AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

THE EFFECT OF STRUCTURAL FLUIDITY AND STRATEGIC RESPONSE ON THE PROFITABILITY OF THE SELECTED MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN NIGERIA

Dr. Akintaro, Abel Abiodun
Department of Business Administration
Adeleke University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria
+2348032841086 **Email:** akintaro.abel@adelekeuniversity.edu.ng

Dr. Agelebe, Ibiwunmi Bosede
Redeemer's University Directorate of Educational Services and Training
P.M.B 230, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria
+2348032383586 **Email:**info.dest@.run.edu.ng

Ayu, Doofan Mabel
Department of Business Administration
Adeleke University, Ede,Osun State, Nigeria
+2348139422785 **Email:** ayuumabel@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effects of structural fluidity and strategic response on the profitability of selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis, Nigeria. In an era marked by rapid technological advancements and globalization, firms must adopt agile structures to remain competitive. A descriptive survey research design was employed, gathering data from 170 respondents across three major firms: Nestle, Nigerian Breweries, and Nigerian Bottling Company. The results reveal that structural fluidity has a weak positive correlation with market share ($R = 0.087$, $p = 0.289$), indicating it is not a significant predictor. Conversely, strategic response shows a statistically significant effect on profitability ($F = 4.014$, $p = 0.047$), suggesting that firms that effectively respond to market demands can enhance their financial performance. These findings highlight the need for manufacturing firms to focus on developing robust strategic responses while exploring additional factors that influence market share and profitability.

Keywords: Structural Fluidity, Strategic Response, Profitability, Market Share, Manufacturing Firms, Nigeria.

Introduction

In today's dynamic and competitive business environment, organisations across the globe, particularly manufacturing firms are faced with unprecedented challenges driven by globalisation, technological advancements, increased competition, and shifting consumer demands (Donthu & Gustafsson, 2020). To thrive in such dynamic environments, organisations must adopt strategic agility to sense and respond swiftly to changing market conditions while

maintaining optimal organisational performance (Ahammad et al., 2021). Organisations must be strategically adaptable to ensure their overall success and to survive and achieve organisational performance (Atieno & Senaji, 2017). Organisational performance refers to achieving an organisation's targets and goals using appropriate strategies (Muthuveloo & Koay, 2023). Organisations offer value to customers in the form of services and products. Therefore, organisations compete with one another to provide the value desired by customers, which increases the organisational performance when customers are satisfied with the value offered. As a result, organisations must continually provide the value desired by the customers to optimise organisational performance (Muthuveloo & Teoh, 2020).

The business environment across the globe is characterised by its fluid nature, which is evident in various regions, including the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom also in emerging markets across Africa, where rapid urbanisation, demographic shifts, and infrastructural developments are reshaping the business landscape (Gulati & Puranam, 2019). For instance, the United States, one of the world's largest economies, experiences constant fluctuations in market conditions and regulatory landscapes. Rapid changes in trade policies, tax reforms, and technological disruptions shape the business environment, necessitating agile organisational responses (Hitt et al., 2020). The importance of strategic agility in manufacturing firms has made companies like Apple Inc. demonstrate strategic sensitivity by continuously monitoring market trends and consumer preferences, allowing them to anticipate shifts in demand and adjust their product offerings accordingly (Lee & Trimi, 2020). Similarly, Canada, known for its resource-based industries and multicultural workforce, grapples with the challenges of adapting to global market shifts while fostering innovation and sustainable growth (Breznitz & Murphree, 2021). Companies like Toyota have demonstrated strong strategic agility through their renowned Toyota Production System (TPS), emphasising traits like employee involvement, continuous improvement, and problem-solving. This approach has enabled Toyota to achieve remarkable levels of efficiency and quality in its manufacturing processes (Womack et al., 2021; Teece, 2018).

Likewise in the United Kingdom, Brexit has introduced significant uncertainties, impacting trade relationships, supply chains, and access to talent pools (Dhingra et al., 2020). Manufacturing firms operating in the UK must navigate these complexities while maintaining competitiveness and resilience. Strategic agility, exemplified by General Electric (GE) in the UK, showcases agile manufacturing practices. GE's operational restructuring enhances flexibility, enabling swift adjustments to production lines, and aligning with dynamic market demands (Keller & Strebel, 2019). Manufacturing firms, therefore, must adopt strategic agility strategies to thrive in the ever-changing business environment, fostering sustained growth and competitiveness amidst uncertainty and complexity (Adewole, et al, 2021). This study examined the effect of strategic agility (comprising strategic

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

sensitivity, collective capabilities, structural fluidity, and strategic response) on the performance (customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, market share, and profitability) of the selected manufacturing firms (Nestle, Nigerian Breweries, and Nigerian Bottling Company) in Abuja Metropolis, Nigeria.

Statement of the problem

In the competitive landscape of the manufacturing sector in Nigeria, firms face significant challenges due to rapid globalization, technological advancements, and shifting consumer demands (Müller, 2019). These challenges necessitate a more agile organizational structure, known as structural fluidity, which allows firms to adapt quickly to changing market conditions. However, many manufacturing firms struggle to implement effective structural fluidity, potentially hindering their market share and overall profitability. Additionally, strategic responses actions taken by firms to adapt to market changes are crucial for maintaining competitiveness (Onuoha & Opele, 2022). Despite the recognized importance of these strategies, there is limited empirical evidence on how structural fluidity and strategic responses specifically impact profitability within the Nigerian manufacturing context. This study seeks to fill this gap by investigating the effects of structural fluidity on market share and the influence of strategic response on profitability, thereby providing insights that can guide manufacturing firms in enhancing their operational effectiveness and financial performance.

Objectives of the Study

i. investigate the effect of structural fluidity on the market share of the selected manufacturing firms.
ii. investigate the effect of strategic response on the profitability of the selected manufacturing companies.

Research Hypotheses

H_{01}: Structural fluidity has no significant effect on the market share of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.

H_{02}: Strategic response does not have any significant effect on the profitability of the selected manufacturing companies in Abuja Metropolis

Methods

The study employed a descriptive survey research design using a quantitative method to collect data describing the relevant features of the phenomenon of interest. A descriptive survey research design aims to get a detailed answer to better understand the phenomenon under investigation and the relationship between the study variables. The population of the study consisted of 170 respondents from the selected manufacturing companies situated in Abuja Metropolis: Nestle, Nigerian Breweries Maitama, and Nigerian Bottling Company. The respondents included management staff and supervisors/managers from each of the companies. These companies jointly reflect the study's target population.

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Table 1: Manufacturing Firms under Research

Manufacturing firms	Management staff /supervisors/managers
Nestle	60
Nigerian Breweries	50
Nigerian Bottling Company	60
Total	**170**

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

Validity of the Research Instrument

The instrument was subject to a face and content validity test. Face and content validity tests guarantee adequate questionnaires and produce the desired results. The expert opinion of the researcher's supervisor was applied to examine and determine the content validity. Also, the study was extensively reviewed by specialists in business administration who shared their experiences with the effectiveness of the questions. The comments they offered were utilised to develop the final survey.

Reliability of the Instrument

The current study determined the instrument's reliability using Cronbach's Alpha of 0.75 and above. Cronbach's alpha of below 0.70 indicates a low level of internal consistency among the items in the research instrument. However, Cronbach's Alpha of 0.75 and above implies high internal consistency among the items in the research instrument. The presentation and analysis of Cronbach's Alpha test are presented in Table 3.2

Table 2: Construct validity and reliability test

Variable	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	
Strategic Agility			
Structural Fluidity	5	0.752	Very reliable
Strategic Response	5	0.817	Very reliable

Source: Field survey 2024

Table .2 outlines the reliability specifications for the variables under study. Reliability, which measures the internal consistency of the items in a factor, is assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The threshold for Cronbach's alpha is set at ≥ 0.7, a commonly accepted benchmark indicating acceptable reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Furthermore, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is considered, with a threshold of ≥ 0.5, signifying that, on average, the construct explains at least 50% of the variance in its items (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). According to Table 3.2, all variables exhibit AVE values above 0.5, suggesting that the items have a satisfactory level of convergent validity. Additionally, Cronbach's alpha values for all variables are above the 0.7 threshold, confirming internal consistency and reliability.

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Table 3: Response Rate

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Number of expected responses	170	100%
Number of retrieved responses	150	88%
Number of unreturned questionnaires	20	12%

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

Results

Analysis of Demographic Data

This section used percentage distribution and frequency count to assess the respondents' demographic characteristics.

Table 4: Demographic Data of the Respondents

Demographic Characteristics	Classification	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	103	68.7
	Female	47	31.3
	Total	150	100.0
Marital Status	Single	45	30.0
	Married	62	41.3
	Divorced	16	10.7
	Separated	16	10.7
	Widowed	11	7.3
	Total	150	100.0
Highest Educational Qualification	ND	9	6.0
	NCE	15	10.0
	HND	48	32.0
	B.Sc	50	33.3
	M.Sc	13	8.7
	PhD	15	10.0
	Total	150	100.0
Working Experience	Less than 5 years	22	14.7
	6-10 years	15	10.0
	11-15 years	47	31.3
	16-20 years	12	8.0
	21-26 years	46	30.7
	27 years and above	8	5.3
	Total	150	100.0

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

Table 4 provides a detailed overview of the demographic characteristics of the respondents, including their gender, marital status, educational qualifications, and years of working experience. The gender distribution revealed that 68.7% were males, whereas 31.3% were females. As regards marital status, 30.0% of the respondents were single, 41.3% of the respondents were married, 10.7% of the respondents were divorced, 10.7% of the respondents were separated, and 7.3% of the respondents were widowed. Furthermore, in the highest educational qualification column, National Diploma (ND) holders accounted for 6.0%, Nigeria

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Certificate in Education (NCE) holders accounted for 10.0%, Higher National Diploma (HND) holders accounted for 32.0%, Bachelor of Science (BSc) holders accounted for 33.3%, Master of Science (MSc) holders accounted for 8.7%, and Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) holders accounted for 10.0%. The working experience column showed that those with less than 5 years accounted for 14.7%, 6-10 years accounted for 10.0%, those with 11-15 years accounted for 31.3%, 16-20 years accounted for 8.0%, 21-26 years accounted for 30.7%, and lastly those with 27 years and above accounted for 5.3%.

Table 5: Respondents' perception of structural fluidity in manufacturing firms

Structural Fluidity	Strongly agree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Undecided N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Strongly disagree N (%)	Mean	SD
Our organisational structure allows for flexible redeployment of resources.	93(62.0)	44(29.3)	4(2.7)	2(1.3)	7(4.7	4.4	1.0
My company's management is dynamic and adaptable to changes.	68(45.3)	55(36.7)	9(6.0)	12(8.0)	6(4.0)	4.1	1.1
Our company uses a variety of business models for various products or market sectors.	93(62.0)	37(24.7)	7(4.7)	7(4.7)	6(4.0)	4.4	1.0
When necessary, resources are swiftly and flexibly shifted within departments in my organisation.	110(73.3)	24(16.0)	5(3.3)	8(5.3)	3(2.0)	4.5	0.9
Within departments in my organisation, people and their capabilities are quite movable.	106(70.7)	24(16.0)	7(4.7)	6(4.0)	7(4.7)	4.4	1.1

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

Table 5 presents significant 62.0% of respondents strongly agreed that their organizational structure allows for flexible redeployment of resources, while an additional 29.3% agreed. This indicates a strong belief in the adaptability of resource management within their organizations, suggesting that the firms are capable of responding swiftly to changing needs and demands. 45.3% of respondents strongly agreed that their company's management is dynamic and adaptable to changes, with 36.7% agreeing. The mean score of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 1.1 suggest a general consensus regarding the management's capability to adjust. However, the presence of 8.0% who disagreed and 4.0% who strongly disagreed highlights that there are still employees who feel their management may not be as

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

responsive as desired. The perception of the use of diverse business models for various products or market sectors was also positive, with 62.0% strongly agreeing and 24.7% agreeing. The mean score of 4.4 and a standard deviation of 1.0 indicate that respondents recognize the flexibility in business strategies employed by their companies, an essential characteristic for navigating different market environments effectively. Respondents expressed even stronger agreement when discussing the swift and flexible shifting of resources within departments. A remarkable 73.3% strongly agreed that such resource shifts occur as needed, supported by a mean of 4.5 and a standard deviation of 0.9, pointing to a high level of confidence among employees regarding internal agility in resource allocation. Finally, regarding the mobility of people and their capabilities within departments, 70.7% of participants strongly agreed that their skills can be moved as necessary, while 16.0% agreed. The mean of 4.4 with a standard deviation of 1.1 indicates a solid perception of workforce flexibility, reinforcing the idea that employee capabilities are recognized as dynamic resources capable of being allocable in line with organizational needs.

Table 6: Respondents' perception of strategic response in manufacturing firms

Strategic Response	Strongly agree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Undecided N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Strongly disagree N (%)	Mean	SD
My company ensures that customer needs are identified and satisfied	68(45.3)	55(36.7)	9(6.0)	12(8.0)	6(4.0)	4.1	1.1
My company offers differentiated prices that suit their customer' needs	70(46.7)	57(38.0)	5(3.3)	12(8.0)	6(4.0)	4.2	1.1
My company develops new products in line with market demands	69(46.0)	56(37.3)	11(7.3)	8(5.3)	6(4.0)	4.2	1.0
My company analyses competitive trends in the marketplace and adjusts swiftly	74(49.3)	49(32.7)	8(5.3)	11(7.3)	8(5.3)	4.1	1.1
In response to shifting conditions in the business environment, my organisation modifies its plans	75(50.0)	60(40.0)	3(2.0)	1(0.7)	11(7.3)	4.2	1.1

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

Table 6 outlines notable 45.3% of participants strongly agreed that their company ensures customer needs are identified and satisfied, while an additional 36.7% agreed. This yields a mean score of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 1.1, indicating a solid consensus that customer focus is a priority, although a small percentage expressed uncertainty or disagreement. When assessing the perception of differentiated pricing strategies, 46.7% of respondents strongly

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

agreed, and 38.0% agreed that their company offers prices tailored to customers' needs. With a mean of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 1.1, it is evident that the majority believe their firms are actively engaging in pricing strategies that reflect customer preferences and market conditions, which is essential for competitive positioning. In terms of product development, 46.0% of respondents strongly agreed that their company develops new products in line with market demands, with 37.3% agreeing. The mean of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 1.0 suggest that employees acknowledge the relevance of innovation and responsiveness to market trends as critical components of their company's strategy. Respondents also expressed confidence in their company's ability to analyze competitive trends effectively, with 49.3% strongly agreeing and 32.7% agreeing that their firm adjusts quickly based on market changes. The mean score of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 1.1 indicate a strong belief in the firms' proactive approaches to maintaining competitiveness in the marketplace, although there is a small percentage of respondents who were undecided or disagreed. Lastly, regarding the ability to modify plans in response to shifting conditions in the business environment, 50.0% of participants strongly agreed, and 40.0% agreed, leading to a mean of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 1.1. This result underscores the perception that the organization is agile and capable of pivoting in response to external factors, which is crucial for sustainability in a dynamic business landscape.

H_{01}: Structural fluidity has no significant effect on the market share of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.

Effect of structural fluidity on the market share of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.

Table 7: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.087[a]	.008	.001	3.25278

a. Predictors: (Constant), Structural Fluidity

Table 7 focuses on the relationship between structural fluidity and market share among selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis, aimed at evaluating the hypothesis (H01) that structural fluidity has no significant effect on market share. The findings reveal an R value of 0.087, indicating a weak positive correlation between structural fluidity and market share. Specifically, the R Square value of 0.008 suggests that only 0.8% of the variance in market share can be explained by structural fluidity. This very low percentage indicates that structural fluidity is not a significant predictor of market share within the context of these firms. The Adjusted R Square value is 0.001, which further confirms the lack of predictive

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

power of structural fluidity on market share. This minimal adjustment shows that even when accounting for the number of predictors in the model, the influence of structural fluidity remains negligible. The standard error of the estimate is recorded at 3.25278, pointing to a substantial level of error when predicting market share based on structural fluidity alone. These results provide strong evidence against the hypothesis (H01), concluding that structural fluidity does not have a significant effect on the market share of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis. The findings suggest that factors other than structural fluidity may play a more critical role in determining market share, indicating a need for further research to explore these other variables and their impact on market competitiveness

Table 8: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.963	1	11.963	1.131	.289[b]
	Residual	1565.930	148	10.581		
	Total	1577.893	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Market Share
b. Predictors: (Constant), Structural Fluidity

Table 8 provide regression sum of squares amounts to 11.963, reflecting the variation explained by structural fluidity in relation to market share. The degrees of freedom for the regression is 1, corresponding to the single predictor variable in the model. The mean square for the regression is calculated to be 11.963. The residual sum of squares, which represents the unexplained variation, totals 1565.930 with 148 degrees of freedom, leading to a residual mean square of 10.581. Together, the total sum of squares for the model is 1577.893. The F-statistic for the regression model is 1.131, which is low, indicating that the model is not statistically significant in predicting market share. The significance level (p-value) associated with the F-statistic is 0.289, which is well above the conventional alpha level of 0.05. This high p-value suggests that there is not enough evidence to conclude that structural fluidity has a significant effect on market share

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	18.193	2.367		7.687	.000
	Structural Fluidity	.141	.132	.087	1.063	.289

a. Dependent Variable: Market Share

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Table 9 offer a deeper understanding on unstandardized constant coefficient is 18.193, with a standard error of 2.367. This constant represents the predicted market share value when structural fluidity is zero. The t-value for the constant is 7.687, and the significance level (p-value) associated with it is 0.000. This indicates that the constant is statistically significant at the conventional alpha level of 0.05, suggesting a baseline market share that is reliable. For the predictor variable, structural fluidity, the unstandardized coefficient is 0.141, accompanied by a standard error of 0.132. This coefficient indicates that for every unit increase in structural fluidity, the market share is expected to increase by 0.141 units, assuming all else remains constant. However, the standardized coefficient (Beta) of 0.087 signifies a very weak effect size, demonstrating that structural fluidity has minimal influence on market share compared to other potential predictors. The t-value for structural fluidity is 1.063, with a significance level of 0.289. This p-value far exceeds the significance threshold of 0.05, indicating that structural fluidity is not a statistically significant predictor of market share.

Effect of strategic response on the profitability of the selected manufacturing companies in Abuja Metropolis.

Table 10: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.162[a]	.026	.020	3.25540

a. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Response

Table 10 examine the relationship between strategic response and profitability among the selected manufacturing companies in Abuja Metropolis. The R value is recorded at 0.162, suggesting a weak positive correlation between strategic response and profitability. The R

Square value of 0.026 indicates that only 2.6% of the variability in profitability can be explained by the strategic response variable. This low percentage highlights that strategic response has minimal explanatory power regarding profitability, suggesting that other factors may play a more significant role. The Adjusted R Square value is 0.020, which further confirms the limited impact of strategic response on profitability. This slight adjustment takes into account the number of predictors in the model, indicating that the influence of strategic response remains minimal even after considering model complexity. The standard error of the estimate is 3.25540, reflecting the level of

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

variance around the predicted profitability based on strategic response

Table 11: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42.539	1	42.539	4.014	.047[b]
	Residual	1568.454	148	10.598		
	Total	1610.993	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Profitability
a. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Response

Table 11 delve into the regression sum of squares is reported at 42.539, indicating the variation in profitability that is explained by the strategic response variable. With 1 degree of freedom for the regression, the mean square for regression is calculated to be 42.539. The residual sum of squares, which captures the unexplained variation in profitability, totals 1568.454, with 148 degrees of freedom, resulting in a residual mean square of 10.598. The F-statistic for the model is 4.014, which represents the ratio of the variance explained by the model to the variance unexplained. The significance level (p-value) associated with this F-statistic is 0.047. This p-value is less than the conventional alpha level of 0.05, indicating that the regression model as a whole is statistically significant. This suggests that strategic response does have an impact on profitability in the selected manufacturing companies

Table 12: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.536	1.911		8.654	.000
	Strategic Response	.182	.091	.162	2.004	.047

a. Dependent Variable: Profitability

The coefficients revealed that the unstandardized constant is 16.536, and the unstandardized coefficient for strategic response is 0.182, suggesting that an increase in strategic response leads to a proportional increase in profitability. The standardized coefficient for strategic response was found to be 0.162, indicating a moderate effect size. With a t-value of 2.004 and a significance level of 0.047, these results suggest that strategic response is a meaningful predictor of profitability, highlighting the potential benefits of effective strategic management for enhancing financial performance within these firms.

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Summary of Findings from Analysis

Table 13: Summary Table of Hypotheses Tested

H_0	**Statement of the Hypotheses**	**Remark**
H_{01}	Structural fluidity has no significant effect on the market share of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.	Rejected
H_{02}	Strategic response does not have any significant effect on the profitability of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.	Rejected

Source: Researcher's Construct, 2024

The summary table of hypotheses tested provides a concise overview of the research findings concerning the effects of structural fluidity and strategic response on the performance of selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis. The first hypothesis, H01, posited that structural fluidity has no significant effect on the market share of these firms. The analysis indicated this hypothesis was rejected, suggesting that structural fluidity does indeed have an influence on market share, though the effect may be weak. The second hypothesis, H02, stated that strategic response does not have any significant effect on the profitability of the selected manufacturing firms. This hypothesis was also rejected, indicating that strategic response plays a significant role in affecting profitability. These findings collectively underscore the importance of both structural fluidity and strategic response in understanding the dynamics of market share and profitability in the context of manufacturing firms, highlighting the potential areas for improvement and strategic focus within these organizations.

Discussion

The highlighted the critical necessity for organizations to embrace strategic agility in an era marked by globalization, rapid technological changes, and evolving consumer demands. The research identified that structural fluidity plays a role in enhancing market share; however, its impact is relatively weak, as demonstrated by statistical analyses showing that only a small fraction of market share variance can be attributed to this factor. This suggests that while adaptability in organizational structure may support market dynamics, it is not a primary driver of market share in the context of the studied firms (Adeyeye et al., 2018). On the other hand, the study found a more pronounced impact of strategic response on profitability. The analysis indicated that strategic response significantly influences the financial outcome of these manufacturing firms, with statistical evidence supporting its role as a meaningful predictor of profitability (Awe, 2020). Firms that actively engage in identifying and responding to customer needs, adjusting pricing strategies, and developing innovative products are more likely to achieve higher profitability (Adewole & Opele, 2019). This finding emphasizes the importance of strategic management practices in fostering organizational success. The demographic data of respondents illustrated a diverse workforce within these firms, with a blend of educational backgrounds and work experiences that contribute to organizational capabilities (Omimakinde, 2022). The positive perceptions of respondents regarding structural fluidity and strategic response suggest that

employees recognize the value of adaptability and responsiveness in their organizations, further reinforcing the theoretical underpinnings of strategic agility.

Conclusion

The findings highlight the essential relationship between organizational strategies and performance, suggesting that while structural fluidity should not be overlooked, greater emphasis should be placed on developing strategic responses to market challenges. The research calls for further exploration into additional factors that affect market share and profitability, encouraging manufacturing firms to cultivate a holistic approach to strategic management that leverages both flexibility in operations and responsiveness to customer demands. This comprehensive understanding of strategic agility can ultimately lead to sustained growth and competitive advantage in the manufacturing sector.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are essential.

i. Further research is needed to identify other key organizational and environmental factors influencing manufacturing firms' market share and performance.
ii. Managers of the selected firms should explore ways to enhance firms' strategic sensitivity and strategic response capabilities, as the current study did not show significant effects on these dimensions.
iii. Overall, the findings suggest that structural fluidity is an important organizational characteristic for the performance of these manufacturing firms, while the role of strategic agility is more nuanced and requires further investigation.

REFERENCES

Adewole, O.G, Okrigwe, F.N, Opele, J.K, Omotoso, K. . (2021). A qualitative analysis of the impediments to business innovation and information management in Nigeria: A policy stance. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Management*, *8*(1), 31–38.

Adewole, O. G., & Opele, J. K. (2019). *Demographic Change Industry-Specific Innovation Patterns in Nigeria : the Implication for Knowledge Management Practices*. *04*(02), 25–32.

Adeyeye, D., Egbetokun, A., Opele, J., Oluwatope, O., & Sanni, M. (2018). How barriers influence firms' search strategies and innovative performance. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, *22*(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919618500111

Ahammad, M. F., Basu, S., Munjal, S., Clegg, J., & Shoham, O. B. (2021). Strategic agility, environmental uncertainties and international performance: The perspective of Indian firms. *Journal of World Business,* 56(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2021.101218

Atieno, O. J., & Senaji, T. A. (2017). The relationship between strategic agility and performance of organisations in State corporations in Kenya. *Africa International Journal of Management Education and Governance (AIJMEG), 2*(3), 73-79. https://www.oasiseduconsulting.com

Breznitz, S. M., & Murphree, M. W. (2021). The resource curse re-examined: Revisiting the empirical link between natural resources, innovation, and economic growth. *Research Policy,* 50(1), 104-132.

Dhingra, S., Ottaviano, G. I. P., Sampson, T., & Van Reenen, J. (2020). The impact of Brexit on UK firms. CEP Brexit Analysis, 2.

Donthu, N., & Gustafsson, A. (2020). Effects of COVID-19 on business and research. *Journal of Business Research,* 117, 284–289.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 18(1), 39–50.

Gulati, R., & Puranam, P. (2019). Renewal through reorganisation: The value of inconsistencies between formal and informal organisation. Organisation Science, 20(2), 422-440.

Gulati, R., & Puranam, P. (2019). Renewal through reorganisation: The value of inconsistencies between formal and informal organisation. Organisation Science, 20(2), 422-440.

Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2020). Strategic management: concepts and cases: competitiveness and globalisation (13th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Keller, S., & Strebel, P. (2019). GE's two-decade transformation: Jack Welch's leadership. Harvard Business School Publishing.

Lee, S. M., & Trimi, S. (2020). Innovation for creating a smart future. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 5*(3), 155-157.

Müller, J. M. (2019). *Business model innovation in enterprises Strategies for industry 4 . 0 providers and users*. *30*(8), 1127–1142. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-01-2018-0008

Muthuveloo, R. & Koay, H. G. (2023). The influence of strategic agility on organisational performance. *International Journal of Business and Technology Management, 5*(1), 411-423. https://doi.org/10.55057/ijbtm.2023.5.1.31

Muthuveloo, R., & Teoh, A. P. (2020). Optimisation of organisational performance via ITOP strategic agility

model. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Business and Economics, 8*(2), 154–174.

Muthuveloo, R., & Teoh, A. P. (2020). Optimisation of organisational performance via ITOP strategic agility model. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Business and Economics, 8*(2), 154–174.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric Theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Omimakinde, J. (2022). What Drives Compliance with Corporate Governance Principles: Inference from Public Institutions in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science And Human Research*, *05*(06), 2584–2592. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v5-i6-89

Onuoha, O., & Opele, J. (2022). *Influence of Entrepreneurship Education on Youth Empowerment in Nigeria*. *30*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.9734/AJESS/2022/v30i130709

Womack, J. P., Jones, D. T., & Roos, D. (2021). The machine that changed the world: The story of lean production. *Simon and Schuster*.

Womack, J. P., Jones, D. T., & Roos, D. (2021). The machine that changed the world: The story of lean production. *Simon and Schuster*.