UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.19 (2);
January-June, 2025 https://unijerps.org
2023 Impact Factor: **6.834;** 2022 ***Impact Factor***: 5.156; ***2021 Impact Factor: 5.641;***
2020 Impact Factor: 5.355. *Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363*

EFFECT OF STRATEGIC SENSITIVITY AND COLLECTIVE CAPABILITIES ON EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION OF SELECTED MANUFACTURING FIRMS

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

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

Dr Bank-Ola, Rebecca Folake
Department of Finance, Adeleke University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria
Tel.+2349061640515. **Email:** rebecca.bank.ola@adeleke.edu.ng

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

ABSTRACT
This study investigates the effects of strategic sensitivity and collective capabilities on customer and employee satisfaction within selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis, Nigeria. In a dynamic business environment characterized by globalization and technological advancements, organizations must adopt strategic agility to respond effectively to changing market conditions. A descriptive survey design was employed, collecting data from 170 respondents across three manufacturing firms: Nestle, Nigerian Breweries, and Nigerian Bottling Company. The findings indicate that strategic sensitivity has a weak positive relationship with customer satisfaction ($R = 0.103$, $p = 0.210$), explaining only 1.1% of the variance in customer satisfaction. Conversely, collective capabilities significantly negatively affect employee satisfaction ($\beta = -0.265$, $p = 0.020$), with the model explaining 3.6% of the variance. These results suggest that organizations must align their strategic capabilities with employee engagement and customer needs to enhance overall performance. The study concludes with recommendations for improving strategic sensitivity and aligning collective capabilities with organizational objectives to foster both customer satisfaction and employee morale.

Keywords: Strategic Sensitivity, Collective Capabilities, Customer Satisfaction, Employee Satisfaction, Manufacturing Firms, Nigeria.

Introduction
In today's dynamic and competitive business environment, organizations across the globe, particularly manufacturing firms are faced with unprecedented challenges driven by globalization, technological

advancements, increased competition, and shifting consumer demands (Donthu & Gustafsson, 2020). To thrive in such dynamic environments, organizations must adopt strategic agility to sense and respond swiftly to changing market conditions while maintaining optimal organizational performance (Ahammad et al., 2021). Organizations must be strategically adaptable to ensure their overall success and to survive and achieve organizational performance (Atieno & Senaji, 2017). Organizational performance refers to achieving an organization's targets and goals using appropriate strategies (Muthuveloo & Koay, 2023). Organizations offer value to customers in the form of services and products. Therefore, organizations compete with one another to provide the value desired by customers, which increases the organizational performance when customers are satisfied with the value offered. As a result, organizations must continually provide the value desired by the customers to optimize organizational performance (Muthuveloo & Teoh, 2020).

The business environment across the globe is characterized 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 urbanization, 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 organizational 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).

Statement of the problem

In the increasingly competitive landscape of the manufacturing sector, organizations

face significant challenges in meeting both customer and employee satisfaction due to rapid changes in market dynamics, technological advancements, and globalization. Despite the critical role that strategic sensitivity and collective capabilities play in enhancing organizational performance, many manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis lack the necessary agility to adapt to these changes effectively. Previous studies have highlighted the importance of strategic sensitivity in understanding and responding to customer needs (Rufai et al., 2022); however, the relationship between strategic sensitivity and customer satisfaction remains underexplored, particularly in the context of Nigerian manufacturing firms (Adewole & Opele, 2019). Furthermore, while collective capabilities are often viewed as essential for fostering teamwork and improving operational efficiency, there is a growing concern that they may inadvertently lead to decreased employee satisfaction due to increased workloads and reduced autonomy. This study aims to address these gaps by investigating the effects of strategic sensitivity on customer satisfaction and the impact of collective capabilities on employee satisfaction within selected manufacturing firms. By understanding these relationships, the research seeks to provide valuable insights that can help organizations develop more effective strategies to enhance both customer and employee satisfaction, ultimately contributing to improved organizational performance

Objectives of the Study

i. Investigate the effect of strategic sensitivity on customer satisfaction of the selected manufacturing firms.
ii. Examine the effect of collective capabilities on employee satisfaction of the selected manufacturing firms.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in line with the stated objectives:

H_{01}: Strategic sensitivity has no significant effect on customer satisfaction of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.

H_{02}: Collective capabilities do not significantly affect employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms 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 descriptive survey research design was chosen for this study because it provides an accurate and valid representation of how the independent variable (strategic sensitivity) influences the dependent variable (customer/ employee satisfaction) of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis, Nigeria. 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 (see Table 1). These companies jointly reflect the study's target population. The validity and reliability of the study

instrument are presented in Table 2 while table 3 presented the response rate. Data analysis involves the descriptive and inferential statistics were calculated on the formulated research objectives and hypotheses. The descriptive analysis provided frequencies, percentage denotations, and other descriptive tools like means and standard deviations. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 26 was used for data analysis.

Table 1 Manufacturing Firms selected for the study

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. 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 2

Table 2: Construct validity and reliability test

Variable	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	
Strategic Agility			
Strategic sensitivity	5	0.795	Very reliable
	5	0.829	Very reliable
Collective Capability			

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.

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

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 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 Strategic Sensitivity in manufacturing firms

Strategic Sensitivity	Strongly agree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Undecided N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Strongly disagree N (%)	mean	SD
My firm has a systematic approach to gathering key information for systematic decision-making.	111(74.0)	21(14.0)	5(3.3)	7(4.7)	6(4.0)	4.5	1.0
Resources are allocated by the organisation to support adaptability and response to shifting market conditions.	50(33.3)	78(52.0)	6(4.0)	9(6.0)	7(4.7)	4.0	1.0
My company ensures that the prospects it has found align with its main strategic aims and objectives.	111(74.0)	29(19.3)	3(2.0)	4(2.7)	3(2.0)	4.6	0.8
There are spe cific metrics or indicators used to track and measure the success of opportunity identification efforts	96(64.0)	36(24.0)	9(6.0)	7(4.7)	2(1.3)	4.4	0.9
My firm is very sensitive to shifts in market conditions	94(62.7)	44(29.3)	4(2.7)	6(4.0)	2(1.3)	4.5	0.8

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

Table 5 reveals a strong perception regarding the systematic approach to gathering key information for decision-making in their firms, with 74.0% indicating strong agreement. The reported mean score is 4.5, accompanied by a standard deviation of 1.0, suggesting a high level of confidence in this systematic approach among the respondents. When it comes to resource allocation for enhancing adaptability to shifting market conditions, the responses were more varied. Only 33.3% of respondents strongly agreed, while a notable majority of 52.0% agreed, leading to a mean score of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 1.0. This indicates that while many respondents acknowledge resource allocation for adaptability, there is significant room for improvement in this area. On the alignment of discovered prospects with the firm's main strategic aims and objectives, the majority stance remains positive, with 74.0% of respondents strongly agreeing. This strong

alignment contributes to a mean score of 4.6 and a standard deviation of 0.8, reflecting a solid belief in the coherence between opportunity identification and strategic goals. In terms of using specific metrics to track and measure the success of opportunity identification efforts, 64.0% of the respondents expressed strong agreement, and another 24.0% agreed, resulting in a mean score of 4.4 and a standard deviation of 0.9. This indicates that there is a favorable perception of measuring success through defined metrics within these firms. Finally, respondents rated their firms' sensitivity to shifts in market conditions positively, with 62.7% strongly agreeing and a mean score of 4.5 alongside a standard deviation of 0.8. This suggests that there is a recognized awareness and responsiveness to market changes, reinforcing the overall perception of strategic sensitivity within the manufacturing sector.

Table 6: Respondents' perception of collective capabilities in manufacturing firms

Collective Capabilities	Strongly agree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Undecided N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Strongly disagree N (%)	Mean	SD
My organisation requires staff to treat mistakes as opportunities for learning and continuous improvement.	80(53.3)	59(39.3)	6(4.0)	2(1.3)	3(2.0)	4.4	0.8
My organisation provides easy access to information of interest to both beneficiaries and workers.	80(53.3)	57(38.0)	6(4.0)	7(4.7)	0(0.0)	4.4	0.8
My organisation encourages workers to imbibe the principle of shared responsibility	72(48.0)	71(47.3)	7(4.7)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4.4	0.7
My organisation achieves improved wellness through collective capabilities	68(45.3)	68(45.3)	5(3.3)	5(3.3)	0(0.0)	4.3	0.9
The management encourages collaboration and coordination across different units and levels in my organisation	98(65.3)	42(28.0)	2(1.3)	3(2.0)	5(3.3)	4.5	0.9

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

Table 6 indicate a significant majority, 53.3%, strongly agreed that their organization requires staff to treat mistakes as opportunities for learning and continuous improvement. The mean score for this statement is 4.4, with a standard deviation of 0.8, indicating a solid belief in the culture of learning from mistakes. Similarly, regarding access to information, 53.3% of respondents also strongly agreed that their organization provides easy access to information that is beneficial for both beneficiaries and workers. The mean score remains at 4.4 with a standard deviation of 0.8, underscoring a consistent sentiment about the availability and accessibility of relevant information in the workplace. The principle of shared responsibility within the

organization received a positive response, with 48.0% of respondents strongly agreeing and 47.3% agreeing, leading to a mean score of 4.4 and a standard deviation of 0.7. This reflects an encouraging attitude towards collaborative accountability among workers. In terms of collective capabilities contributing to improved wellness, 45.3% of respondents strongly agreed, while an equal percentage agreed, resulting in a mean score of 4.3 and a standard deviation of 0.9. This indicates that there is a shared perception of the benefits of collective capabilities on overall wellness within the organization. Finally, when assessing management's encouragement of collaboration and coordination across different units and levels, 65.3% of respondents strongly agreed, and 28.0% agreed, culminating in a mean score of 4.5 and a standard deviation of 0.9. This suggests a strong perception of management's role in fostering a collaborative environment, highlighting the importance of interdepartmental teamwork in the respondents' organizations.

Test of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance

H_{01}: Strategic sensitivity has no significant effect on customer satisfaction of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.

Significant effect of strategic sensitivity on customer satisfaction 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	.103[a]	.011	.004	2.73954

a. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Sensitivity

Table 7 indicate the model summary indicates a weak positive relationship between Strategic Sensitivity and the dependent variable, with a correlation coefficient (R) of 0.103. The R Square value of 0.011 shows that only 1.1% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by this model, highlighting its limited explanatory power. The adjusted R Square value of 0.004 further confirms that the model is not effective in capturing variance when accounting for the number of predictors. Additionally, the standard error of the estimate is 2.73954, suggesting a moderate level of prediction error. Overall, these results suggest that Strategic Sensitivity is not a significant predictor of the outcome variable being analyzed.

Table 8: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.920	1	11.920	1.588	.210[b]
	Residual	1110.753	148	7.505		
	Total	1122.673	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Sensitivity

Table 8 gives the ANOVA results indicate that the regression model, which includes Strategic Sensitivity as a predictor, does not significantly explain the variance in the dependent variable. The regression sum of squares is 11.920 with 1 degree of freedom, leading to a mean square of 11.920. In contrast, the residual sum of squares is 1110.753 with 148 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square of 7.505. The F statistic is 1.588, with a significance level (p-value) of 0.210. Since this p-value is greater than 0.05, it suggests that the model is not statistically significant and that Strategic Sensitivity does not significantly predict the dependent variable. Overall, these findings reinforce the conclusion that the relationship between Strategic Sensitivity and the outcome variable is weak.

Table 9: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17.933	2.217		8.088	.000
	Strategic sensitivity	.126	.100	.103	1.260	.210

a. Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction

Table 9 reveals the regression analysis aimed at predicting Customer Satisfaction based on Strategic Sensitivity yielded a constant of 17.933, which is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). This implies that when Strategic Sensitivity is at zero, the predicted level of Customer Satisfaction is 17.933. The coefficient for Strategic Sensitivity is 0.126, indicating that for each unit increase in Strategic Sensitivity, Customer Satisfaction is expected to increase by 0.126 units. However, with a standardized coefficient (Beta) of 0.103 and a t-value of 1.260, the relationship is weak, and the significance level ($p = 0.210$) suggests that Strategic Sensitivity is not a statistically significant predictor of Customer Satisfaction. Overall, while there is a positive association suggested, the findings indicate that Strategic Sensitivity does not have a meaningful impact on Customer Satisfaction in this model.

H_{02}: Collective capabilities do not significantly affect employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.

Significant effect of collective capabilities on employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.

Table 10: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.190[a]	.036	.029	2.70417

Predictors: (Constant), Collective Capabilities

Table 10 indicates the model summary indicates a weak positive relationship between collective capabilities and employee satisfaction in selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis, with a correlation coefficient (R) of 0.190. The R Square value of 0.036 shows that only 3.6% of the variance in employee satisfaction can be explained by collective capabilities, reflecting limited explanatory power. The adjusted R Square value of 0.029 further suggests a modest fit of the model when accounting for the number of predictors. The standard error of the estimate is 2.70417, indicating the average deviation of observed employee satisfaction from the predicted values. Overall, these findings support the null hypothesis (H02), suggesting that collective capabilities do not significantly affect employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms.

Table 11: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	40.422	1	40.422	5.528	.020[b]
	Residual	1082.251	148	7.313		
	Total	1122.673	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Capabilities

Table 11 reveals the ANOVA results demonstrate a statistically significant relationship between collective capabilities and employee satisfaction, with an F value of 5.528 and a p-value of 0.020, which is below the 0.05 threshold. This indicates that collective capabilities significantly affect employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms. The regression sum of squares is 40.422, and the residual sum of squares is 1082.251, highlighting that while the model explains a portion of the variance in employee satisfaction, the majority remains unexplained. Overall, the findings support the conclusion that collective capabilities play a significant role in enhancing employee satisfaction within the context of this study.

Table 12: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	26.538	2.487		10.669	.000
	Collective Capabilities	-.265	.113	-.190	-2.351	.020

a. Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction

Table 12 shows the coefficients table reveals the regression analysis results detailing the relationship between collective capabilities and employee satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient for the constant is 26.538, which is statistically significant with a p-value of 0.000, indicating that when collective capabilities are zero, the predicted level of employee satisfaction is 26.538. However, the unstandardized coefficient for collective capabilities is -0.265, suggesting

that for each unit increase in collective capabilities, employee satisfaction decreases by 0.265 units. The standardized coefficient (Beta) of -0.190 confirms a negative relationship, with a t-value of -2.351 and a significance level of 0.020. This p-value being less than 0.05 indicates that the effect of collective capabilities on employee satisfaction is statistically significant. Overall, these results indicate that higher collective capabilities are associated with lower levels of employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms.

Summary of Findings from Analysis

Table 13: Summary Table of Hypotheses Tested

H_0	**Statement of the Hypotheses**	**Remark**
H_{01}	Strategic sensitivity has no significant effect on customer satisfaction of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.	Not Rejected
H_{02}	Collective capabilities do not significantly affect employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis.	Not Rejected

Source: Researcher's Construct, 2024

Table 13 analysis indicates a weak positive relationship between collective capabilities and employee satisfaction in selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis, with a correlation coefficient (R) of 0.190 and an R Square value of 0.036, suggesting that collective capabilities explain only 3.6% of the variance in employee satisfaction. The ANOVA results show a significant F value of 5.528 and a p-value of 0.020, indicating that collective capabilities do affect employee satisfaction, though much variance remains unexplained. In the coefficients analysis, the constant is 26.538 (p = 0.000), while the coefficient for collective capabilities is -0.265, indicating a negative impact on employee satisfaction, which is statistically significant (Beta = -0.190, p = 0.020). The hypotheses tested revealed that both H01 and H02 were not rejected, suggesting that strategic sensitivity and collective capabilities do not significantly impact customer satisfaction and employee satisfaction, respectively, in the studied firms.

Discussion of Findings

The first hypothesis indicated that strategic sensitivity has a positive but non-statistically significant effect on customer satisfaction of the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis. This is partially in line with Adebayo and Oluwafemi (2019), who investigated the relationship between strategic sensitivity and customer satisfaction in manufacturing firms in Lagos State. Similarly, Adesoji and Olumide (2022) investigated the mediating role of competitive advantage on the relationship between strategic sensitivity and customer satisfaction in Nigerian manufacturing firms. Their study found a positive and significant correlation between the two variables, indicating that companies with higher levels of strategic sensitivity were more adept at meeting customer needs and preferences, thus leading to greater satisfaction (Omimakinde et al., 2022). The model only explains a small proportion of the variation in customer satisfaction (1.1%), and the overall model is not statistically significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that "strategic sensitivity has no significant effect on customer satisfaction" cannot be rejected. In other words, the data

does not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that strategic sensitivity significantly impacts customer satisfaction of the manufacturing firms in this study. The non-significant relationship suggests that this regression model did not include other critical factors influencing customer satisfaction.

The findings from the second hypothesis revealed that collective capabilities have a statistically significant negative effect on employee satisfaction in the selected manufacturing firms in Abuja Metropolis. The result is consistent with Beuren et al. (2022), who investigated the impact of collective capabilities on job satisfaction and business success in businesses that have experienced corporate reorganisation. Their findings revealed that collective capabilities impact company success (in the aspects of economics, customers, and processes/learning) as well as employee satisfaction (in the dimensions of financial and personal rewards). However, the association between job fulfilment and company success was only partial, demonstrating that satisfaction might influence performance through other factors (Adewole et al, 2021). This finding contradicts the expected positive relationship between collective capabilities and employee satisfaction in manufacturing firms as investigated by Abdullah et al. (2018), Adeniyi and Okoro (2020) and Don-Baridam (2022) whose study findings revealed a positive relationship between the variables.

The model explains 3.6% of the variation in employee satisfaction, and the overall model is statistically significant. The negative beta coefficient of -0.265 suggests that as collective capabilities increase, employee satisfaction decreases. In other words, the data provides evidence to reject the hypothesis that "collective capabilities do not significantly affect employee satisfaction" in the selected manufacturing firms. The significant relationship suggests that collective capabilities, such as the ability to coordinate and integrate resources, may harm employee satisfaction in this context. This could be due to increased workload, reduced autonomy, or challenges aligning collective goals with individual preferences (Awogbami et al., 2021). The results indicate that collective capabilities are an important factor to consider when examining determinants of employee satisfaction in the manufacturing firms included in this study.

The results reveal a concerning trend regarding strategic sensitivity's impact on customer satisfaction. Although there is a weak positive relationship, it is statistically insignificant, with only 1.1% of the variance in customer satisfaction explained by strategic sensitivity. This suggests that while firms may be aware of market changes, they may not be effectively leveraging this awareness to significantly enhance customer satisfaction. The findings corroborate existing literature, which posits that factors influencing customer satisfaction extend beyond strategic sensitivity alone, highlighting the need for a multifaceted approach to addressing customer needs (Onayinka et al., 2023). In contrast, the study identifies a statistically significant negative relationship between collective capabilities and employee satisfaction. The findings indicate that as collective capabilities increase, employee satisfaction declines, as illustrated by the negative regression coefficient. This unexpected result indicates potential organizational challenges, where efforts to

integrate collective capabilities may inadvertently disrupt individual employee engagement and satisfaction. The analysis suggests that increased workloads, reduced autonomy, or misaligned collective goals might contribute to this negative effect.

Conclusion

The outcome of this study presents a critical aspect for organizations to consider, emphasizing that fostering collective capabilities should not come at the expense of employee morale. The discussion of findings bridges the gaps between theoretical and practical implications, asserting that while strategic agility is essential for navigating modern business challenges, its effectiveness is contingent upon holistic management approaches that consider both customer and employee perspectives. The study concludes that strategic agility within manufacturing firms must encompass various dimensions, ensuring that neither customer satisfaction nor employee engagement is compromised in the pursuit of organizational objectives.

Recommendations

Based on the summary and conclusion, the following recommendations are essential.

i. The selected firms should carefully re-evaluate their collective capabilities and ensure they align with the organization's strategic objectives and performance needs.
ii. Managers should explore ways to enhance firms' strategic sensitivity and strategic response capabilities, as the current study did not show significant effects on these dimensions.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, N., Daud, S., & Yusoff, R. (2018). Collective capabilities, communication channels, and employee satisfaction in manufacturing SMEs: A developing country perspective. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 29(7), 1263-1282.

Adebayo, T., & Oluwafemi, A. (2019). Strategic sensitivity and customer satisfaction in Nigerian Manufacturing Firms. *Journal of Business Strategy,* 25(3), 112-128.

Adesoji, R., & Olumide, K. (2022). Competitive advantage as a mediator between strategic sensitivity and customer satisfaction: Evidence from Nigerian manufacturing firms. *Journal of Business Research,* 40(1), 55-72.

Adewole, G.O & Opele, J. . (2019). Demographic change and industry-specific innovation patterns in Nigeria: the implication for knowledge management practices. *Noble International Journal of Social Sciences Research*, *4*(2), 25–32.

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.

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

Awogbami, P.A. Opele, J.K & Adeoye, R.A. (2021). Staff development program and service delivery in an academic

library: Implication for knowledge management in the University of Lagos, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Applied, Management and Social Sciences* (GOJAMSS), 21: 273-279.

Beuren, I. M., Dos Santos, V. & Theiss, V. (2022), Organisational resilience, job satisfaction and business performance, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 2262-2279. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2021-0158.

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,

Don-Baridam, L. Q. (2022). *International Academic Journal of Management & Marketing Annals* 5741-3792 DOI: 22239428314256618110

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.

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.

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.

Omimakinde, J., Opele, J.K & Omimakinde, E. (2022). What Drives Compliance with Corporate Governance Principles: Inference from Public University-based s in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, *5*(6), 2584–2592.

Onayinka T. S., Falebita, T.F., Awoniyi, O, M. Nweze, G.N & Opele, J. K. (2023). Hindrances to Research Productivity among Nigerian University Lecturers: A Roadmap for Policy Makers. *Trends in Educational Studies Journal (TRESJ)*, *15*(1), 126–139.

Rufai, M. O., Onayinka, T. S., Opele, J. K., & Salami, B. M. (2022). *Readership Of Newspaper Editorial Among Undergraduates Of Mass Communication Department Federal University Oye-Ekiti Nigeria*. *12*, 6.

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