significantly motivate the relationship between orientation and organizational health.

5. It was found that environmental dynamism can significantly motivate the relationship between orientation and organizational health.

The outcomes led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, and the alternative stating environmental dynamism can significantly motivate the relationship between orientation and organizational health of manufacturing industry was accepted. Based on the result, it was concluded that environmental dynamism which is perceived as a range of change and turn-over in the marketing forces of the external/task surrounding can highly motivate and keep the orientation of an organization at its peak. Thus, improving organizational health. The outcome agrees with the study of Jintong, Michele and Lowell (2012) which observed that strategy alert organizations have stand out

preparedness and readiness to explore an opportunity ahead of other organizations.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The environment of business today is characterized with changes, complexities, and challenges; therefore, organizations should work to improve vigilance with regards to the environment of business and come up with new insight or ideas on how to appropriately allocate available resources and exhaustively utilize same to the benefit of the organization. Again, strategic flexibility enables organizations to react sufficiently and suitably to changes, complexities, and challenges in the business environment. This could be applied by organizations as a defense mechanism, depending to the nature of changes that occurs. Lastly, organizational dynamism should be sought after by manufacturing organizations as it enhances the ability to increase productivity, profit, and ensure organizational health.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, H. (2009). *Major challenges to the effective management of human resource training and development activities*. *The J. Int. Soc. Res.* 2(8): 11- 25.
2. Armstrong, M. (2005). *A handbook of Human Resource Management practice, (9th eds.)*. Cambrian Printers Ltd. Wales.
3. Aswathapa, K (2008). *Human Resource Management: Text and cases, (5th eds)*. McGraw Hill. New Delhi.
4. Aydan, Y., Burcu, D. and Didem, K. (2013). *The relation between organizational health and organizational commitment*. *Mediterranean J. Soc. Sci.* 4(10):781-788.
5. Balwinder, S., (2006). *OECD Global forum on governance sharing lessons on promoting good governance and integrity in public procurement*.
6. Barsky, A. (2007). *Understanding the ethical cost of organizational goal- setting: A review and theory development*. *J. Bus. Ethics*, 81(1): 63-81.
7. Bevans, K., Bradshaw, C, Miech, R., and Leaf, P. (2007). *Staff and school level predictors of school organizational health: A multilevel analysis*. *J. School Health*, 77(6): 294-302.
8. Bowley, A.L. (1926). *Measurement of precision attained in sampling*. *Bulletin of Institute of International Statistics, Gallicia*.
9. Breckel, T.P.K., Giessing, C., and Thiel, C. M. (2011). *Impact of brain networks involved in vigilance on processing irrelevant visual motion*. *NeuroImage*, 55(4), 1754-1762.
10. Chauvin, S. D. (2010). *Relationship within principal leadership behavior, organizational health, and academic achievement of at-risk*



- students. Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation Southeastern Louisiana University.
11. Colbert, A., and Witt, L. (2009). The role of goal-focused leadership in enabling the expression of conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 790-796.
  12. Datta, J. (2004) *Materials management: procedures, text and cases*. (2nd eds.), New Delhi.
  13. Eisenhardt, K.M. and Martin, J.K. (2000). Dynamic Capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Manage. J.* 21: 1105-1121.
  14. Falk, A., and Knell, M., (2014). Choosing the Joneses: Endogenous goals and reference standards. *The Scandinavian J. Econ.* 106(3): 417–435.
  15. Freel, M. (2005). Perceived environmental uncertainty and innovation in small firms, *Small Bus. Econ.* 25' 49-64.
  16. Freund, A. M., and Riediger, M. (2006). Goals as building blocks of personality and development in adulthood. In D. K. Mroczek and T. D. Little (Eds.), *Handbook of personality development* (pp. 353–372). Mahwah, NJ, US: Erlbaum.
  17. Freund, A.M., Hennecke, M., and Mustafić, M. (2012). On gains and losses, means and ends: Goal orientation and goal focus across adulthood. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 280–300). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
  18. Gaglio, C.M. and Katz, J.A. (2001). The psychological basis of opportunity identification: Entrepreneurial orientation. *Small Bus. Econ.* 16, 95-111
  19. Garcia-Zamora, E., Gonzalez-Benito, O. and Munoz-Gallego, P.A. (2013). Organizational and environmental factors as moderators of the relationship between multidimensional innovation and performance. *Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice.* 15(2): 224–244.
  20. Gilbert, C.G. (2005). Unbundling the structure of inertia: resource versus routine rigidity. *Academy of Management J.* 48(5):741–763.
  21. Gómez-Miñambres, J. (2012). Motivation through goal setting. *J. Econ. Psychol.* 33:6: 1223–1239.
  22. Grewal, R. and Tansuhaj, P. (2001) Building organizational capabilities for managing economic crisis: The role of market orientation and strategic flexibility, *J. Marketing*, 65:67-80.
  23. Hill, G.D., (2003). Organizational health: Using an assessment tool to diagnose internal conditions and relationships before writing a prescription. *The School Administrator*, [www.organizationalhealth.com](http://www.organizationalhealth.com).
  24. Hoy, W.K., and Miskel, C.G. (2005). *Educational administration theory, research and practice*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
  25. [http://www.hewlett.org/wpcontent/uploads/2016/08/Deeper\\_Learning\\_D](http://www.hewlett.org/wpcontent/uploads/2016/08/Deeper_Learning_D)
  26. Jintong, K., Michelle, K.K. and Lowell, B. (2012). Entrepreneurial orientation in the pursuit of new opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(1), 77-94.
  27. keitany, JP, Daniel MW, and Salome R (2014) Assessment of the role of materials management on organizational performance: a case of new Kenya cooperative creameries limited, eldoret Kenya. *European J. Material Sci.* 1:1-10.
  28. Kirzner, I.M., (2008). The alert and creative entrepreneur: A clarification. *Research Institute of Industrial Economics, Stockholm SE*.
  29. Koch, A. K. and Nafziger, J. (2011). Self-regulation through goal setting. *The Scandinavian J. Econ.* 113(1); 212–227.
  30. Korkmaz, M. (2006). The relationship between organizational health and robust school vision in elementary schools. *Educ. Res. Quart.* 30(1): 14-36.
  31. Kwon, S., Ryu, D. and Park, E. (2018). The influence of entrepreneurs' strategic agility and dynamic capability on the opportunity pursuit process of new ventures: Evidence from South Korea. *Acad. Strat. Manage. J.* 17(1):1-17
  32. Latham, G.P., and Locke, E. A. (2006). Enhancing the benefits and overcoming the pitfalls of goal setting. *organizational Dynamics*, 35(4), 332-340.
  33. MacKinnon, W., Grant, G., and Cray, D., (2008). Enterprise information systems and strategic flexibility. *Proceedings of the 41st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, pp. 1-9.
  34. Mahmoudi, M. (2005). The role of organizational culture in preventing Administrative corruption. *Tadbir training- scientific monthly 2005; (160): 38-42*.
  35. McMullen, J.S., Shepherd, D.A., (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 31(1):132–152.
  36. Michael, C.J. and William H.M. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *J. Financial Econ.* 3(4): 305-360.
  37. Miles, M. B. (1969), *Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground*, in F. D. Carver and T. J. Sergiovanni (Eds.) *organizations and human behavior: Focus on Schools*, New York, McGraw Hill.
  38. Mirkalamli, S. and Malekinia, E. (2008). The relationship between employees' cooperation and organizational health of Senior High Schools. *Educ. Sci. Thought J.* p.3.
  39. Mohsen, F. F., Mohammad, H. M., Naghi, B. and Afsouran, S. M. (2014). The study of the relationship of organizational health of the schools and that of the student's' academic achievement: A case study of high schools of Kohkilouie and Boierahmad Province, Iran. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 628 – 633
  40. Murphy, L.R., and Cooper, C.L. (2003). *Healthy and productive work, an international perspective*. Taylor and Francis group, USA.



41. Mussweiler, T., and Strack, F. (2000). *The relative self: Informational and judgmental consequences of comparative self-evaluation*. *J. Personality and Soc. Psychol.* 79(1): 23-38.
42. Njeru, W.P., Bwisa, H.M., and Kihoro, J.M. (2012). *Assessing the relationship between perceived business orientation and business performance*. *Int. J. Bus. and Commerce*, 1(9): 52-66
43. Oyewole, A.A. (2004). *Utilization of indigenous inventions/research results by small and medium sized enterprises: The critical issues, key constraints and implementation strategies*. Paper presented at the 8th Annual conference of Heads of Research and Development in Nigerian Civil Services, Public and Private Enterprises, Organised by CMD, RMRDC and Abia State University, on August 2004, at Empire Hotels Ltd, Umuahia.
44. Pagano, P. and Schivardi, F. (2003). *Firm size distribution and growth*, *The Scandinavian J. Econ.* 105: 255–274.
45. Perez-Luno, A., Wiklund J. and Cabrera R.V. (2011). *The dual nature of innovative activity: How entrepreneurial orientation influences innovation generation and adoption*. *J. Bus. Venturing*. 26(5):555-571
46. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.03.001>
47. Raymond, A (2003) *Basic Marketing Management*. MC Graw Hill. New York.
48. Ruckstuhl, K.E., Festa-Bianchet, M., and Jorgenson, J.T. (2003). *Bite rates in rocky mountain bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis): effects of season, age, sex and reproductive status*. *Behavioral Ecol. And Sociobiol.* 54: 167–173.
49. Saed, H. G. and Khaled, M. A. (2017). *Impact of strategic agility on business continuity management (BCM): The moderating role of entrepreneurial orientation: An applied study in Jordanian insurance firms*. *Int. J. Bus. Manage.* 12(10):155-165
50. Sangosanya, A. O. (2011). *Firms' growth dynamics in Nigeria's manufacturing industry: A panel analysis*. *J. Appl. Econ. Rev.* 1(1): 1-18.
51. Schunk, D. H. (2003). *Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting and self-evaluation*. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19:159-172
52. Sebastian, J. G. (2015). *Goal setting and worker motivation*. *IZA World of Labor*. 178.
53. Seyed. H.J. (2012). *Environmental determinants, entrepreneurial orientation and export performance: Empirical evidence from Iran*. *Serbian J; Manag.*
54. Sharifi, A. and Agasi S. (2010). *Investigating the relationship between managers' performance and organizational health, Seeking Novel Solutions in Manage. J.* 4:149-168.
55. Shimizu, K. and Hitt, M. A. (2004). *Strategic flexibility: organizational preparedness to reverse ineffective strategic decisions*. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, 44–59
56. Tezera, D, and Yadesa D (2017). *Assessment of material resource utilization practices and its challenges: The Case of Wollega University*. *J. Hotel Bus Manage* 6: 155. doi: 10.4172/2169-0286
57. Tang, J., Kacmar, K.M. and Busenitz, L. (2012). *Entrepreneurial orientation in the pursuit of new opportunities*. *J. Bus. Venturing*, 27, 77-94.
58. Torrington, D et al (2005). *Human Resource Management, (6th eds)*. Pearson Education Ltd. Boston.
59. Turingan, O.M. (2002). *organizational health of Philippine Colleges of Nursing cited as Centres of Excellence and its relationship to perceived organizational effectiveness and school performance*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Texas.
60. Uhlenbruck, K. (2003). *organizational transformation in transition economies: resource-based and organizational learning perspectives*. *J. Manage. Stud.* 40: 257–82.
61. Upton, (1994). *The management of manufacturing flexibility*, *California Management Review*, 72-89.
62. William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. (2013). *Deeper learning competencies*. Retrieved from
63. Wissen, L.V. (2002). *Demography of the firm: A useful metaphor?* *European J. Population.* 18: 263–279.
64. Woike, B., Lavezzary, E., and Barsky, J. (2001). *The influence of implicit motives on memory processes*. *J. Personality and Soc. Psychol.* 81: 935–945.
65. Worren, N, Moore K, Cardona P. (2002). *Modularity, strategic flexibility, and firm performance: a study of the home appliance industry*. *Strat. Manage. J.* 23(12):1123–1140.
66. Yiannis, X. and Kyriakos, T. (2014). *organizational health: Definition and assessment*. *Procedia Engineering*, 562 – 570.
67. Zahra, S.A., Sapienza, H.J. and Davidsson, P. (2006). *Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A review, model and research agenda*, *J. Manage. Stud.* 43/4:917-955.
68. Zhou, KZ, Li JJ, Zhou, N, and Su C. (2008). *Market orientation, job satisfaction, product quality, and firm performance: Evidence from China*. *Strategic Management Journal* 29(9): 985–1000.
69. Zikmund, W. G. (2003). *Business research methods (7th ed.)*. Ohio: Thomson South-Western