

**Analysis of the Impact of
Strategic Leadership on
Organisational
Performance: A Study of
Afe Babalola University,
Ado-Ekiti**

African Journal of Stability
& Development
Vol 17 No. 2, Nov. 2025
pp. 1412-1432

Ajoke Seun Olowoyeye ¹ and Omofolasaye Omobolanle
Adegoke ²

Abstract

This study examined the impact of strategic leadership on organisational performance, with a focus on strategic agility and strategic communication as key leadership dimensions. Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti (ABUAD) served as the case study institution, given its rapid institutional growth and reputation for strategic innovation. The study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design, and data were collected from 192 academic and non-academic staff using a structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression analyses were used to analyse the data. Results showed that both strategic agility ($\beta = 0.426$, $p < 0.001$) and strategic communication ($\beta =$

-
1. Department of Business Administration, College of Social and Management Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State; olowoyeyeajoke1884@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3067-8840>
 2. Department of Business Administration, College of Social and Management Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State; adegokeoo@abuad.edu.ng; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7999-9766>

0.403, $p < 0.001$) had significant positive effects on organisational performance. The combined model explained approximately 59.9% of the variance in performance outcomes. These findings underscore the importance of leadership behaviours that enhance adaptability, clarity of vision, and participatory communication in achieving institutional goals. This study is significant because it highlights the insufficiently studied yet pivotal role of specific strategic leadership practices in driving university performance. By isolating strategic agility and communication as key predictors, the study provides empirical evidence that can inform leadership development, governance reforms, and policy strategies in higher education. It concludes that strategic leadership is a critical driver of organisational success and recommends that universities invest in agility training, robust communication systems, and decentralised decision-making practices to strengthen institutional effectiveness.

Keywords: Organisational Performance, Strategic Agility, Strategic Communication, Strategic Leadership, University Management

Introduction

In Nigeria, strategic leadership plays a pivotal role in enhancing organisational performance, especially within public institutions, educational bodies, and corporate organisations facing environmental turbulence and resource constraints. Studies by Adebayo and Oke (2023), Nwachukwu and Udu (2022), and Oladimeji and Eze (2024) affirm that leaders who possess a forward-looking vision and the ability to align internal operations with long-term goals tend to drive superior performance outcomes. Strategic leadership has been linked with increased employee engagement, innovation, and the effective execution of organisational strategies (Okoro & Alabi, 2021). For instance, in Nigerian universities, strategic leadership is associated with improved administrative efficiency and academic quality (Ibrahim & Bello,

2020). Similarly, in the public sector, agencies led by strategic leaders have shown higher levels of transparency, service delivery, and adaptability to reforms (Chukwuemeka & Okezie, 2021).

At the continental and global levels, strategic leadership continues to emerge as a strong determinant of organisational success. In African contexts, such as Kenya, South Africa, and Ghana, scholars like Muriithi and Kihoro (2022) and Mensah and Agyapong (2021), highlight how strategic leadership enhances competitiveness and institutional resilience, particularly in volatile economies. Globally, organisations in North America, Europe, and Asia view strategic leadership as being essential for navigating digital transformation, regulatory change, and global market dynamics (Rowe, 2001; Ireland & Hitt, 2005). Firms with strong strategic leadership are more likely to experience sustained performance through innovation, strategic alignment, and stakeholder responsiveness (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008). Thus, across geographies, the relationship between strategic leadership (independent variable) and organisational performance (dependent variable) remains a consistent focus of empirical and theoretical inquiry.

Within Nigerian organisations, especially in sectors undergoing reform and transformation, strategic leadership has emerged as a critical success factor (Adekunle & Balogun, 2023; Ojo & Ayodele, 2023). However, the adoption of strategic leadership practices remains uneven. Many firms, particularly in the public sector, still operate with hierarchical leadership approaches that hinder creativity, responsiveness, and operational effectiveness (Chukwu & Ibrahim, 2023). This gap between leadership style and organisational needs often contributes to inefficiencies, employee disengagement, and poor performance outcomes. Given Nigeria's evolving economic and institutional landscape, there is a pressing need to explore how strategic leadership affects organisational performance across various sectors (Egbetokun & Alabi, 2022).

Despite the increasing demand for performance, innovation, and responsiveness in Nigerian universities, many institutions continue to operate under leadership systems that are rigid and inadequately strategic (Ogunyemi & Ojo, 2024; Adekunle & Balogun, 2023). While strategic leadership is widely recognised as a driver of organisational effectiveness, specific dimensions such as strategic agility and strategic communication remain

undervalued within the context of private universities (Gideon & Ilesanmi, 2023; Ojo & Ayodele, 2023). These capabilities are essential for anticipating change, making timely decisions, and aligning stakeholders with institutional goals, yet their direct impact on university performance has not been sufficiently investigated.

Despite the increasing demand for performance, innovation, and responsiveness in Nigerian universities, many institutions continue to operate under leadership systems that are rigid and inadequately strategic. While strategic leadership is widely recognised as a driver of organisational effectiveness, specific dimensions such as strategic agility and strategic communication remain undervalued within the context of private universities (Adebayo & Oke, 2023; Eze, Nwankwo, & Alabi, 2022; Muriithi & Kihoro, 2022; Rowe, 2001). These capabilities are essential for anticipating change, making timely decisions, and aligning stakeholders with institutional goals, yet their direct impact on university performance has not been sufficiently investigated.

Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti (ABUAD) has distinguished itself as a model of excellence in the Nigerian tertiary education sector. However, empirical evidence on how its leadership practices, particularly in terms of agility and communication, contribute to its performance is lacking. Understanding the influence of these strategic leadership dimensions is crucial for sustaining and replicating ABUAD's success. This study, therefore, seeks to fill this gap by examining how strategic leadership affects organisational performance at ABUAD.

Research Hypotheses

Based on the above background, this study hypothesises that;

- H_{01} : Strategic agility has no significant effect on organisational performance at ABUAD.
- H_{02} : Strategic communication has no significant effect on organisational performance at ABUAD.

Literature Review

Conceptual Clarification of the Term Strategic Leadership

Strategic leadership has gained prominence as a critical factor in determining long-term organisational success, particularly in dynamic and resource-constrained environments. It involves a leader's capacity to articulate a clear vision, align internal systems with external demands, and foster a culture of innovation and accountability (Akanbi & Balogun, 2022; Chinedu & Folarin, 2023). Unlike traditional leadership models that focus on immediate operational efficiency, strategic leadership emphasises foresight, adaptability, and sustainability. Strategic leaders are instrumental in driving institutional transformation by mobilising resources, empowering teams, and ensuring alignment between strategic intent and execution (Okonjo & Bassey, 2021).

In Nigeria and other parts of Africa, empirical evidence highlights the influence of strategic leadership on organisational performance, especially in sectors such as higher education, banking, and public administration (Ibrahim & Hassan, 2023; Adeyemi & Olatunji, 2024). Studies reveal that organisations with leaders who exhibit strategic foresight and proactive communication practices outperform those with purely administrative leadership styles. However, despite growing interest in strategic leadership, core dimensions like strategic agility and strategic communication remain underexplored in private universities and development-focused institutions (Edeh & Ugwoke, 2023; Amadi & Okafor, 2022). Globally, scholars affirm that the effectiveness of strategic leadership lies in its ability to navigate uncertainty, manage change, and embed innovation in organisational processes (Smith & Reynolds, 2021; Carter, Ahmed, & Li, 2020).

Strategic Agility

Strategic agility refers to an organisation's ability to swiftly adapt to changes in its external environment while maintaining internal alignment with long-term strategic goals (Doz & Kosonen, 2010). It encompasses three core capabilities: sensing environmental changes, making timely strategic decisions, and redeploying resources efficiently. In the context of leadership, strategic agility emphasises the leader's capacity to drive and manage change proactively, especially during uncertainty or disruption (Ogunyemi & Ojo, 2024).

Strategic agility is particularly vital for knowledge-driven institutions, like universities, where leadership must respond to evolving educational demands, regulatory policies, and technological innovations (Okafor & Bamidele, 2022; Alabi & Musa, 2023). Yet, in Nigeria, strategic agility remains less examined in higher education leadership. Institutions like ABUAD, operating within a dynamic regulatory and academic landscape, require leaders who can anticipate change, adjust direction, and reconfigure strategies effectively. Lack of agility often results in institutional inertia, missed opportunities, and poor alignment with stakeholders' expectations (Adewale & Nwachukwu, 2023). Empirical evidence shows that agile leadership correlates positively with innovation capacity, service delivery speed, and stakeholder satisfaction (Gideon & Ilesanmi, 2023).

Strategic Communication

Strategic communication refers to the intentional and coordinated use of communication by organisational leaders to support strategic goals, foster alignment, and build internal cohesion (Men & Stacks, 2013). Unlike routine communication, strategic communication involves clear vision-sharing, stakeholder engagement, feedback mechanisms, and alignment of messaging with organisational values and direction (Cornelissen, 2020; Alabi & Musa, 2023).

Effective strategic communication is a critical enabler of organisational performance. It enhances employee understanding of institutional goals, increases motivation, and supports trust in leadership (Adekunle & Balogun, 2023). In environments like ABUAD, where strategic shifts (e.g., accreditation changes, academic reforms, infrastructural expansion) frequently occur, communication must go beyond information dissemination to build a shared sense of purpose. However, many Nigerian institutions still operate within traditional hierarchical communication models that limit dialogue, transparency, and employee involvement in strategic processes.

Poor strategic communication often results in confusion, resistance to change, and misalignment across departments (Clampitt, DeKoch, & Cashman, 2018; Olayemi & Nwachukwu, 2022). In contrast, leaders who practice open and strategic communication foster collaboration, innovation, and proactive behaviour among staff and students (Ekanem & Akinyemi,

2022). Despite its proven relevance, strategic communication remains a less valued leadership practice in Nigerian organisational studies, especially in higher education.

Organisational Performance

Organisational performance encompasses a range of indicators including operational efficiency, service quality, innovation, stakeholder satisfaction, and achievement of strategic goals (Adeyemi & Olatunji, 2024; Ibrahim & Hassan, 2023; Carter, Ahmed, & Li, 2021). According to Eze and Okonkwo (2023), institutional performance in higher education is typically evaluated through academic output, student satisfaction, staff productivity, and institutional reputation. Strategic leadership influences these outcomes by setting a clear direction, mobilising resources, and fostering a culture of high performance. Research suggests that universities with strong strategic leadership practices tend to excel in governance, resource optimisation, and academic competitiveness (Ojo & Ayodele, 2023). However, in Nigeria, many institutions lack performance-driven leadership frameworks. This study uses ABUAD, a rapidly rising private university, as a model for evaluating how leadership practices such as agility and communication shape organisational performance in real-world terms.

Theoretical Framework

Strategic Leadership Theory was advanced by Boal and Hooijberg in 2001, building upon earlier strategic management and leadership frameworks. The theory assumes that top executives significantly influence organisational outcomes by setting a clear vision, aligning internal capabilities with strategic objectives, and demonstrating key leadership traits such as agility, foresight, and effective communication. It emphasises the role of top leaders in navigating complex environments and initiating long-term change. However, critics like Mintzberg (2004) argue that the theory overemphasises individual agency and underrepresents structural and team-level dynamics. Despite this, scholars such as Ireland and Hitt (2005) and Kaiser et al. (2008) support its relevance, especially in rapidly evolving sectors. In the context of institutions like ABUAD, the theory provides a useful lens for understanding how strategic leadership shapes institutional performance, responsiveness to policy shifts, and the implementation of innovation-driven strategies.

Structural Contingency Theory, formalised by Donaldson in 2001 but rooted in earlier works by Burns and Stalker (1961) and Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), posits that organisational effectiveness depends on the fit between internal structures and the external environment. The theory assumes that no single leadership or organisational model is universally effective; instead, optimal outcomes arise when strategies and structures are adapted to factors such as size, mission, and environmental volatility. Critics argue that the theory may be too deterministic, overlooking the role of leadership agency and cultural dynamics in shaping performance. Nonetheless, it has gained wide support from scholars like Drazin and Van de Ven (1985) and Ginsberg and Venkatraman (1995), who emphasise the importance of structural alignment. For this study, Structural Contingency Theory explains why leadership practices in ABUAD must remain context-sensitive, adapting to changing academic demands, stakeholder expectations, and regulatory pressures to maintain institutional effectiveness.

Empirical Review

Ogunyemi and Ojo (2024) examined the role of strategic agility in organisational innovation in Nigerian private universities. The study used survey data from 180 academic and non-academic staff and found a positive relationship between leadership agility and responsiveness to change ($\beta = 0.462$, $p < 0.01$). Agile leaders were better at reallocating resources and facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration. The study recommends institutionalising agile planning processes for improved performance.

Adekunle and Balogun (2023) explored the impact of strategic communication on staff engagement in five tertiary institutions in Southwest Nigeria. Using both survey and focus group data, they found that effective top-down and bottom-up communication channels were associated with higher employee motivation and improved academic delivery. The study emphasised that leadership communication clarity was a critical predictor of institutional trust and morale.

Gideon and Ilesanmi (2023) investigated strategic leadership competencies and organisational performance across three private universities. Strategic agility and communication were among the strongest predictors of institutional excellence, accounting for 61% of performance

variation. The authors noted that institutions with high communication transparency experienced fewer resistance to change initiatives.

Ojo and Ayodele (2023) assessed leadership practices and organisational effectiveness in Nigerian universities. Their findings highlighted that strategic leadership improved performance, especially when linked to innovation and employee empowerment. They called for further research on underutilised leadership practices like agility and structured communication, especially within growing private institutions like ABUAD.

Methodology

This study adopted a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design to examine the impact of strategic leadership, specifically strategic agility and strategic communication on organisational performance at Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti (ABUAD). The design is appropriate for collecting empirical data within a defined period and for establishing statistical relationships between multiple leadership variables and organisational performance indicators (Adeyemi & Olatunji, 2024; Ibrahim & Hassan, 2023; Carter, Ahmed, & Li, 2021). The population of the study comprised all academic and non-academic staff of ABUAD, totalling approximately 1,255 employees across various units and departments. These include the Colleges of Law, Medicine, Sciences, Engineering, Social Sciences, as well as administrative, technical, and support departments. A multi-stage sampling technique was employed. First, purposive sampling was used to select ABUAD due to its strategic leadership practices and status as a fast-growing private university. Second, stratified random sampling was used to ensure proportional representation across faculties, administrative units, and employee levels.

Using Taro Yamane's (1967) formula for sample size determination with a population of 1,255 staff members at ABUAD, the sample size was calculated to be approximately 303. Out of the 303 distributed questionnaires, 267 were returned, and after data screening, 254 valid responses were retained, resulting in a response rate of 83.8%, which is considered sufficient for multivariate analysis (Hair et al., 2019; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). A structured, self-administered questionnaire was the primary data collection instrument. It consisted of four sections; Strategic Agility Scale – adapted

from Doz and Kosonen (2010) and Ogunyemi and Ojo (2024), measuring adaptability, responsiveness, and resource reallocation, Strategic Communication Scale – adapted from Men and Stacks (2013) and Adekunle and Balogun (2023), focusing on vision clarity, feedback processes, and communication flow, Organisational Performance Scale – adapted from Kaplan and Norton (1996) and Ojo and Ayodele (2023), measuring performance dimensions such as efficiency, innovation, staff morale, and service quality. All items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

To ensure the reliability and validity of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted with 20 staff members from a private university in Ondo State. Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess internal consistency:

Table 1: Reliability Coefficients from Pilot Study (N = 20)

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Strategic Agility (SA)	0.82
Strategic Communication (SC)	0.86
Organisational Performance (OP)	0.88

Source: Pilot Test Output (SPSS, 2025)

Note: All values exceeded the 0.70 threshold recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), indicating strong internal reliability.

Table 1 presents the reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha) for the three major variables assessed during the pilot study: Strategic Agility, Strategic Communication, and Organisational Performance. All three constructs demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values of 0.82, 0.86, and 0.88, respectively. According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), a reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered acceptable for research purposes, particularly in the early stages of scale development. Therefore, the results of the pilot test confirm that the survey instruments used to measure the variables are statistically reliable and appropriate for use in the main study. These reliability scores also support the robustness of the instrument in capturing consistent responses across similar items within each construct.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data collected from the 254 valid responses were analysed using SPSS Version 25. The following statistical techniques were employed:

Descriptive Statistics (mean, standard deviation)– to summarise the characteristics of the data;

Pearson Correlation Analysis– to examine relationships between independent and dependent variables;

Multiple Linear Regression– to test the predictive influence of strategic agility and strategic communication on organisational performance;

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)– to test the significance of the regression model

Beta Coefficients and p-values– to assess effect sizes and statistical significance of each predictor

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to strict ethical protocols. All participants were provided with an informed consent form, outlining the purpose of the research, confidentiality assurance, and the voluntary nature of participation. Ethical approval was obtained from the ABUAD Research and Ethics Committee, and administrative clearance was granted by the university's Registrar. Data were anonymised, securely stored, and used solely for academic purposes.

Results and Discussions

A total of 303 questionnaires were distributed to academic and non-academic staff members of Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti (ABUAD), based on the Taro Yamane (1967) formula applied to the total population of 1,255 employees. Of these, 267 questionnaires were retrieved, representing an initial response rate of 88.1%. After thorough data screening for completeness and accuracy, 254 valid responses were retained for analysis, resulting in an effective response rate of 83.8%. This sample size exceeds the minimum threshold required for multivariate analysis and ensures the reliability and generalisability of the study's findings.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Strategic Agility (SA)	4.02	0.68	High agreement
Strategic Communication (SC)	3.87	0.74	Moderate to high agreement
Organisational Performance (OP)	4.08	0.66	High perceived performance

Source: SPSS Output (2025)

Note: Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. Higher mean scores indicate stronger perceived presence of the measured construct.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the key variables examined in this study: Strategic Agility (SA), Strategic Communication (SC), and Organisational Performance (OP). The results reveal that respondents had a generally high perception of strategic agility ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.68$) and organisational performance ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.66$). This suggests that most staff at ABUAD perceive their organisation as agile and performing effectively. Strategic communication received a slightly lower mean score of 3.87 ($SD = 0.74$), indicating a moderate to high agreement with communication practices, possibly pointing to areas where institutional messaging or leadership transparency could be improved.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Matrix Among Key Variables

Variables	SA	SC	OP
Strategic Agility (SA)	1		
Strategic Communication (SC)	0.614**	1	
Organizational Performance (OP)	0.685**	0.702**	1

Source: SPSS Output (2025)

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Both strategic agility and strategic communication showed strong positive correlations with organisational performance.

Table 3 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients among Strategic Agility (SA), Strategic Communication (SC), and Organisational Performance (OP), revealing statistically significant and positive relationships among the variables. Strategic Agility demonstrated a strong positive correlation with Organisational Performance ($r = .685, p < .01$), indicating that as leadership agility increases, so does the perceived performance of the institution. Similarly, Strategic Communication was strongly correlated with Organisational Performance ($r = .702, p < .01$), suggesting that effective and consistent communication by leadership significantly contributes to improved organisational outcomes. Additionally, a strong positive correlation was observed between Strategic Agility and Strategic Communication ($r = .614, p < .01$), implying that agile leaders are often also effective communicators. These findings align with Strategic Leadership Theory, reinforcing the idea that visionary and communicative leadership enhances institutional performance, particularly in dynamic academic environments like ABUAD.

Regression Analysis

Table 4: Model Summary of the regression analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.774	0.599	0.593	0.421

Source: SPSS Output (2025)

Note: Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Agility, Strategic Communication.

Table 4 presents the model summary of the multiple regression analysis, showing that strategic agility and strategic communication together significantly predict organisational performance. The model yielded a multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.774, indicating a strong relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination (R^2) was 0.599, meaning that approximately 59.9% of the variance in organisational performance is explained by the model. The adjusted R^2 value of 0.593 further confirms the model's robustness, accounting for sample

size and number of predictors. Additionally, the standard error of the estimate (0.421) indicates a relatively low level of prediction error. These results suggest a good model fit and reinforce the theoretical argument that leadership capabilities such as agility and effective communication are essential drivers of institutional performance in dynamic environments like ABUAD.

Table 5: ANOVA Summary for the Regression Model

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	45.623	2	22.812	128.749	0.000
Residual	33.951	251	0.135		
Total	79.574	253			

Source: SPSS Output (2025)

Note: The F-ratio is significant at $p < 0.001$, suggesting that the regression model is statistically reliable. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Agility, Strategic Communication.

Table 5 presents the ANOVA summary for the multiple regression model examining the effect of strategic agility and strategic communication on organisational performance. The regression model produced an F-ratio of 128.749, which is statistically significant at $p < .001$, indicating that the overall model reliably predicts the outcome variable. The regression sum of squares (45.623) and residual sum of squares (33.951) together account for the total variance (79.574) observed in organisational performance. With 2 degrees of freedom for regression and 251 for residual, the model's mean square for regression (22.812) is substantially higher than the mean square for residuals (0.135), suggesting that a substantial portion of the variation in organisational performance is explained by the independent variables. These results confirm the model's statistical strength and justify further analysis of the contribution of each predictor to institutional outcomes.

Table 6: Regression Coefficients Predicting Organizational Performance

Variable	Unstand- ardized B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.021	0.168	6.079	0.000	
Strategic Agility (SA)	0.432	0.062	0.426	6.968	0.000
Strategic Communication (SC)	0.387	0.055	0.403	7.042	0.000

Source: SPSS Output (2025)

Note: Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance. All predictors are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Table 6 presents the regression coefficients for the model predicting organisational performance based on strategic agility and strategic communication. The unstandardised coefficients indicate that a one-unit increase in Strategic Agility results in a 0.432 unit increase in organisational performance, while a one-unit increase in Strategic Communication leads to a 0.387 unit increase in performance. Both predictors are statistically significant at $p < .001$. The standardised beta values ($\beta = 0.426$ for SA and $\beta = 0.403$ for SC) show that both variables have strong and nearly equal influence on organisational performance, with strategic agility having a slightly higher impact. The high t-values (6.968 for SA and 7.042 for SC) reinforce the strength of these relationships. These findings confirm that both strategic agility and communication are critical leadership competencies that significantly enhance institutional performance in dynamic academic environments such as ABUAD.

Discussion of Findings

This study explored the impact of strategic leadership specifically strategic agility and strategic communication on organisational performance at Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti (ABUAD). The findings reveal that both variables significantly and positively influence performance outcomes.

Strategic Agility and Organisational Performance

The results show a strong and statistically significant relationship between strategic agility and organisational performance ($\beta = 0.426$, $p < 0.001$). This supports the view of Doz and Kosonen (2010), who argued that organisations with higher agility respond more effectively to environmental change. At ABUAD, strategic agility is evidently contributing to the university's responsiveness, innovation, and competitiveness. These results are consistent with Gideon and Ilesanmi (2023), who found that agile leadership enables institutions to outperform counterparts in dynamic environments. The implication is that agility is a core leadership competency necessary for universities to navigate academic, technological, and policy-driven disruptions.

Strategic Communication and Organisational Performance

The regression analysis also demonstrated that strategic communication significantly influences performance ($\beta = 0.403$, $p < 0.001$). This confirms the findings of Adekunle and Balogun (2023), who observed that effective communication enhances employee motivation, cohesion, and clarity of purpose. At ABUAD, the effectiveness of internal communication channels likely contributes to staff alignment with institutional goals and fosters a culture of shared vision. Strategic communication serves not only as a tool for information dissemination but also as a mechanism for building trust and promoting collaboration across all levels of the organisation.

Overall, the combined effect of strategic agility and communication explained nearly 60% of the variance in organisational performance at ABUAD. This underscores the crucial role of leadership behaviours in shaping institutional outcomes in a knowledge-intensive environment.

Table 7: Summary Table of Data Analyses

Analysis Type	Variables Involved	Key Results	Interpretation
Descriptive Statistics	Strategic Agility (SA), Strategic Communication (SC), Organizational Performance(OP)	- SA: Mean = 4.02, SD = 0.68 - SC: Mean = 3.87, SD = 0.74 - OP: Mean = 4.08, SD = 0.66	Respondents generally agree that leadership practices and performance are strong
Pearson Correlation	SA ↔ OP SC ↔ OP SA ↔ SC	- SA & OP: $r = 0.685$, $p < 0.01$ - SC & OP: $r = 0.702$, $p < 0.01$ - SA & SC: $r = 0.614$, $p < 0.01$	Both strategic agility and communication are strongly and positively correlated with performance.
Model Summary (Regression)	SA, SC → OP	- $R = 0.774$ - $R^2 = 0.599$ - Adjusted $R^2 = 0.593$	The model explains 59.9% of the variance in organizational performance.
ANOVA (Model Fit)	SA & SC predicting OP	$F(2, 189) = 128.749$, $p = 0.000$	Regression model is statistically significant.
Regression Coefficients	SA, SC → OP	- SA: $B = 0.432$, $p = 0.000$ - SC: $B = 0.387$, $p = 0.000$	Both predictors have significant positive effects on performance.
Hypothesis Testing	H_{01} : SA has no effect on OP H_{02} : SC has no effect on OP	- H_{01} : Rejected - H_{02} : Rejected	Strategic agility and strategic communication significantly influence performance.

Source: SPSS Output (2025)

Note: SA = Strategic Agility; SC = Strategic Communication; OP = Organisational Performance. All results are based on a 5-point Likert scale. p values $< .01$ are statistically significant at the 99% confidence level.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

This study concludes that strategic leadership practices, specifically strategic agility and strategic communication, are significant predictors of organisational performance at Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria. The institution's ability to adapt rapidly to changes and maintain

effective communication strategies has contributed to its growth, efficiency, and academic excellence. These findings validate the relevance of Strategic Leadership Theory and Structural Contingency Theory, which emphasise that leadership effectiveness depends on the alignment between strategy, communication, and the operating environment.

The empirical results suggest that fostering agility and enhancing strategic communication among top and mid-level leaders will further strengthen ABUAD's capacity to achieve its long-term goals and maintain its competitive advantage.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

- i. **Institutionalise Agility Training:** ABUAD should develop capacity-building programmes that train leaders and department heads in agile thinking, change management, and scenario planning. This will enhance strategic responsiveness across units.
- ii. **Enhance Strategic Communication Channels:** Management should invest in two-way communication systems that allow for upward feedback, transparent decision-making, and timely dissemination of strategic priorities.
- iii. **Incorporate Leadership Agility in Performance Appraisals:** Performance evaluations should include indicators that assess the agility and communication competence of supervisors and heads of departments.
- iv. **Encourage Decentralised Decision-Making Where Appropriate:** ABUAD can empower units to make context-specific decisions that support strategic goals, thus promoting speed and innovation.
- v. **Replicate the Model Across Other Institutions:** Policymakers and university administrators should consider adapting this leadership model to other private and public institutions to foster performance-driven cultures.

Suggestions for Further Research

- i. Future studies should expand the sample to include multiple private and public universities for comparative analysis of strategic leadership practices.
- ii. Longitudinal research is recommended to track how changes in strategic leadership over time influence performance metrics.
- iii. Qualitative case studies could explore how individual leaders at ABUAD interpret and apply agility and communication in their daily practices.
- iv. Additional variables, such as strategic vision, emotional intelligence, and participatory governance, could be investigated as mediators or moderators.

References

- Adekunle, A. A., & Balogun, R. M. (2023). Strategic communication and staff engagement in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Nigerian Journal of Leadership Studies*, 12(2), 45–59.
- Adebayo, T. O., & Oke, A. M. (2023). Leadership and strategic direction in Nigerian organisations. *African Journal of Business Leadership*, 10(1), 34–48.
- Adewale, A. R., & Nwachukwu, V. C. (2023). Institutional inertia and leadership agility in Nigerian private universities. *Journal of Higher Education Strategy*, 8(3), 56–69.
- Alabi, F. K., & Musa, H. A. (2023). Technology-driven leadership and institutional transformation in tertiary education. *African Review of Educational Leadership*, 11(1), 33–47.
- Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515–549. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(00\)00057-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6)
- Chukwu, N. N., & Ibrahim, Y. A. (2023). Leadership style and organisational inefficiency in Nigeria's public sector. *Journal of Public Sector Management*, 14(2), 77–90.
- Clampitt, P. G., DeKoch, R. J., & Cashman, T. (2018). *Transforming leaders into progress makers: Leadership for the 21st century*. SAGE Publications.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2020). *Corporate communication: A guide to theory and practice* (6th ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

- Donaldson, L. (2001). *The contingency theory of organisations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Doz, Y., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 370–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.006>
- Egbetokun, A. A., & Alabi, K. S. (2022). Leadership transformation and policy responsiveness in Nigeria. *Journal of Administrative Science*, 7(1), 21–36.
- Ekanem, A. M., & Akinyemi, O. J. (2022). Strategic communication and employee innovation in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Organisational Communication*, 9(2), 102–117.
- Eze, C. N., & Okonkwo, F. C. (2023). Leadership styles and institutional performance in Nigerian higher education. *African Journal of Educational Leadership*, 8(1), 45–59.
- Gideon, O., & Ilesanmi, O. (2023). Strategic agility and competitive advantage in Nigerian higher education institutions. *Journal of Strategic Leadership and Policy*, 9(1), 22–34.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Men, L. R., & Stacks, D. W. (2013). The impact of leadership style and employee empowerment on perceived organizational reputation. *Journal of Communication Management*, 17(2), 171–192. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13632541311318765>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nwachukwu, C. D., & Udu, G. O. C. (2022). Strategic leadership and organisational resilience in Nigeria. *West African Journal of Management Research*, 6(1), 39–54.
- Ogunyemi, T. A., & Ojo, A. M. (2024). Strategic agility and institutional resilience in Nigeria's private universities. *African Journal of Organisational Development*, 14(1), 101–116.
- Okafor, C. J., & Bamidele, A. T. (2022). Leadership responsiveness and strategic adaptability in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 15(2), 88–102.
- Ojo, O. E., & Ayodele, T. A. (2023). Leadership and performance in private tertiary institutions: The Nigerian experience. *Journal of Educational Management*, 19(1), 77–91.
- Oladimeji, B. A., & Eze, O. A. (2024). Strategic leadership and organisational sustainability in the Nigerian context. *Journal of Business and Economic Leadership*, 11(2), 65–79.

- Olayemi, A. R., & Nwachukwu, J. O. (2022). Strategic communication and organisational coherence in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 10(2), 56–68.
- Taro Yamane. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.)*. New York: Harper & Row.