JOURNAL OF GLOBAL ACCOUNTING
9 (2) July, 2023.
ISSN: 1118 – 6828
https://journals.unizik.edu.ng/joga

CORPORATE AGILITY, SUSTAINABILITY AND LONG RUN SURVIVAL IN A DISRUPTIVE ORGANISATIONAL ENVIRONMENT IN NIGERIA

Paper Type: *Original Research Paper.*
Correspondence: *dh.emiaso@stu.unizik.edu.ng*

Key words: *Corporate Agility, Disruptive Organisation Environment, Organization Performance*

CITATION: Emiaso, D. & Okafor, G.O. (2023). Corporate Agility, Sustainability and Long Run Survival in a Disruptive Organisation Environment in Nigeria *Journal of Global Accounting*, 9(2), 232 – 253.

Available:https://journals.unizik.edu.ng/joga

Dheseviano Emiaso[1] Gloria O. Okafor[2]
[1]Research Scholar, [2]Professor,
Department of Accountancy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria
1. Email: dh.emiaso@stu.unizik.edu.ng
2. Email: go.okafor@unizik.edu.ng

ABSTRACT:

The research investigated business adaptability, sustainability, and long-term survival in a disruptive organisational environment. The study's overarching purpose was to explore the moderating influence of disruptive organisation environment on the link between corporate agility and organisational performance of manufacturing companies in the state of Rivers. The reaction of correspondents in the state of Rivers was analysed via questionnaire. After calculating the Mean and Standard Error of the Mean, the compiled responses were evaluated using coefficient determination, ANOVA, and regression analysis. Corporate agility has no significant relationship with the organisational performance of manufacturing organisations in the state of Rivers (t-test = 0.14, p-value = 0.989>0.05); the moderating effect of a disruptive organisation environment on corporate agility has no significant effect on organisational performance (F-ratio = 0.76, p-value = 0.469>0.05). Based on this conclusion, the study suggests that organisational performance in the Nigerian state of Rivers is unaffected by corporate agility and a somewhat disruptive organisational environment. In order to increase investment prospects and organisational performance of industrial organisations in Nigeria's Rivers state, the research recommends a reduction in operating costs, consistent investment-friendly government regulations, and efficient infrastructure facilities.

1. INTRODUCTION

In light of the fact that the global organisation environment is afflicted by politics, environmental circumstances, socio-cultural concerns, technical advancements, changing climatic conditions, and government laws, one must conclude that the global organisation environment is disruptive. These have led in dangers and opportunities that have affected organisation performance (Kim, 2018; Kwon, Ryu & Park, 2018; Felip, Roldan & Leal-Rodriguez, 2016). In order to minimise the consequences of risks and utilise the resulting possibilities, organisations must become proactive,

inventive, futuristic, radical, and esoteric for their long-term viability and existence. Targeted performance is threatened by volatility risks in the manufacturing business caused by a turbulent organisational environment. (Adim, Lebura & Adubasim, 2017; Wyman, 2018) Therefore, industrial organisations cannot exist without major consideration of corporate agility measures and the influence of a disruptive organisational environment on their organisational and operational schedules and decision-making processes. Manufacturers need to maintain a high degree of responsiveness following the volatility of raw material costs and the global financial crisis to achieve agility and preserve their competitiveness on the global market (Garbie, 2011). According to scholars from around the world, corporate agility initiatives are a proactive approach to reduce disruptive organisation environments in order to improve organisation performance, particularly in the manufacturing sector, in response to challenges posed by disruptive organisation environments (Arokodare & Asikhia, 2020). Numerous businesses are acknowledging the influence of environmental pressures and dangers on their operations and activities. Uncertainty produced by a disruptive organisational environment is one of the primary challenges in this procedure. In the market circumstances of the twenty-first century, manufacturing organisations must regularly rewrite their work practises and procedures in order to respond swiftly to a variety of dynamic changes that frequently occur simultaneously and unpredictably (Anggraini & Sudhartio, 2019). A company's capacity for rapid, proactive responses in response to difficulties and business opportunities is referred to as corporate agility. A study conducted in Nigeria by Ehie and Muogboh (2016) indicated that issues such as political unrest, sectorial terrorism, economic and financial instability, and high unemployment rates resulting in destitution and insecurity enhance the disruptiveness of an organization's surroundings. Apart from inept management and a lack of solid regulations and insufficient infrastructure, other causes of a chaotic corporate environment include a lack of institutional cohesion and weak growth plans (Ojo & Ajayi, 2017).

If an organisation is faced with a dynamic and disruptive organisational environment, Kim (2018) believes that most manufacturing organisations in developed economies respond with workforce agility in order to achieve organisational performance, while those in developing economies respond with hesitation. Price fluctuation, regulatory unpredictability, and infrastructural restrictions limited the capacity of industrial organisations to attain their targeted performance. To corporate management experts, adaptability is a good indication for increased organisational performance and an effective defence against the perils of an ever-changing economic world (Claub, Abebe, Tangpong & Hock, 2019; Oyerinde, Olatunji & Adewale, 2018; Abbas & Hassan, 2017). It was found that most organisations, particularly Nigerian oil and gas firms, have unstable performance as

a result of the inappropriate application of corporate agility measures and the slowness of corporate responses to problems that arise in a disruptive organisational environment, such as unpredictable outcomes, globalisation, innovative thinking and creativity, and changing customer preferences.

A chaotic business climate and regulations characterised by poor corporate agility measures, inflexible organisational culture, regulatory instability, and a lack of infrastructure prevent many Nigerian manufacturing enterprises from achieving their organisational performance objectives (PWC, 2018). According to Anggraini and Sudhartio (2019), the majority of organisations are unprepared to deal with disruptions, which has a negative impact on their performance. According to Arokodare and Asikhia (2020) and Oyerinde, Olatunji, and Adewale (2018), corporate agility initiatives were misdirected in a disruptive organisational environment, which negatively impacted the performance of Nigerian manufacturers.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

In light of the aforementioned issues, the broad objective of this study is to evaluate the how disruptive organisational environment moderates the impact of corporate agility (sustainability and long-term survival) on the performznce of industrial organisations in Rivers State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study intends to determing:

a. the connection between business agility and organisational success
b. the moderating influence of a disruptive organisational environment on the link between organisational agility and performance.

1.2 Hypotheses

In order to achieve the aforementioned objective, this study speculates that:

H_o: There is no significant relationship between corporate agility and organisational performance.

H_o: The moderating effect of disruptive organisation environment have no significant impact on the relationship between corporate agility and organisational performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual review

2.1.1 Disruptive organisation environment

Disruptive organisational environments, according to Anggraini and Sudhartio (2019), are characterised by a high degree of uncertainty and risk. The turmoil of the business landscape is exemplified by the concept of a disruptive organisational environment. According to Rimita (2019), a disruptive organisational environment comprises a competitive environment and internal hazards, as well as the complexity and variety of the supply chain within and beyond the organization's domain. Nnamani and Ajagu (2014) described a disruptive organisation environment as the external variables and forces that have the ability to dramatically impact the performance of the organisation, either favourably or adversely, They have a substantial influence on the most critical internal operations of the business, in addition to the firm's overall goals and strategy (Gathenya, 2012). Disruptive organisational environments are one component of general models of the task environment that constrains organisational behaviour and performance, according to Ibidunni and Ogundele (2013) and Boyne and Meier (2009). The unpredictable change in an organization's environment abundance and complexity is a component of these general models. An growing number of organisations are operating in a more dynamic and complicated environment, which includes technological advancements and globalisation, resource constraints and huge swings in the organisation cycle as well as changing societal values, consumers and suppliers. Uncertainty coming from unforeseen adjustments in market demand, client preferences, new technology improvements, and technological breakthroughs, according to Pavlou and Sawy (2011), is also classified as a disruptive organisational environment. The capacity to execute procedures, prepare for operational reconfiguration, and the ability to improvise are the three sorts of talents that offer a competitive advantage in a disruptive business environment (the learned ability to spontaneously reconfigure operational capabilities). Those are the "dynamic" capabilities we're talking about here. Dynamic capability and competitive advantage are therefore related in a disruptive organisational situation (Banerjee, Farooq & Upadhyaya, 2018). However, Anggraini and Sudharti (2019) argue that a disruptive organisational environment is a change in the wealth or complexity of an organization's organisational environment that is unexpected because we are unable to predict its scope. They claim that this change has a negative impact on an organization's performance.

2.2 Corporate Agility

It is said that responsiveness and knowledge management are the two components of organisational agility, as stated by Tabe-Khoshnood and Nematizadeh (2017b). Business agility is the capacity of a business to recognise and respond to environmental changes. By 2020, Arokodare (2020) characterised corporate agility as "the ability of an organisation to sense changes in dynamic, fast-paced environments and quickly respond by staking out market opportunities and sustaining competitiveness through the building and strengthening of its capabilities," thus achieving and maintaining superior performance beyond its competition. This adds to Mavengere's (2013) and Anggraini's and Sudharto's (2013) definitions of corporate agility (2005). (2019).

In order to be flexible in the face of changing conditions, a company must have "corporate agility" (Doz & Kosonen, 2008). The ability of a company to continually adjust its corporate direction and produce new ways of producing value was also conceptualised as corporate agility. Adaptability and renewal may be seen in terms of a company's capacity to combine information of its external environment with its internal capabilities and translate these into actions in order to handle disruptive organisational environmental challenges.

There are three interdependent skills that make up a company's agility, according to Anggraini and Sudhartio (2019): corporate sensitivity, group commitment, and resource fluidity. A company's responsiveness to and interpretation of market conditions, as well as its ability to make quick, correct decisions without regard to organisational politics, are referred to as corporate sensitivity, collective commitment, or resource fluidity by the authors of this article. They were of the opinion that the only way to maintain competitiveness in today's disruptive business climate is via continuous innovation and the creation of new capabilities. Accurately managing an organization's agility is a critical component to its long-term viability as well as its capacity to compete in today's rapidly changing business climate and achieve its stated goals (Al-Romeedy, 2019; Kwon et al., 2018; Nzewi& Moneme, 2016). Disruptive organisational environments may benefit companies that are empathetic, skilled, adaptable, and swift (Arokodare, Asikhia, &Makinde, 2019; Nafei, 2016; Oyedijo, 2012). In a recent study, researchers discovered that organisations that focus more on learning are better prepared to adapt to environmental challenges.

2.3 Organisational Performance

Organizational success is critical to its operations since profit maximisation is its major goal (Olanipekun, Abioro, Akanni, Arulogun & Rabiu, 2015). There are a range of financial and nonfinancial techniques to assess a company's performance in order to determine how well it is

reaching its goals and accomplishing its objectives. Organisational success is a measure of a company's capacity to satisfy both financial and non-financial objectives, according to a 2018 study by Egbunike and Okerekeoti (Arokodare & Asikhia, 2020). Organizational performance, according to Syafarudin (2016), is the outcome or accomplishment that is impacted by the company's actions and the use of its own assets. Organizational performance, according to Jahanshahi, Rezai, Nawaser, Ranjbar and Pitamber (2012), may be defined as the difference between actual results and those expected. According to Jones and Charles (2010) and Davidson (2004), the term refers to the goals and objectives set by management, regardless of whether or not such goals are met. Musyoka (2016) viewed the evolution of the notion as a result of the company's common principles. An organization's success is dependent on its returns being at least average, according to Awino (2011) who emphasised elements of performance from the organization's top to bottom. This research looked at several aspects of an organization's success, including profitability, efficiency, advantage in the market, and innovation inside the organisation.

2.4 Corporate Agility and Organisation Performance Relationship

Corporate agility, according to Kwon *et al.* (2018), is a key factor in a company's success because it enables entrepreneurs to constantly recognise, create, and take advantage of new chances for business growth. According to Hadad (2017), a company's ability to adapt and think quickly is a competitive advantage. Trademark's operational effectiveness in East Africa and the competitiveness of private institutions in Kenya were examined by Okotoh and Muthoni (2015). Corporate agility has a positive and considerable influence on a company's operational success, according to Muthoni (2015) and Okotoh (2015). The failure of some organisations is attributed to a lack of corporate agility and plans for these conditions, resulting in an inability to provide the appropriate product at the appropriate time for the appropriate customer, resulting in a decline in their organization's performance, according to some research. (Zaridis&Mousiolis, 2014; Amin-Beidokhti & Zargar, 2012). According to Reid and Zyglidopoulos, the lack of corporate adaptability in multinational corporations in China was highlighted by the researchers (2004). Studies have found a strong link between a company's ability to change quickly and its overall effectiveness. In order to thrive in today's global economy and contend with the dynamic competition, companies must include corporate agility into their management style, procedures, and decision-making (Qin & Nembhard, 2015; Ashori, Veisari, & Taghavi, 2015 and Cegarra-Navarro, Soto-Acosta & Wensley2016;). There is a strong correlation between an organization's competitive edge and its performance, according to Al-Romeedy (2019). In today's unpredictable and constantly changing labour market, airline agility has become one of the most critical weapons for long-term survival. They have a significant

influence on the overall performance of the company. An increase in entrepreneurial and emotional ability was found to have a positive, statistically significant impact on corporate agility, according to Khorshid (2019). Previous research also found that an increase in entrepreneurial and emotional ability was found to have a positive impact on corporate agility. For further information on how corporate agility impacts university entrepreneurship, see Khorshid (2019).

2.5 Disruptive Organisation Environment as a Moderator of Corporate Agility and Organisational Performance Relationship

Organizational performance was shown to be affected greatly by a disruptive organisation environment, as studied by Pratono and Mahmood (2014), while looking at the link between entrepreneurial management and organisational performance. On the other hand, Abbas and Hassan (2017) investigated the moderating influence of a disruptive organisational environment when it comes to connecting organisational innovation and performance. The relationship between organisational innovation and performance has been severely disrupted by technology. Disruptive organisational conditions, such as new technology and change market direction, have been shown to moderate the performance of organisations by both scholars. Project success is influenced by client interactions being disrupted due to technological change (Voss &Kock, 2013). Technology disruption dramatically alters the connection between supplier market orientation and customer happiness, according to a research by Whitwell, Widing, and O'Cass (2011).

According to Wang and Feng's findings, quality management practises have a significant moderating effect on an organization's performance (2012). According to Yauch (2010), in highly disruptive marketplaces, firms do better. Organizational best practises and organisational performance have been found to have a small moderating influence on competitiveness, market disruption, and technical innovation (Inman, Sale, Green & Whitten, 2011). The link between a company's performance and its focus on the market has dissipated due to market instability and fierce competition (Chong, Bian& Zhang, 2016; Jaakkola, 2015). A volatile work environment has a detrimental influence on the connection between export orientation and export performance (Cadogan, Cui & Li, 2003). Organizations desire to cooperate more in a disruptive and competitive environment, which eventually leads to growth. Because of this, workers who face intense competition in less technologically disruptive environments are more engaged, which ultimately improves organisational performance and growth (Ang, 2008). For example, a lack of research on the impact of disruptive organisational environments on the link between corporate agility and manufacturing organisation performance in Rivers State, South-South Nigeria, may be derived from

the empirical studies analysed. On a national and international scale, this is true. The following hypotheses were generated in light of the lack of empirical evidence in the evaluated literature:

In the state of Rivers, there is no connection between organisational agility and success. No matter how disruptive the organisational environment is, the relationship between corporate agility and organisational success remains unaltered.

2.2 Theoretical Review

2.2.1 Dynamic Capability Theory (DCT)

This study is grounded in the Dynamic Capability Theory (DCT). In 1994, Teece and Pisano came up with the idea. It is the most advanced organisational abilities that are beneficial for long-term success (Wang & Ahmed, 2007). There are three distinct factors that determine the dynamic capabilities of a company's competitiveness: First, the availability of a spectrum of alternatives and their route dependence; second, the company's resource position, which includes real but primarily intangible assets; and third, organisational processes, which comprise managerial abilities, patterns of behaviour, thinking, and learning. (Pisano 2015;Teece *et al*., 1997). According to Teece (2019), organisations with high levels of dynamic capabilities are better equipped to adapt to changes in their external environment, technological opportunities, business culture, new product development, and process innovation. Here, the company's competitive advantage derives from its dynamic capabilities, which refer to its ability to build up corporate agility dimensions, have a company and forward-looking leadership, renew and reconfigure entrepreneurial capabilities and competencies to achieve congruence with the changing organisational environment and ensure superior performance. (Kylaheiko, Sandstrom, & Virkkunen, 2002).

Dynamic capacity (DC) is a term used in organisational theory to describe an organization's proactive potential to adjust its resource base. In the year 2000, Eisenhardt and Martin defined dynamic capability as "the organisational processes that use resources-specifically the processes to integrate, reconfigure, gain and release resources-to match and even create market change" and "the organisational and corporate routines by which organisations obtain new resources and configurations as markets emerge, collide, split, evolve and die.". Focusing on organisational actions that are strategic and aiming to strengthen responsiveness to a quickly changing environment through dynamic capabilities may lead to a long-term competitive benefit. A company's ability to produce new forms of competitive advantage despite route dependencies and market positioning is reflected in these skills (Teece *et al.*, 1997). A three-step approach proposed by Teece (2007) can do

this: spotting (the discovery of potential threats and opportunities), seizing (the mobilisation of resources to meet new possibilities while maximising value), and adapting (ongoing organisational renewal).In accordance with the assertions of the Dynamic Capabilities Theory that entrepreneurial dynamic capabilities and competencies promote great performance, a conceptual model was developed for this study. As seen in figure 1.



Figure 1: Conceptual framework.

Source: Researcher's concept (2022)

Corporate agility and organisational performance are shown to be linked in the conceptual model, with the disruptive nature of the work environment acting as a moderator. Organisational performance is dependent on corporate agility (sustainability and long-term survival), while disruptive organisation environment is a brick wall (monster) that every organisation strives to overcome.

3. MATERIAL AND METHOD

In order to evaluate the moderating influence of a disruptive organisational environment on the link between corporate agility and organisational performance in industrial organisations in Rivers State, a survey research approach was employed to collect survey data on the study variables.

Corporate agility (sustainability and long-term survival) was the independent variable, disruptive organisational environment was the moderating variable, and organisational performance was the dependent variable. For each questionnaire item, a modified four-point Likert scale was used to elicit responses for all variables. Very High (VH)-4, Moderately High (MH)-3, Moderately Low (ML)-2, and Very Low (VL)-1 were the outcomes on this scale. The questionnaires used in this study passed evaluations for internal consistency, construct validity, and face validity. The questionnaire tools were statistically verified in order to accurately and consistently assess the variables in the current study.

3.1 Model Specification

The model was denoted based on the hypotheses of the study:

Y = Dependent Variable = Organisational Performance (OP)

X = Independent Variable = Corporate Agility (CA)

Z = Moderating Variable = Disruptive organisation environment (DBE)

Functional formulation of model based on the objectives and hypotheses of the study:

Y =f(X)

OP = f(CA)

H_1: There is no significant relationship between corporate agility and organisational performance of organisation in Rivers State;

Y = f(X)

$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \varepsilon i$

$OP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CAi + \varepsilon i$

H_2: Disruptive organisation environment does not moderate the relationship between corporate agility and organisational performance of organisation in Rivers State;

Decision Criteria: If β_1 & $\beta_{iz} \neq 0$ & $p \leq 0.05$, Reject null hypotheses;

Where $\beta 0$ = the constant term; βi= the regression coefficient for CA; βz= the regression coefficient for the multiplied moderator (CA*DBE); while βiz is the regression coefficient for moderator multiplied with independent variable (CA) and lastly, εi= Error Term.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

The respondents in Rivers State received a total of 110 questionnaires. Among the total of 110 questionnaires presented to respondents, 88.2% (or 97 questionnaires) were returned properly filled out, while 11.8% (or 13 questionnaires) were either not returned, incomplete, or mutilated. Thus, the 88.2% return rate for questionnaires is deemed satisfactory. Table 1 displays the rate at which respondents returned surveys.

Table 1: Questionnaire Return Rate for Organisationes in Rivers State

S/No	Kind of Service	No. of Questionnaires Administered	No. of Questionnaires Returned	% Return
1	Batch process manufacturing	29	28	96.6
2	Continuous process manufacturing	50	44	88
3	Other Organisationes	31	25	80.6
	Total	**110**	**97**	**88.2**

Source: Field Survey, 2023

The descriptive statistics shown in Table 2 provide a precise approximation of the sample size and the responses of respondents to each questionnaire item, as indicated by the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean..

Table 2: Responses on Corporate Agility, Sustainability and Long run Survival

Corporate Agility	4 Very High	3 Moderately High	2 Moderately Low	1 Very Low	Mean	Standard Error
1.How strategically does the corporation manage organisational rigidity?	38	29	20	10	2.9794	1.01015
2.How can you overcome rigidity effectively and efficiently?	32	26	25	14	2.7835	1.06289
3.How does the organisation mobilise resources to overcome organisational rigidity?	35	29	27	6	2.9588	.94558
4. How rigid is the company in responding to challenges?	30	29	26	12	2.7938	1.01999
Organizational capabilities						
5.How is the conflict between competence growth and the reduction of rigidity in an organization's response to a disruptive	45	19	20	13	2.9897	1.10392

environment managed?						
6.How does your Management handle the conflict between competence growth and the reduction of rigidity while reacting to a disruptive organisational environment?	25	38	32	2	2.8866	.81492
7. How capable are employees in your company in adapting to changes?	18	22	43	14	2.4536	.95765
8. How has your company explored and utilized its capabilities to respond to threats?	32	25	28	12	2.7938	1.04021
9. Is your company fast-changing to growing demands?	36	24	19	18	2.8041	1.13320
Disruptive Organisation Environment						
10. How do you believe Management is adapting to a disruptive business environment?	25	24	41	7	2.6907	.93942
11. How has the corporation managed to react and respond to a disruptive organisational environment efficiently and effectively?	28	28	23	18	2.6804	1.08538
12. How has the business adapted to rapidly shifting environments?	30	10	41	16	2.5567	1.09895
13. How has top management been able to develop appropriate strategies in respond to disruptive organisation environment?	26	29	24	18	2.6495	1.07084
14. How effective have you been in responding to disruptive organisation environment?	9	39	42	7	2.5155	.76531
Organization Performance						
15. How well has the company applied the strategies that have helped this company to be successful over the years?	27	32	23	15	2.7320	1.03597
16. How has the strategies empowered managers to service delivery?	28	19	39	11	2.6598	1.01946
How has the corporation been able to utilise its resources to create new strategies that create value?	36	28	21	12	2.9072	1.04166
18. How has the corporation structured and marshalled its skills to enhance the overall	25	26	40	6	2.7216	.92130

performance of the organisation?						
19. How has the organization's strategy been conveyed and adopted by all employees?	29	31	27	10	2.8144	.98245

Source: Field Survey, 2022.

The range of the mean statistics was 2.45 to 2.98, while the standard error was from 0.076 to 0.110. Estimates of a population parameter are more accurate when their standard errors are less. Moreover, smaller standard errors of the mean translate to smaller p-values and narrower confidence intervals, both of which are desirable qualities. This indicates that the sample mean is closer to the study's actual value.

The lower standard deviation values indicate that the standard or normal distance of the observation from the sample mean when utilising the original data units does not deviate significantly from the sample mean. Therefore, small values correlate to larger distributions and indicate that data points are unlikely to deviate from the sample mean further. Consequently, confirming limited response variation among the population of the correspondent.

4.1 Test of Hypotheses

4.1.1 Hypothesis One

H_o: There is no significant relationship between corporate agility and organisational performance.

Given below is the output of the relevant analysis carried out:

Table 3: Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for Corporate Agility and Organization Performance

Correlations

		Responding to Challenges	Overall Organizational Performance
Responding to Challenges	Pearson Correlation	1	.526**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	97	97
Overall Organizational Performance	Pearson Correlation	.526**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	97	97

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS 25 Result, 2022

Table 3 above displays the correlation analysis between corporate agility and whole organisation performance for the sampled Rivers State industrial firms. Positive and strong (.526) correlation is established, and this is further complemented by a p-value (.000) which is less than 5%, suggesting statistical significance. Since p-value is less than 0.05, the alternate hypothesis is accepted, thus providing evidence that corporate agility has a major influence on organisational performance in Rivers state, Nigeria.

4.1.2 Hypothesis Two

H_o: The moderating effect of disruptive organisation environment have no significant impact on the relationship between corporate agility and organisational performance.

The outcome of the analysis conducted is as presented below:

Table 4: Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for the moderating effect of disruptive Organisation Environment on Corporate Agility and Organization Performance

Correlations

Control Variables			Responding to Challenges	Overall Organizational Performance
Reacting and Responding to DBE	Responding to Challenges	Correlation	1.000	.525
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000
		df	0	94
	Overall Organizational Performance	Correlation	.525	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.
		df	94	0

Source: SPSS 25 Result, 2022

The influence of the moderating factor on the examination of the link between corporate agility and overall organisation performance is displayed in Table 4. The p-value (.000) which is evidently less than 5%, indicates that the moderating factor had a significant and positive (.525) influence on the connection between corporate agility and organisational success.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Unfavourable environmental conditions, sociocultural obstacles, inadequate technological progress, and variable climatic conditions all contribute to the idea that the environment of African nations is disruptive, leading in a lack of infrastructure investment. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine how corporate agility enhances organisational performance and lowers disruptive environmental hazards in the Nigerian state of Rivers (through this study).

By analysing data from a prior study, the researchers discovered that corporate agility had a positive and statistically significant effect on organisational performance. However, the continual presence and moderation of a disruptive organisational environment have a substantial effect on the influence of corporate agility on organisational performance. The performance of an organisation is harmed by a disorderly work environment. The existence of corporate agility in Rivers state industrial organisations had a negligible impact on the state's overall improvement in organisational performance. All of the elements that contribute to According to a partial correlation research, the combination between corporate agility and disruptive organisational settings has a substantial effect on organisational performance in the workplace.

Despite the fact that both corporate agility and organisational success looked to be on an upward trajectory, the graph revealed a positive link between the two variables. Demonstrating in the research community that improved/increased corporate agility enhances organisation performance. Organizational performance is negatively affected by a disruptive organisational environment according to Cadogan, Cui and Li (2003); Jaakkola, (2015); and Chong, Bian and Zhang (2016). In contrast to our findings, Abbas and Hassan (2017) claim that technology disruption promotes organisational effectiveness. In other words, according to the findings, corporate agility and a somewhat chaotic work environment have no effect on the efficiency of Nigeria's Rivers state's organisations. Reduced operating costs, elimination of multiple taxes, consistent investment-friendly government regulation, efficient infrastructure facilities to boost investment opportunities, and organisational performance of manufacturing organisations in the Nigerian state of Rivers can mitigate the repercussions.

REFERENCES

Abbas, M. W., & Hassan, M. (2017).Moderating impact of environmental turbulence on relationship between organisation innovation and organisation performance. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 11(2), 576-596

Adim, C.V., Lebura, S., &Adubasim, E.I. (2017). Innovation culture and organization survival in hospitality firms in Port Harcourt. *Nigerian Organisation and Social Review*, 9(1), 66-79.

Al-Romeedy, B. S. (2019). Strategic agility as a competitive advantage in airlines-Case study: Egypt Air. Journal of the Faculty of Tourism and Hotels-University of Sadat City, 3(1), 1-15.

Amin-Beidokhti, A. A., &Zargar, S. M. (2012). Pathology of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and practical strategies to support them (Semnan Province Case Study). Quarterly Journal of Management and Development Process, 24(4), 125-156

Ang, S. H. (2008). Competitive intensity and collaboration: Impact on firm growth across technological environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(10), 1057-1075

Anggraini, W., &Sudhartio, L. (2019). Strategic agility in environmental turbulence: A case of banking sector in Indonesia. Proceedings of the 1st Sampoerna University-AFBE International Conference, SU-AFBE 2019, 6-7 December 2019, Jakarta Indonesia

Arokodare, M.A. (2020). Strategic agility and firm performance of selected oil and gas marketing organisation in Lagos State, Nigeria (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis) Babcock University, Nigeria.

Arokodare, M. A., &Asikhia, O. U. (2020).The moderating effect of external environment on the relationship between strategic entrepreneurship and performance of selected oil and gas service firms in Lagos and Rivers States, *Nigeria.Review of European Studies*, 12(2), 62-85

Arokodare, M. A., &Asikhia, O. U. (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation as a determinant of oil and gas service firm performance in Nigeria: The moderating role of external environment. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 11(2), 1-17

Arokodare, M. A., Asikhia, O. U., &Makinde, G. O. (2019). Strategic agility and firm performance: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Organisation Management Dynamics*, 9(3), 1-12

Ashori, H., Veisari, E. F., &Taghavi, S. A. (2015). The relationship between the organization agility and mental health of staff on strategic preparation for crisis management: The case study in Islamic Azad Universities of Mazandaran. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, 6(5), 272-281

Awino, Z. B. (2011). Strategic management: An empirical investigation of selected strategy variables on firms performance: A study of supply chain management in large private

manufacturing firms in Kenya. *Prime Journals Organisation Administration Management (BAM)*, 1(2), 26-31.

Boyne, G. A.,& Meier, K. J. (2009).Environmental turbulence, organizational stability, and public service performance. *Administration and Society*, 40(8), 799-824

Brătianu, C. (2015), Developing strategic thinking in organisation education. Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy, 3(3), 409-429

Cadogan, J. W., Cui, C. C., & Kwok Yeung Li, E. (2003). Export market-oriented behavior and export performance: The moderating roles of competitive intensity and technological turbulence. *International Marketing Review*, 20(5), 493-513

Cegarra-Navarro, J. G., Soto-Acosta, P., &Wensley, A. K. (2016). Structured knowledge processes and firm performance: The role of organisational agility. *Journal of Organisation Research*, 69(5), 1544-1549

Chirchir, E. (2015). Relationship between organisational agility and operational productivity at Kenya Ports Authority (Unpublished MBA project) University of Nairobi.

Chong, W. K., Bian, D.,& Zhang, N. (2016). E-marketing services and e-marketing performance: the roles of innovation, knowledge complexity and environmental turbulence in influencing the relationship. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32(1-2), 149-178

Claub, T., Abebe, M., Tangpong, C., & Hock, M. (2019). Strategic agility, organisation model innovation, and firm performance: An empirical investigation. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Transactions on Engineering Management, 99, 1-18

Davidson, P. (2004). Researching Entrepreneurship. Boston, MA: Springer.

Denning, S. (2016). Christensen updates disruption theory. Strategy and Leadership, 44(2), 10-16

Di-Minin, A., Frattini, F., Bianchi, M., Bortoluzzi, G., &Piccaluga, A. (2014).UdineseCalcio soccer club as a talents factory: Strategic agility, diverging objectives, and resource constraints. *European Management Journal*, 32(2), 319-336

Djaja, I., &Arief, M. (2015).The impact of dynamic information technology capability and strategic agility on organisation model innovation and firm performance on ICT firms.Advanced Science Letters, 21(5), 1225-1229

Doz, Y., &Kosonen, M. (2008).Fast Strategy: How Strategic Agility Will Help You Stay Ahead of the Game. Philadelphia: Wharton School Publishing.

Doz, Y. L., &Kosonen, M. (2010).Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating organisation model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 370-382

Egbunike, C. F., &Okerekeoti, C. U. (2018).Macroeconomic factors, firm characteristics and financial performance.*Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, 3(2), 142-168

Ehie, I., &Muogboh, O. (2016). Analysis of manufacturing strategy in developing countries: A sample survey of Nigerian manufacturers. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 27(2), 234-260

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1105-1121

Felip, C.M., Roldan, J.L. & Leal-Rodriguez, A.L. (2016).An explanatory and predictive model for organizational agility. *Journal of Organisation Research*, 69, 4624-4631.

Garbie, I. H. (2011).Implementation of agility concepts into oil organisation. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 4, 203-214

Gathenya, J. W. (2012). Entrepreneurial strategic planning practices and firm performance among women-led small and medium enterprises in Kenya (PhD Thesis) Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.

Hadad, S. (2017). Knowledge economy: Characteristics and dimensions. Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy, 5(2), 203-225

Hemmati, M.,Feiz, D., Jalilvand, M. R., &Kholghi, I. (2016).Development of fuzzy two-stage DEA model for competitive advantage based on RBV and strategic agility as a dynamic capability.*Journal of Modelling in Management*, 11(1), 288-308

Ibidunni, O. S., and Ogundele, O. J. K. (2013). Competition in marketing: Survival yardstick for small and medium enterprises in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 231-240.

Inman, R. A., Sale, R. S., Green Jr, K. W., and Whitten, D. (2011). Agile manufacturing: Relation to JIT, operational performance and firm performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 29(4), 343-355

Jaakkola, M. (2015). Market-driven innovation capability and financial performance: Moderating effect of environmental turbulence. The Sustainable World Marketplace, 320-320

Jahanshahi, A. A., Rezaei, M., Nawaser, K., Ranjbar, V., and Pitamber, B. K. (2012).Analyzing the effects of electronic commerce on organisational performance: Evidence from small and medium enterprises. *African Journal of Organisation Management*, 6(22), 6486-6496

Jones, G. R., and Charles, W. L. (2010). Strategic Management: An Integrated Approach (9th ed.). South-Western Publisher.

Khorshid, S. (2019). The impact of organisation's strategic agility and emotional capability on entrepreneurship orientation (Case study: The university of Khashan and Qom cities). Management in the Islamic University, 14(6), 238-262. Retrieved from https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=576016

Kim, J. (2018). A study on the effect of environmental turbulence on the agility of government agencies and the effect of agility on the organizational performance. *Journal of Product Research*, 36(1), 19-27

Khan, H., and Wisner, J. D. (2019). Supply chain integration, learning, and agility: Effects on performance. Journal of Operations and Supply Chain Management, 12(1), 14-23

Kwon, S. J., Ryu, D., and Park, E. (2018). The influence of entrepreneur's strategic agility and dynamic capability on the opportunity pursuit process of new ventures: Evidence from South Korea. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(1), 1-17

Kyläheiko, K., Sandström, J., and Virkkunen, V. (2002).Dynamic capability view in terms of real options. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 80(1), 65-83

Lebans, M., and Euske, K. (2006). Conceptual and operational delineation of performance: Organisation performance measurement. Cambridge University Press.

Lin, X., and Germain, R. (2003).Product quality orientation and its performance implications in Chinese state-owned enterprises. *Journal of International Marketing*, 11(2), 59-78

Mavengere, N. B. (2013). Information technology role in supply chain's strategic agility. International *Journal of Agile Systems and Management*, 6(1), 7-24

Musyoka, S. M. (2016). Factors that influence organisational performance in the hospitality organisation: A case study of Sankara Nairobi (A MBA Project Report, Chandaria School of Organisation).

Muthoni, A. M. (2015). Influence of strategic agility on competitive capability of private universities in Kenya (Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi).

Nafei, W. A. (2016). Organisational agility.The key to organisational success. *International Journal of Organisation and Management*, 11(5), 296-309

Nnamani, E., and Ajagu, H.E. (2014). Environmental factors and organisational performance in Nigeria: A study of Juhel Company. *World Engineering and Applied Sciences Journal*, 5(3), 75-84

Nzewi, H. N., and Moneme, P. (2016).Organisation agility and competitive advantage of selected commercial banks in Anambra State, Nigeria. *Pyrex Journal of Organisation and Finance Management Research*, 2(8), 81-88

Ogah, M. S. (2018). Productivity and employee behavior change strategies in two Nigerian manufacturing organizations (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN).

Oginni, B. O., and Adesanya, A. S. (2013). Organisation environmental factors: Implications on the survival and growth of organisation organisations in the manufacturing sector of Lagos Metropolis. *Organisation and Management Research*, 2(3), 146-153

Ojha, D. (2008). Impact of strategic agility on competitive capabilities and financial performance (Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University).

Ojo, E. O., and Ajayi, A. T. (2017). From Balewa to Buhari: The paradox of Nigeria's underdevelopment. *The Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies*, 42(2), 180-227

Okotoh, A. K. (2015). Influence of organisational agility on operational performance of Trademark East Africa (A Master Thesis, University of Nairobi).

Olanipekun, W. D., Abioro, M. A., Akanni, L. F., Arulogun, O. O., and Rabiu, R. O. (2015).Impact of Strategic Management on Competitive Advantage and Organisational Performance-Evidence from Nigerian Bottling Company. Journal of Policy and Development Studies, 289(1850), 1-14

Oyedijo, A. (2012). Strategic agility and competitive performance in the Nigerian telecommunication organisation: an empirical investigation. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(3), 227-237.

Oyerinde, A. J., Olatunji, O. C., and Adewale, O. A. (2018).Corporate social responsibility and performance of oil and gas organisation in Nigeria. EKSU Journal of the Management Scientists, 2(1), 97-106.

Pavlou, P. A., and Sawy, E. O. A. (2011).Understanding the elusive black box of dynamic capabilities. Decision Sciences, 42(1), 239-273

Power, B., and Reid, G. C. (2005).Flexibility, firm-specific turbulence and the performance of the long-lived small firm. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 26(4), 415-443

Pisano, G. P. (2015). A normative theory of dynamic capabilities: Connecting strategy, know-how, and competition. Working Paper 16-036, Harvard Organisation School

Pratono, A. H., and Mahmood, R. (2014).The moderating effect of environmental turbulence in the relationship between entrepreneurial management and firm performance. *Universal Journal of Management*, 2(7), 285-292

PricewaterhouseCoopers (2018).Taking on tomorrow: Africa oil and gas review.Retrieved from www.pwc.co.za/oil-gas-review.

Qin, R., and Nembhard, D. A. (2015).Workforce agility in operations management. *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science*, 20(2), 55-69

Reid, D. M., and Zyglidopoulos, S. C. (2004).Causes and consequences of the lack of strategic foresight in the decisions of multinational enterprises to enter China. Futures, 36(2), 237-252. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287(03)00150-2

Rimita, K. N. (2019). Leader readiness in a volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous organisationenvironment.PhDThesis.WaldenUniversity.https://doi.org/10.5590/JOSC.2020.12.1.02

Salih, A. A., and Alnaji, L. (2014). Impact of strategic thinking and strategic agility on strategic performance: A case study of Jordanian insurance organisationorganisation. International *Review of Management and Organisation Research*, 3(4), 1871-1882

Sudon, A., Abareshi, P., and Pittayachawan, S. (2015). Agility enablers, capabilities and performance: Thai automotive part organisation. *Journal of Organisation Research*, 65(56), 579-585.

Syafarudin, A. (2016). Strategy of leadership and innovation in improving company performance against competitive advantage: A case study of PT. Pegadaian (Ltd) in Indonesia. International *Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 4(6), 471-482

Tabe-Khoshnood, N., and Nematizadeh, S. (2017). Strategic agility and its impact on the competitive capabilities in Iranian private banks. International Journal of Organisation and Management, 12(2), 220-229

Teece, D. J. (2007).Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319-1350

Teece, D. J. (2019). A capability theory of the firm: An economics and (Strategic) management perspective. *New Zealand Economic Papers*, 53(1), 1-43

Teece, D., Peteraf, M., and Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. California Management Review, 58(4), 13-35

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., and Shuen, A. (1997).Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533

Terawatanavong, C., Whitwell, G. J., Widing, R. E., and O'Cass, A. (2011).Technological turbulence, supplier market orientation, and buyer satisfaction. *Journal of Organisation Research*, 64(8), 911-918

Tikkanen, J. (2014). Dynamic capability influence on strategic agility: A case study in energy conservation organisation. Unpublished Master`s Project. University of Oulu.

Tse, Y. K., Zhang, M., Akhtar, P., and MacBryde, J. (2016). Embracing supply chain agility: An investigation in the electronics organisation. Supply Chain Management: *An International Journal*, 21(1), 140-156

Turulja, L., and Bajgorić, N. (2015).Information technology capability and its impact on firms' performance. SSRN Electronic Journal

Voss, M., and Kock, A. (2013).Impact of relationship value on project portfolio success—investigating the moderating effects of portfolio characteristics and external turbulence. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(6), 847-861

Wang, C. L., and Ahmed, P. K. (2007). Dynamic capabilities: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 9(1), 31-51. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00201.x Wang, Y., and Feng, H. (2012). Customer relationship management capabilities Measurement, antecedents and consequences. Management Decision, 50, 115-129

Winter, S. G. (2003).Understanding dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 991–996

Yauch, C. A. (2010). Measuring agility as performance outcome. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 22(3), 384-404

Zaridis, A. D., and Mousiolis, D. T. (2014). Entrepreneurship and SME's organisational structure: Elements of a successful organisation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 148, 463-467