American Journal of Economics and Business Management

Vol. 8 Issue 12 | **pp.** 6379-6392 | **ISSN:** 2576-5973

Available online @ https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/ajebm

Article

Leadership Organization in Light of The Interaction Between Financial Improvisation and Agility: An Analytical Study of The Gene Views of Leaders At The University of Dhi Qar Assistant Lecturer

Iqbal Waheed Hussein[1]

1. Department of Business Administration, Dhi Qar Education Directorate

* Correspondence: aqbalaltaie@gmail.com

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to determine the interactive effect of the organizational leadership in the linkage between strategic improvisation and organizational performance flexibility within the University of Thi-Qar. The study population consisted of leaders from various faculties at the University of Thi-Qar, and a questionnaire was the primary data collection tool, with 119 questionnaires distributed, 10 of which were not returned, and six were invalid for analysis, with a total of 103 questionnaires being analyzed and hypothesis testing using SPSS version 20 and PLS SMART software. The study adopted a descriptive-analytical approach. The selected colleges at the University of Thi-Qar included: College of Medicine, College of Administration and Economics, College of Education for Humanities, College of Education for Pure Sciences, College of Arts, College of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Science, College of Computer Science and Mathematics, College of Agriculture, College of Law, College of Islamic Sciences, College of Media, College of Archaeology, College of Nursing, and the university presidency.

Keywords: Strategic improvisation, organizational leadership, organizational agility (GA), University of Dhi Qar

Citation: Hussein, I. W. Leadership Organization In Light Of The Interaction Between Financial Improvisation And Agility: An Analytical Study Of The Gene Views Of Leaders At The University Of Dhi Qar. Assistant Lecturer. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2025, 8(12), 6379-6392

Received: 25th Oct 2025
Revised: 17th Nov 2025
Accepted: 27th Nov 2025
Published: 19th Dec 2025

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Strategic improvisation is a critical topic in commercial management and needs to be managed by people within the organization who are skilled and able to make decisions to achieve organizational agility [1]. Based on this, researchers felt that further research on strategic improvisation, organizational leadership, and organizational resilience was warranted [2]. To understand this, a number of statistical indicators were employed to test the hypotheses used in the current study. In contrast, the topics were covered in a scientific manner by dividing the research into four parts: (1) the research methodology, (2) the theoretical aspect, (3) the practical and applied aspect, and (4) the results of the study.

Study methodology

1. The study problem

1. Does planned managing have an impact on GA?
2. Is there a relationship between strategic managing and GA?

3. What is the extent of the message between organizational leadership, strategic improvisation, and GA?

4. What is the impact of organizational leadership on GA?

2. The importance of the study

1. This study provides a more actionable framework that managers may utilize to create agility and improvisation-oriented leadership strategies.
2. It helps to fill a gap in the literature by offering an integrative framework that synthesizes leadership, agility, and improvisation.
3. This interaction can be extended to the research sample and applied to crisis response, change management, and organizational excellence.
4. It may also be used in decision-making in designing organizational policies that facilitate entrepreneurial leadership and reduce change resistance.
5. It can contribute to a more flexible organizational culture that is equipped to handle uncertainty.

3. Study objectives

1. To determine whether organizational leadership enhances or weakens the impact of strategic improvisation on organizational agility.
2. To develop a theoretical framework that explains the interaction between variables and helps in understanding the performance dynamics of the organizational sample under study.
3. To contribute to the development of knowledge about leadership and organizational agility in unstable contexts[3].
4. To determine the extent to which improvisation contributes to improving an organization's ability to adapt to environmental changes.

4. Study scale

Table 1.

Variables	Dimensions	**Code**		measurement
Strategic improvisation	Innovation	SINN	SI	Arshad,2011
	Spontaneity	SSPO		
	Intuition	SINT		
Organizational leadership	Risk-taking	ORIT	OL	Yeboah,2013
	Creativity	OINU		
	Independence	OIND		
	Proactivity	OPRO		
	Aggressive competitiveness	OOFC		
Organizational agility	Flexibility	OFLE	OA	Shajrawi & Aburub,2023
	Sensing ability	OSEA		
	Competencies	OCOM		
	Responsiveness	ORES		

5. The hypothetical plan of the study

Figure 1. Model of the hypothetical study plan

6. Study sample

Seventh: Sample and Study Population. The study population was selected from the University of Thi Qar, which includes the following faculties: (College of Medicine, College of Administration and Economics, College of Education for Human Sciences, College of Education for Pure Sciences, College of Arts, College of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Science, College of Computer Science and Mathematics, College of Agriculture, College of Law, College of Islamic Sciences, College of Media, College of Archaeology, College of Nursing, and the Presidency of the University of Thi Qar). The research sample is a portion of the population that the researcher resorts to for the study [4], [5]. The study population, which is the University of Thi Qar, was defined as (the University President, deans of faculties, heads of departments, and department directors at the University of Thi Qar Presidency). The reason for selecting this sample is due to its relevance to the nature of the work of administrative leaders and the nature of the main variables, which are (strategic improvisation, organisational leadership, and organisational flexibility). The total number of leaders included was (119), of which (103) questionnaires were valid for analysis, (10) were not returned, and (6) were invalid for analysis.

2. Strategic Improvisation

1. the concept of strategic improvisation

It is the innovation of new ideas, adopting them and implementing them by individuals within a context of shared awareness of group performance and its development over time. This includes rapidly building intuition, providing flexible options to deal with an unclear and changing environment, and combining immediate learning through design iterations and testing with a focus on leadership tasks and discipline in achieving goals [6]. It is the ability to automatically recombine knowledge, processes, and structures in real time, leading to creative problem-solving based on the realities of the moment [7]. It refers to the convergence between planning and execution and has been formally defined as the deliberate and objective integration of designing and executing a new output. In other words, the more an organization designs an activity pattern during its execution—rather than before—the greater the presence of improvisation.

2. The Importance of Strategic Improvisation

Al-Balaghi & Al-Zubaidi, Antunes, Al-Abadi & Al-Sharmani & Zain emphasized the following:

a. It represents the best formation methodology for dealing with rapid changes and evolving inter-organizational requirements [8].
b. It contributes to the rapid acquisition of information in real time, as improvisation requires immediate access to information and real-time communication with all stakeholders.

c. It is the best strategy for dealing with rapid changes and evolving environmental requirements.
d. Improvisation can be a source of competitive advantage because creativity and intuition in strategic decision-making influence the differentiation of organizations in changing work environments.
e. It provides a rapid response method by reducing the time required to make strategic decisions.
f. It reduces the time required to implement strategic actions [9], [10].
g. it is conducive to flexibility and responsiveness, as it takes place under conditions in which organizations need to be agile in the face of environmental challenges, which require rapid learning and adjustment; it results in better performance and quality.
h. it allows organizations to discover creative solutions to problems in a timely fashion. Strategic improvisation is a high degree of flexibility and adaptability to vicissitudes in the surrounding environment, and it improves learning through improvisational activities and decisions [11].
i. Strategic improvisation combines flexibility and adaptability to vicissitudes in the surrounding environment to a tall degree. It enhances an organization's ability to learn through improvisational activities and decisions.
j. Improvisation motivates an organization because it provides the ability to confront important events, especially recurring ones.
k.

2. Materials and Methods

Dimensions of Strategic Improvisation

1. Intuition: Intuition expresses a person's ability to discover things or make decisions without relying on direct or logical knowledge. Intuition can be based on past experience, vague feelings, or even an inexplicable affinity. In some cases, intuition can be a powerful source for making sound decisions. Intuition interacts with knowledge and procedures intuitively, as it is defined as utilizing the natural properties of the mind to think about things unconsciously and provide appropriate solutions when necessary.

2. Spontaneity: Spontaneity is defined as the behavior of members of organizations and their ability to formulate and implement strategic procedures or decisions simultaneously, or it is the immediate action derived from a specific stimulus. Spontaneity among people is manifested not only as activities involving response but also as physical reactions that form part of performance. Spontaneity is a social activity in which one surprises oneself in situations that require an immediate reaction.

3. Innovation: is the process of developing something new, whether in the production of goods or services that meet the needs of individuals and society. Creativity and innovation manifest themselves in several aspects, such as the quality and size of the product or service, the method of its delivery, the diversification of its uses, and the increase in its effectiveness. Innovation can also involve combining different rudiments in a new way, integrating inconsistent ideas, or making new models that meet the needs and desires of employees.

Organizational Leadership

1. The concept of Organizational Leadership

This is the process of converting rigid and static business activities into flexible and dynamic ones, it is a process that converts individual thinking into collective action, propels organisations to move towards optimal performance and reconfigures economic capabilities. Likewise, organisational entrepreneurship is seen by some authors as business diversification and growth that leads to the creation of new ventures within existing organisations to improve competitiveness, productivity, and profitability. It is an internal strategy that can be used to search for opportunities in organizational settings, it has a long-

term effect on organizational growth, and is about the ongoing reinvention of novel business projects that demand the discovery and exploitation of resources avail.

2. The Importance Organizational Leadership

Hassan and Olaniran and Barringer et al. emphasized the importance of entrepreneurship in several ways:

1. Entrepreneurial behavior donates to the economic strength and energy of the economy by either building on current projects or creating new undertakings, which creates new service for individuals and the public.
2. Innovations from entrepreneurial companies impact the communities in which they operate by providing the products and services that make the lives of community members more productive and better.
3. Entrepreneurship strengthens the relationship between universities and research centres on one hand, and industrial companies on the other.
4. It significantly reduces unemployment and provides new job opportunities for young people, contributing to the reduction of poverty and addressing social issues.
5. It curbs the phenomenon of brain drain by providing a supportive and stimulating entrepreneurial environment for investment, innovation, and creativity. The more nurturing the environment, the greater the number of entrepreneurial and adventurous investors carrying promising ideas and projects.

Dimensions Organizational Leadership

1. Risk-taking: Acting boldly without knowing the results. Entrepreneurial-oriented organizations should look for alternatives that represent risk. The organization's desire to obtain opportunities despite the lack of certainty surrounding it means that knowing the risk and assessing its degree constitutes the practical basis for risk management in the organization. This management consists of identifying the risk and prioritizing it on a special risk scale, thus reaching the most important risks facing the organization.

2. Creativity: Creativity is defined as the tendency to engage with creative ideas, activities, and experiences through excellence in new products and services and entering markets with a high degree of confidence. Creativity is the defining function of entrepreneurship, whether in a public organization or a new project presented by an individual. Creativity provides new resources that generate wealth or maintain existing resources while improving their productive capabilities. Creativity is the main output of organizations seeking leadership and is often the source of competitive success, as there are no specific limits to risk-taking behavior between organizations and entrepreneurs with regard to new projects. The less risk, the more the entrepreneur is a worker, and the more risk, the more the entrepreneur becomes. Embracing risk is related to decision-making and is based on the principle of adventure.

3. Autonomy: This refers to the freedom granted to individuals and work teams by encouraging them to exercise their creativity through proposing new ideas and pursuing them to achieve the desired results. There are two approaches for organizations that utilize autonomy: (First) Work groups can be used to speed entrepreneurial thinking and enable managers and employees to work together to generate new ideas and ideas for innovation. (Second) Designing organizational structures to foster autonomy: Organizational structures can also be designed to encourage autonomy. When competition makes a change in the competitive environment necessary, stable organizations with traditional structures cannot withstand competition and must be restructured.

4. Proactivity: Proactivity is a proactive strategy that includes scanning for opportunities in the market, testing new ideas, and reacting to environmental trends, and involves the organization engaging in environmental and future-oriented activities such as idea generation, anticipation of problems, avoidance of problems, and maintaining flexibility and consistency through new processes or new products. Finally, the proactive dimension is related to leadership, because it is the organization that is seeking to seize new opportunities or enter new markets ahead of competition. The concept of proactivity refers

to the extent to which an organization tries to lead competitors instead of following them in key areas of work, such as producing new products or services, adopting new technologies, or new management techniques (Dess, 2005).

5.Offensive competitiveness: Competition is represented by the project management's effort to outperform competitors through spending to expand manufacturing capacity or reduce prices to gain market share. Competition is defined as the organization's ability to survive in business and protect its investments to gain returns on these investments. This is achieved through the ability to adapt to environmental changes. When organizations face challenges from their competitors, they must have the ability to possess the characteristic of competitiveness in order to confront the challenges and control the organizations. Through this dimension, organizations can determine the extent of aggressive attacks on competitors. Therefore, competition reflects the strength of the organization's attempts to obtain more achievements from its competitors. If the organization has a distinguished position, it must make an attempt to maintain the position from competition.

3. Results

Organizational Agility

1.The Concept of Organizational Agility

Organisational flexibility is the ability of any organisation to survive and thrive in the modern global business environment. An organisation must be agile and responsive to internal and external changes in the business environment. This involves adapting to and managing the turbulent conditions of the business environment, thereby meeting the evolving demands of the business world. Organisational strategies need to be developed to address such demands. Organisational flexibility refers to the ability of organisations to maintain or increase efficiency and effectiveness of business operations in the face of changing market dynamics, as well as to be responsive to and overcome challenges [12], [13]. Two of the most important dimensions of successful application of competitive rules are the rate of change and flexibility. Organisational flexibility is a concept that is characterized by several attributes, namely sensing flexibility, decision-making flexibility, and operational flexibility. It is the ability of an organization to adapt to its environment and its landscape in real time. Flexibility is a natural state. Organisations that respond consciously and proactively to constant and unpredictable environmental changes will be more resilient and grow and evolve in a competitive environment. The agile system works [14].

2. The Importance of Organizational Agility

According to Young, Moffat & Atkinson, and

1. Organisational flexibility is typically concerned with how the organisation can respond to its operational environment, but it also can deal with recycling, integration, and generative flexibility.
2. Much of the research on organisational flexibility has centered on what makes an agile organisation.
3. Organisational flexibility provides managers with information that can help them manage employees more efficiently.
4. It allows the organisation to adapt to change, to become open and non-hierarchical, to focus on the employee, to empower the employee by giving him complete responsibility, to accept ambiguity and uncertainty, and to develop problem-solving skills and to generate quick solutions [15].
5. It fosters a positive, collaborative environment to realize the goals and vision of the organization. This is important because it helps... generate value and capitalize on opportunities, leverage resources, carry out obligations, and deliver superior performance.

6. Organizational flexibility is a driver of competitiveness and survival that allows institutions to respond to new opportunities [16], [17].
7. Risk management and ongoing performance improvement.
8. Engaged and empowered employees.
9. Efficiency and effectiveness.
10. Fast decision-making and implementation.
11. Innovation, collaborative learning, and positive work environment.
12. Ability to learn, adapt, and change to address threats.
13. Bypassing structural constraints through flexible structures.

Dimensions of Organizational Agility

1.Flexibility: Organizational flexibility is the ability of an organization to react to environmental changes and to perform in a dynamic environment, particularly in complex environments that are experiencing continuous and rapid change[18]. Organizational flexibility refers to the capacity of an organization to respond to environmental changes and continuous and rapid changes in complex environments[19]. Organizational flexibility is a dynamic process of the organization that enables it to adapt to its external environment and to respond to unexpected and ongoing environmental changes, allowing companies to grow and develop in a competitive environment. Organizational flexibility addresses customer needs, brings in new products, engages in planned expansion, and participates in acquisition and divestiture activities [20].

2.Sensing ability: Sensing is the capacity to actively gather valuable information, process and interpret the information, analyze the causes and implications, and forecast opportunities and threats in the organizational environment, as well as to monitor changes in the environment, such as changes in customer preferences, competitor moves, and new technologies [21].

3. Competencies: The concept of competencies is one of the most misunderstood and misapplied in organizational management. Organizational competencies are often viewed as mere employee-specific skills, rather than as fundamental, company-wide competencies that enhance integrated business execution and management alignment. Some large organizations have recognized the importance of identifying competencies and restructuring all aspects of work to support them. The result is a cohesive team focused on executing the organization's core strategy [22].

4. Responsiveness: It is the capability of an organization to connect with customers or partners rapidly and seamlessly, and to reconfigure groups to devise innovative actions with ease. Responsiveness may involve adapting, but it may also involve acquiring external partners, new systems, or expertise. It is the capacity to reconfigure the resources and processes of an organization to restart activities in accordance with the work environment. It is the detection and quick reaction, either anticipatory or corrective. Responsiveness can enhance organizational performance and competitive advantage, organizational productivity, and effective marketing [23].

Data Analysis

1. Coding and Characterizing Research Variables

Coding and telling research variables is one of the important steps in designing research educations, as it significantly donates to organising information and analysing data professionally. Accordingly, Table (2) illustrates the device used in the research for coding and telling the variables.

Table 2. Variable Coding

Variables	Dimensions	Items	Code		Scale
Strategic improvisation	Innovation	3	SI	SINN	Arshad,2011
	Spontaneity	3		SSPO	
	Intuition	3		SINT	
	Risk-taking	3	OL	ORIT	Yeboah,2013
	Creativity	3		OINU	

Organizational leadership	Independence	3	OA	OIND	Shajrawi & Aburub,2023
	Proactivity	3		OPRO	
	Aggressive competitiveness	3		OOFC	
	Flexibility	3		OFLE	
Organizational agility	Sensing ability	3		OSEA	
	Competencies	3		OCOM	
	Responsiveness	3		ORES	

2. Normality Test of the Measurement Instrument

The findings in Table (3) show that the data used to analyze the variables that were studied are normally distributed, and therefore the findings of the study can be generalized to the study population. In addition, the null hypothesis that the data are normally distributed is accepted at a significance level of 0.05 or greater, and the alternative hypothesis that the data are not normally distributed is rejected at a significance level of less than 0.05.

Table 3. Normality Test of the Measurement Instrument

Variables	Dimensions	Items	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test	
Strategic improvisation	Innovation	3	0.131	0.153
	Spontaneity	3		0.145
	Intuition	3		0.150
	Risk-taking	3		0.182
Organizational leadership	Creativity	3	0.122	0.153
	Independence	3		0.166
	Proactivity	3		0.160
	Aggressive competitiveness	3		0.133
Organizational agility	Flexibility	3	0.130	0.169
	Sensing ability	3		0.160
	Competencies	3		0.133
	Responsiveness	3		0.169

3. Testing the Reliability of the Measurement Instrument

Table (4) displays the item reliability values for Strategic Improvisation (0.864), Organizational Leadership (0.946), and Organizational Agility (0.822); all dimensions had reliability values above the reliability requirement for Cronbach\'s alpha coefficient of (0.776) and (0.903) for Spontaneity and Risk, respectively.

Table 4. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha					
Strategic improvisation	Innovation	0.856	Spontaneity	0.776	Intuition	0.805
	The overall average of Cronbach's alpha factor					
	0.864					
Organizational leadership	Risk-taking	0.903	Creativity	0.821	Independence	0.835
	Proactive		0.797		Offensive competitiveness	0.849
	The overall average of Cronbach's alpha coefficient					
	0.946					
Organizational agility	Flexibility	0.800	Sensing ability	0.797	Competencies	0.836
	Responsiveness				0.779	
	The overall average of Cronbach's alpha coefficient					
	0.822					

4. Statistical Description

Table (5) displays the overall mean score and standard deviation for the strategic improvisation variable, where the mean score was (4.12) with a S.D of (0.65), indicating

that the surveyed sample prioritizes strategic improvisation, which is consistent with the innovation dimension (SINN) as the first with a mean score of (4.18) and a S.D of (0.72) and the intuition dimension (SINT) as the last with a mean score of (4.06) and a S.D of (0.74), suggesting that innovation in strategies is a top priority for the surveyed sample, a trend in today's world that reflects the need for more creativity and innovation to gain a competitive edge. On the other hand, intuition as a dimension needs more attention to become a good part of the strategies used [24].

The organizational leadership variable, as can be seen in Table (5), had an overall mean score of (4.11) and a standard deviation of (0.64), which is indicative of a strong proactivity, suggesting a tendency to take action in response to changes in the environment (i.e., OPRO dimension with a mean of 4.12 and a standard deviation of 0.84) rather than a competitiveness in the pursuit of goals (i.e., OOFC dimension with a mean of 4.09 and a standard deviation of 0.82).

As can be seen in Table (4), the mean score of the Organizational Agility variable is (4.06) with a standard deviation of (0.74), and the mean scores of its dimensions, sensing ability (OSEA) and responsiveness (ORES), were (4.12) with a standard deviation of (0.84) and (4.02) with a standard deviation of (0.88), respectively [25]. This indicates that the sensing ability dimension was the highest priority for the surveyed sample, followed by the responsiveness dimension, which needs further improvement in the organizational agility strategy.

Table 5. Statistical Description of Research Variables

Paragraph	Meaning	Standard Deviation	Paragraph	Meaning	Standard Deviation	Paragraph	Meaning	Standard Deviation
SINN1	4.39	0.74	**OINU1**	4.16	1.08	**OFLE1**	3.90	1.18
SINN2	4.31	0.90	**OINU2**	4.01	1.13	**OFLE2**	4.07	1.05
SINN3	3.84	1.06	**OINU3**	4.17	0.88	**OFLE3**	4.10	1.09
SINN	4.18	0.72	**OINU**	4.11	0.79	**OFLE**	4.02	0.88
SSPO1	4.20	0.93	**OIND1**	4.12	1.04	**OSEA1**	4.10	1.09
SSPO2	4.16	0.92	**OIND2**	4.09	1.03	**OSEA2**	4.05	1.03
SSPO3	4.00	0.83	**OIND3**	4.09	1.02	**OSEA3**	4.22	0.88
SSPO	4.12	0.75	**OIND**	4.10	0.91	**OSEA**	4.12	0.84
SINT1	4.02	0.99	**OPRO1**	4.10	1.09	**OCOM1**	4.06	1.06
SINT2	4.09	0.86	**OPRO2**	4.05	1.03	**OCOM2**	4.09	1.00
SINT3	4.06	0.84	**OPRO3**	4.22	0.88	**OCOM3**	4.12	1.04
SINT	4.06	0.74	**OPRO**	4.12	0.84	**OCOM**	4.09	0.82
SI	4.12	0.65	**OOFC1**	4.06	1.06	**ORES1**	3.90	1.18
ORIT1	3.93	1.16	**OOFC2**	4.09	1.00	**ORES2**	4.07	1.05
ORIT2	4.22	1.00	**OOFC3**	4.12	1.04	**ORES3**	4.10	1.09
ORIT3	4.17	1.07	**OOFC**	4.09	0.82	**ORES**	4.02	0.88
ORIT	4.11	0.72	**OL**	4.11	0.64	**OA**	4.06	0.74

5. Testing the Research Hypotheses

H1: There is a significant correlation between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership, from which the following hypotheses branch out:

The results of Table (6) of the correlation matrix showed a strong positive correlation between strategic improvisation and organisational leadership (0.628), indicating the positive impact of strategic improvisation on organisational leadership among individuals; a strong positive correlation between the dimensions of the variables, such as (0.286) between the intuition dimension (SINT) and the autonomy dimension (OIND), indicating a moderate relationship that needs to be strengthened; and (0.503) between the innovation dimension (SINN) and the proactivity dimension (OPRO), indicating a clear positive relationship that enhances the effectiveness of innovation within the framework of proactivity [26], [27].

H2: There is a significant correlation between strategic improvisation and organizational agility, from which the following hypotheses stem:

Table (6) shows that the correlation matrix indicates that strategic improvisation is positively correlated with organisational work flexibility with a correlation coefficient of (0.566) suggesting a strong positive effect of strategic improvisation on organisational work flexibility. The results also indicated strong correlations between the dimensions of the variables from (0.346) between the intuition dimension (SINT) and the response dimension (ORES), suggesting a moderate relationship that should be reinforced to improve performance, and (0.530) between the innovation dimension (SINN) and the sensing capability dimension (OSEA), a clear positive correlation that emphasises the importance of innovation in sensing capability.

H3: There is a significant correlation between organizational leadership and organizational agility, from which the following hypotheses stem:

Table (6) shows that the correlation matrix for organisational leadership and organisational work flexibility had a correlation value of 0.874, indicating a high positive correlation which strongly suggests that organisational leadership has a positive effect on organisational work flexibility [28]. The results also revealed high correlations between variable dimensions, such as 0.369 between the risk dimension (ORIT) and the competence dimension (OCOM), which shows a moderate relationship that requires improvement to perform better, and 0.779 between the autonomy dimension (OIND) and the competence dimension (OCOM), which shows a high positive correlation indicating that autonomy is important in enhancing organisational competencies.

Table 6. Correlation Matrix

	SINN	SSPO	SINT	SI	ORIT	OINU	OIND	OPRO	OOFC	OL	OFLE	OSEA	OCOM	ORES	OA
SINN	1														
SSPO	.675"	1													
SINT	.700"	.610"	1												
SI	.897"	.867"	.876"	1											
ORIT	.459"	.444"	.417"	.500"	1										
OINU	.486"	.342"	.495"	.501"	.411"	1									
OIND	.418"	.388"	.286"	.413"	.446"	.397"	1								
OPRO	.503"	.471"	.373"	.510"	.453"	.546"	.567"	1							
OOFC	.476"	.473"	.404"	.512"	.369"	.439"	.779"	.507"	1						
OL	.605"	.548"	.507"	.628"	.687"	.715"	.840"	.799"	.809"	1					
OFLE	.441"	.457"	.364"	.471"	.443"	.490"	.579"	.735"	.498"	.714"	1				
OSEA	.530"	.471"	.373"	.510"	.453"	.546"	.567"	.578"	.507"	.799"	.735"	1			
OCOM	.476"	.473"	.404"	.512"	.369"	.439"	.779"	.507"	.472"	.809"	.498"	.507"	1		
ORES	.441"	.457"	.346"	.471"	.443"	.490"	.579"	.735"	.498"	.714"	.695"	.735"	.498"	1	
OA	.536"	.536"	.423"	.566"	.494"	.567"	.720"	.860"	.715"	.874"	.940"	.860"	.715"	.940"	1

H4: Strategic improvisation has a significant effect on organizational leadership, leading to the following hypotheses:

Table (7) demonstrates that the beta coefficient and regression parameter of strategic improvisation results in improving organizational leadership, meaning that an increase of one unit in strategic improvisation leads to an increase of 0.621 towards the beta coefficient and 1.560 towards the regression parameter with a standard error of 0.077 and a critical value of 20.260, thus strategic improvisation explains 0.395 of the organizational leadership variable, so that the effect of strategic improvisation on organizational leadership can be calculated as:

$Y = a + \beta X$

Where:

Y = Dependent variable (Organizational Leadership)

a = Regression parameter

β = Beta value

X = Strategic improvisation

$Y = 1.560 + 0.621\ X$

Assume that X = 1, then the equation becomes:

$Y = 1.560 + 0.621 * 1$

$Y = 1.560 + 0.621$

$Y = 2.181$

H5: Strategic improvisation has a significant effect on organizational agility, leading to the following hypotheses:

Table (7) depicts the results which demonstrate that strategic improvisation contributes to organizational agility, suggesting that the effect of increasing strategic improvisation by one unit will lead to an increase of 0.649 in the beta coefficient, a decrease in the regression parameter of 0.199, a standard error of 0.094, and a critical value of 2.117, and that this relationship will account for 0.320 of the variation in the organizational agility variable:

$Y = a + \beta X$

Where:

Y = Dependent variable (Organizational Agility)

a = Regression parameter

β = Beta value

X = Strategic improvisation

$Y = 0.199 + 0.649\ X$

Assume that X = 1, then the equation becomes:

$Y = 0.199 + 0.649 * 1$

$Y = 0.199 + 0.649$

$Y = 0.848$

H6: There is a significant effect of organizational leadership on organizational agility, from which the following hypotheses stem:

Organizational leadership in Table (7) results reveal that one unit of organizational leadership will result in 0.963 increase in the beta coefficient and 1.403 increase in the regression parameter with a standard error of 0.056 and a critical value of 25.054, which accounts for 0.764 of the organizational agility variable [29], [30]. Thus, we know that the effect of organizational leadership on organizational agility is given by the following equation:

$Y = a + \beta X$

Where:

Y = Dependent variable (Organizational Agility)

a = Regression parameter

β = Beta value

X = Organizational Agility

$Y = 1.403 + 0.963\ X$

Assume that X = 1, then the equation becomes:

$Y = 1.403 + 0.963 * 1$

$Y = 1.403 + 0.963$

$Y = 2.366$

H7: There is a significant effect of the interaction between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership on organizational agility, from which the following hypotheses stem:

The results in Table (7) show that the interaction between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership contributes to enhancing organizational agility. This indicates that increasing the interaction between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership by one unit leads to an improvement of 0.821 towards the beta coefficient and 1.884 towards the regression parameter, with a standard error of 0.010, resulting in a critical value of 188.400. Consequently, this relationship contributed to the interaction between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership explaining 0.603 of the organizational agility variable. Therefore, the effect of the interaction between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership on organizational agility can be determined using the following equation:

$Y = a + \beta X$

Where:

Y = Dependent variable (Organizational Agility(

a = Regression parameter

β = Beta value

X = Interaction between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership

$Y = 1.884 + 0.821\ X$

Assume that X = 1, and therefore the equation becomes:
Y = 1.884 + 0.821 * 1
Y = 1.884 + 0.821
Y = 2.705

Table 7. Results of the Influence Hypotheses

P	Value R^2	Value F	Critical Value	Standard Error	Valueβ	Regression Coefficient (a)	Path		
0.001	0.395	65,810	20.260	0.077	0.621	1.560	OL	<---	SI
0.001	0.320	47,508	2.117	0.094	0.649	0.199	OA	<---	SI
0.001	0.764	326,243	25.054	0.056	0 pieces	1.403	OA	<---	OL
0.001	0.603	153,474	188.400	0.010	0.821	1.884	OA	<---	SIOL

From the above, it is noted that the interactive role between strategic improvisation and organizational leadership contributes to enhancing organizational agility. It contributed to improving the relationship between strategic improvisation and organizational agility from (0.848) to (2.705), which means that the amount of improvement is (1.857).

4. Conclusion

a. The findings designated that organizational leadership was a dynamic interaction of strategic managing and organizational agility, and that the combination of these two rudiments allowed for the organization to influence chances and turn tests into modest recompenses.

b. The findings showed that strategic managing allowed organizational receptiveness by letting for adaptive decision-making in surprising circumstances, which in turn reinforced the organizational capability for business innovation in dynamic settings.

c. The results designated that organizational agility creates the circumstances for coordination, authorization, and organizational trust mechanisms that enable strategic managing by converting improvised ideas into strategic practices.

d. The results established that the communicating relationship between invention and agility increases leadership.

e. that a balanced interaction between them upsurges the efficacy of the organization in capturing entrepreneurial chances while lessening the risks of immediate decisions.

f. And organizations with flexible constructions and a culture that inspires experimentation are more likely to attain entrepreneurial fineness than organizations with rigid or administrative procedures.

5. Recommendations

a. An organizational philosophy that promotes controlled research and knowledge-supported individual creativities to allow for reply to environmental changes without losing strategic way.

b. Flexible leadership systems that mix strategic vision with rapid executive capabilities to ensure that improvisation is allied with long-term goals and improves entrepreneurial effectiveness.

c. Consolidation the organizational substructure that supports agility by plummeting administrative levels and flared the decision-making expert of working teams to reply quickly to developing changes.

d. Mixing knowledge organization does to transform the knowledge from improvisational experiences into accrued organizational knowledge that improves sustainable leadership.

e. Investment in entrepreneurial human capital growth, including training in groundbreaking thinking, handling unforeseen situations, and decision-making under doubt.
f. Activating digital skills and artificial intelligence to improve organizational agility in data group and analysis, which enables the organization to improvise on the basis of real-time information.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Al-Anzi and H. Hamoud, "The mediating role of strategic improvisation in the relationship between creative leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: An applied study on public hospitals in the Northern Borders Region," Scientific Journal of Financial and Commercial Studies and Research, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 749–782, 2024.

[2] N. Al-Balaghi, N. Nour, and S. Al-Zubaidi, "The role of organizational improvisation in reducing strategic rigidity: An exploratory study at the Middle East Iraqi Investment Bank," Journal of Business Economics, no. 1, pp. 309–325, 2021.

[3] D. A. Arshad, Understanding Organisational Improvisation: Foundations and Performance Implications, Ph.D. dissertation, Loughborough Univ., Loughborough, UK, 2011.

[4] S. Atkinson and J. Moffat, The Agile Organization: From Informal Networks to Complex Effects and Agility, CCRP Publication Series, 2005.

[5] H. A. Bakar, R. Mahmood, and N. N. H. Ismail, "Effects of knowledge management and strategic improvisation on SME performance in Malaysia," Asian Social Science, 2015.

[6] M. Banumathi and C. Samudhrarajakumar, "A study on corporate entrepreneurship development by organizational learning capability and outcome of job satisfaction," Journal of Gujarat Research Society, vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 121–129, 2019.

[7] R. B. Barringer and R. D. Ireland, Entrepreneurship: Successfully Launching New Ventures, 2nd ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 2012.

[8] R. Chamanifard, A. Nikpour, S. Chamanifard, and S. Nobarieidishe, "Impact of organizational agility dimensions on employees' organizational commitment in foreign exchange offices of Tejarat Bank Iran," European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, vol. 4, no. 1, 2015.

[9] Y. Costin et al., "Using simulation to develop entrepreneurial skills and mindset: An exploratory case study," pp. 136–145, 2018.

[10] M. Darvishmotevali, L. Altinay, and M. A. Köseoglu, "The link between environmental uncertainty, organizational agility, and organizational creativity in the hotel industry," International Journal of Hospitality Management, vol. 87, Art. no. 102499, 2020.

[11] G. G. Dess, G. T. Lumpkin, and M. L. Taylor, Strategic Management: Creating Competitive Advantages, 2nd ed., New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

[12] M. P. e Cunha, E. Gomes, K. Kamoche, J. Mair, A. Miner, and S. Tarba, "Improvisation, strategy, and strategic improvisation in emerging markets," 2014.

[13] J. Ejdys, "Entrepreneurial orientation vs. innovativeness of small and medium size enterprises," 2016.

[14] N. Farahmand, H. Tagizadeh, and M. Kheirandish, "A strategy formulation model based on corporate entrepreneurship in industrial firms of Iran," Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, vol. 5, no. 12, pp. 1221–1230, 2011.

[15] J. M. Gonzalez-Varona, A. López-Paredes, D. Poza, and F. Acebes, "Building and development of an organizational competence for digital transformation in SMEs," arXiv preprint, arXiv:2406.01615, 2024.

[16] A.-A. Z. Hashem Al-Abadi and A. F. Ali, "Strategic improvisation and its role in achieving organizational excellence," Journal of Kufa Studies Center, vol. 1, no. 59, pp. 419–444, 2020.

[17] M. A. Hassan and S. O. Olaniran, "Developing small business entrepreneurs through assistance institutions: The role of Industrial Development Centre, Osogbo, Nigeria," International Journal of Business and Management, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 213–226, 2011.

[18] P. Hopkin, Fundamentals of Risk Management, 2nd ed., London, UK: Kogan Page, 2013.

[19] P. Hughes, R. E. Morgan, I. R. Hodgkinson, Y. Kouropalatis, and A. Lindgreen, "A diagnostic tool to determine a strategic improvisation readiness index score (IRIS) to survive, adapt, and thrive in a crisis," Industrial Marketing Management, vol. 88, pp. 485–499, 2020.

[20] N. A. Ibrahim, R. Mahmoud, and H. Bakkar, "Strategic improvisation and the performance of banking institutions: The moderating role of organizational culture," PSU Research Review, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 212–230, 2018.
[21] N. B. Mavengere, "Role of information systems for strategic agility in supply chain setting: Telecommunication industry study," Electronic Journal of Information Systems Evaluation, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 100–112, 2014.
[22] B. Mrugalska and J. Ahmed, "Organizational agility in Industry 4.0: A systematic literature review," Sustainability, vol. 13, no. 15, Art. no. 8272, 2021.
[23] H. Nzewi and P. Moneme, "Business agility and competitive advantage of selected commercial banks in Anambra State, Nigeria," Pyrex Journal of Business and Finance Management Research, vol. 2, no. 8, pp. 81–88, 2016.
[24] Y. K. Park, The Dynamics of Opportunity and Threat Management in Turbulent Environments: The Role of Information Technologies, Ann Arbor, MI, USA: ProQuest LLC, 2011.
[25] S. J. Kilan, "Strategic improvisation and its impact on achieving organizational success: An exploratory study of the opinions of a sample of administrative leaders in the Iraqi Tourism Authority," Journal of Administration and Economics, vol. 49, no. 144, pp. 196–207, 2024.
[26] S. Singer, M. Alpeza, and M. Balkić, "Corporate entrepreneurship: Is entrepreneurial behavior possible in a large company?" in Proc. 29th Conf. Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Maribor, Slovenia, pp. 217–227, 2009.
[27] D. Teece, M. Peteraf, and S. Leih, "Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy," California Management Review, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 13–35, 2016.
[28] A. Vuckic, Uncovering the Mystery of Improvisation in Project Management, M.S. thesis, Univ. of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden, 2022.
[29] A. G. Young, Identifying the Impact of Leadership Practices on Organizational Agility, M.S. thesis, Organization Development, 2013.
[30] J. Zhan and D. Deschoolmeester, "The contextual determinants behind entrepreneurial behavior within 3D of entrepreneurial orientation: Evidence from SMEs in China," International Retail and Marketing Review, 2006.