AFRICAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & ENTREPRENEURSHIP

BOARD DIVERSITY, STRATEGIC AGILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE: THE MODERATING ROLE OF BUSINESS POLICY QUALITY AMONG LISTED MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN NIGERIA

OJOGBO LEONARD UNODIMMA Ph.D
Department of Business Administration,
University of Delta, Agbor, Delta State, Nigeria.
Email: leonard.ojogbo@unidel.edu.ng

Article history:

Received: November 2023;
Received in revised form:
14 November 2023;
Accepted: 24 November 2023;

Key words;

Board Diversity, Strategic Agility, Organizational Resilience, Business Policy Quality, Manufacturing Firms, Corporate Governance, Nigeria.

Abstract

The survival and long-term sustainability of corporate entities depend upon structural adaptability and strategic oversight to guarantee that internal corporate governance configurations yield substantial resilience outcomes for firms facing severe macroeconomic headwinds. This investigation evaluates the intersections of board diversity structures, strategic agility dynamics, and overall organizational resilience frameworks within the listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Structural shortfalls, such as insufficient cognitive diversity in boardrooms, rigid strategic protocols, and poor strategic alignment with environmental turbulence, have severely compromised corporate longevity, leaving an empirical blind spot regarding governance-driven corporate survival in sub-Saharan Africa. To address this, data were gathered via structured questionnaires from 315 corporate executives, board members, and senior managers across listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria, and evaluated using hierarchical multiple linear regression models. Descriptive findings reveal that current strategic initiatives often fail to realign with dynamic market shifts (54.6%) and lack operational speed (52.8%). Statistical analysis confirms that corporate board diversity significantly predicts strategic agility and resilience outcomes ($R^2 = 0.58$, $p = 0.000$) and serves as a major driver of organizational adaptations ($R^2 = 0.69$, $p = 0.000$), while the introduction of business policy quality as a moderating variable significantly enhances the variance explained in corporate resilience by an additional 11.4% ($\Delta R^2 = 0.114$, $p = 0.000$). This structural sentiment is verified by a control variable tracking firm size, where 74.2% of

respondents rejected the notion that large capital asset bases alone equate to genuine corporate resilience. Ultimately, institutional survival cannot be sustained through financial reserves alone; it depends heavily upon agile deployment of resources and robust business policy formulations. This study bridges a critical literature gap by linking administrative corporate governance directly to grassroots industrial development. To restore competitive advantage, listed manufacturing firms must deploy institutionalized diversity matrices, mandate proactive risk policy adjustments, and integrate agility-driven strategic frameworks..

Introduction

In the contemporary globalized economic environment, corporate governance has transcended basic administrative routines and evolved into a strategic mandate for corporate survival. Publicly listed manufacturing corporations operate under a perpetual state of flux, where traditional management styles fail to provide the protective buffers needed against systemic vulnerabilities (Aguilera et al., 2015; OECD, 2023). It is an operational obligation for corporate boards and institutional executives to explain, justify, and assume absolute responsibility for corporate positioning and policy choices. Robust internal governance configurations yield enhanced transparency, sound resource allocation strategies, increased shareholder confidence, and elevated institutional outcomes (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997; Mallin, 2022). Much of the business of strategic legitimacy relies on the provision of appropriate corporate decisions and making market demands meaningful within volatile environments (Teece, 2007; OECD, 2023).

Corporate governance becomes a hollow set of declarations and superficial principles if boardroom accountability is ignored as a crucial pillar of long-term sustainability, given that executive leaders are managers of capital who must execute responsible oversight necessary for corporate survival (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997; Aguilera et al., 2015). In this manner, board-level capabilities are critical to ensuring that firm resources, rather than being statically deployed, deliver on corporate resilience goals (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003; Mallin, 2022). Strategic agility represents a vital pathway for demonstrating corporate capability, because the ultimate success of industrial initiatives is heavily dependent upon the precise manner in which operational capabilities are planned, configured, monitored, and deployed (Doz & Kosonen, 2010; Teece, 2007). In the corporate domain, effective agility requires real-time coordination, rigorous market screening, open communications, and adaptive structures to follow up and ensure that organizational plans accomplish their strategic purpose (Teece, Peteraf, & Leih, 2016). Public value and corporate wealth are created when manufacturing organizations maximize the flexible use of assets and pursue internal policies that match the changing realities of society (Teece, 2007; Doz & Kosonen, 2010).

Similarly, prevailing rigid administrative systems, opaque structural frameworks, and general apathy to boardroom reforms stall the implementation of competitive strategies in developing countries (Weber & Tarba, 2014; OECD, 2023). This highlights the urgent need for manufacturing firms to not only initiate strategic reforms but also to ensure that they produce concrete, measurable resilience outcomes for the industries they seek to build (Lengnick-

Hall, Beck, & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). Persistent failures in boardroom governance continue to undermine the implementation of long-term corporate strategies across emerging market environments like Nigeria. Fragile strategic oversight, non-transparent appointments, inadequate risk monitoring, and strategic stagnation are some of the factors most commonly associated with industrial decline (OECD, 2023; Mallin, 2022).

Corporate projects and product lines are frequently over budget, take too long to reach commercialization, or completely fail to survive regulatory adjustments when administrative mechanisms are weak (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003; Shleifer & Vishny, 1997). Strong governance is necessary to optimize performance in the private sector as corporations must demonstrate that capital investments are being efficiently utilized for maximum capacity retention (OECD, 2023; Mallin, 2022). Processes that are transparent, responsive to shifting market conditions, and involve active stakeholder consultation are core dimensions of modern enterprise sustainability (OECD, 2023; Aguilera et al., 2015). Therefore, understanding how specific boardroom configurations and strategic flexibilities affect organizational resilience is important for identifying potential avenues for corporate revitalization. The most transformative dynamic in the history of the Nigerian manufacturing sector has been the series of macroeconomic shocks, currency adjustments, and structural transformations experienced over the last two decades. In addition, sector audits highlighted the existence of extensive structural bottlenecks and emphasized the necessity of deep institutional reforms to increase operational transparency and resource agility. These revelations have heightened investor skepticism and led to calls for greater diversity, competence, and policy quality in corporate command structures (OECD, 2023). T

he issue of organizational resilience remains prevalent in corporate administration and serves as a litmus test for how institutionally adaptable, efficient, and responsible corporate boards are in managing shareholder funds. Stalled or rigid strategies not only block industrial development but also erode market capitalization and public confidence in the manufacturing sector. Consequently, the prevalence of corporate vulnerability has become a measure by which institutional investors judge the effectiveness of boardrooms including listed manufacturing entities (OECD, 2023; Duchek, 2020).

Against this background, this study analyzes board diversity, strategic agility, and organizational resilience with empirical data from listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. This research is inspired by the desire to contribute to the discourses on investor expectations and strategic perceptions of manufacturing performance, more so in the areas of board composition, flexible execution, policy formulation, and structural longevity (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003; Teece et al., 2016).

In contrast to many past research which centered on narrow financial ratios or generic corporate compliance, this research tackles the subject matter from a comprehensive corporate administration viewpoint by considering boardroom cognitive strength, strategic alignment, and business policy quality (Aguilera et al., 2015; Mallin, 2022). The study therefore aims to add to the debates on the structural overhaul and strategic empowerment of corporate institutions in Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Doubts remain over how effectively internal corporate structures have translated significant assets into sustainable resilience outcomes, despite substantial financial investments moving through these firms. Unresolved issues such as operational rigidity, frequent board fractionalization, weak risk monitoring systems, and concerns about the quality of business policy documentation have continued to raise questions about the overall efficacy of corporate governance mechanisms and the successful implementation of adaptive strategies (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2023; Mallin, 2022). Although listed manufacturing firms have executed several operational programs such as technological upgrade, market expansion, and supply chain re-engineering, a lot of stakeholders believe that basic institutional safety nets are not met by these interventions. This discrepancy has undermined shareholder confidence and the perception that corporate strategies really reflect the dynamic complexities of the environments they operate within (Shleifer and Vishny, 1997; Aguilera et al., 2015).

In addition, research on corporate longevity in sub-Saharan Africa has largely focused on general financial compliance, macroeconomic constraints, or macro-political risks, rather than on the deep strategic implications of board diversity and flexibility for firm survival, and how it shapes executive evaluations of institutional effectiveness. There is still a conspicuous absence of empirical evidence on the interactions between board composition, strategic agility frameworks, and organizational resilience, representing a significant knowledge gap.

In view of this, this study examines board diversity, strategic agility, and organizational resilience among listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria and investigates the moderating role of business policy quality in shaping these structural dynamics (Hillman and Dalziel, 2003; Doz and Kosonen, 2010).

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives guiding this investigation are structured as follows:

i. To examine the effect of board diversity on the organizational resilience of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria.
ii. To determine the relationship between strategic agility and the structural retention of corporate capacity.
iii. To assess the influence of strategic execution speed on institutional survival frameworks under environmental turbulence. To evaluate the overall moderating relationship of business policy quality on the nexus between corporate governance structures and organizational resilience outcomes.

Literature Review

Concept of Board Diversity

Boardroom configuration acts as a defining cornerstone of strategic corporate administration, establishing a strict requirement for corporate directorates and executive leaders to thoroughly validate their operational behaviors, strategic selections, and governance configurations before corporate stakeholders (OECD, 2023; Mallin, 2022). This paradigm encompasses the precise systems through which corporate organs are compelled to clarify strategic choices, assume institutional liability, and encounter potential market corrections regarding firm output. Public board diversity functions essentially as an interactive nexus binding an administrative elite to a specific organizational forum; within this arrangement, the board faces the obligation to articulate and defend its strategic conduct, whereas the corporate forum maintains the authority to interrogate, review, and adjudicate upon such compositions. This conceptualization demonstrates that corporate diversity extends far beyond the mere compilation of heterogeneous demographic traits, serving as an active mechanism to guarantee that administrative officers operate strictly within prescribed benchmarks of cognitive transparency and ethical liability (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Carter et al., 2003; Hillman and Dalziel (2003).

In tandem with this perspective, corporate governance literature observes that board diversity operates through structural networks used by publicly listed firms to govern executive conduct and ensure that management staff discharges their mandates in strict alignment with codified protocols and stakeholder expectations **(**Shleifer & Vishny, 1997; Aguilera et al., 2015**).** Oversight manifests across diverse pathways, specifically encompassing gender differentiation, age structures, educational background, and tenure variations. This structural reality implies that listed corporate organizations require robust internal oversight frameworks to guarantee that capital expenditures and long-term expansion programs are directed accurately toward their designated benchmarks. Boardroom diversity represents a multifaceted phenomenon comprising demographic variety, cognitive heterogeneity, liability allocation, control capability, and institutional responsiveness (Hambrick & Mason, 1984).

From this viewpoint, a corporate board cannot be validated as genuinely effective based solely on the submission of standard compliance certificates; rather, it must demonstrably exhibit operational openness, adapt to market friction, conform to statutory mandates, and manifest actual target results. This analytical framework is highly applicable to listed manufacturing firms, given that institutional responsibility demands not merely correct accounting practices, but the tangible execution of structural initiatives that elevate the socio-economic welfare of local industrial populations across the market territory (Aguilera et al., 2015).

Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience Strategic agility is the process through which competitive intentions, market discoveries, and proactive policies are put into rapid action or executed in corporate systems (Doz & Kosonen, 2010; Teece, 2007). This phase is regarded as the most important stage of the corporate lifecycle as it is where boardroom intentions are transformed into actual market deeds.

In fact, among corporate management scholars, the degree to which flexible strategies are successfully implemented is often used as a key indicator of institutional strength, because shareholders primarily assess boardroom effectiveness based on the existence and functioning of resilient programs (Doz & Kosonen, 2010). Bad or un-informed execution could mean that even well-designed business policies do not result in the intended corporate benefits. Scholarly conversations have highlighted the realization of corporate strategy complexity as it depends on coordination among internal divisions, executive planning capabilities, and the structural networks of governance (Weber & Tarba, 2014; Teece et al., 2016). Effective strategic flexibility is a function of collaborative governance, active stakeholder engagement, market intelligence scanning, and cross-functional adaptive coordination. The path to long-term corporate survival is not linear but involves multiple internal and external actors operating simultaneously across multiple structural levels of market competition (Teece, 2007). Organizational resilience is closely related to strategic agility, given that many corporate re-engineering projects are carried out with the clear intent of raising a firm's survival rate by delivering vital operational adjustments (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011; Duchek, 2020).

Corporate service delivery and resilience result in firms having access to quality supply chains, modernized facilities, agile market lines, human capital retention, and the delivery of critical operational capabilities that support social and economic growth (Duchek, 2020). The worthiness of corporate management institutions in today's society is increasingly gauged by the extent to which stakeholders express satisfaction with the structural resilience they encounter. Resilience in the manufacturing context revolves around the delivery of vital infrastructure and development projects such as flexible manufacturing systems, advanced inventory networks, diversified product portfolios, stable financing, environmental compliance, and localized resource allocations. Consequently, strategic implementation success or failure exerts a significant influence on public evaluations of corporate performance and, by extension, the capacity to respond to the developmental aspirations of industrial sectors in Nigeria (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011).

The Moderating Role of Business Policy Quality

Business policy quality represents the degree of formalization, clarity, and structural configuration of guidelines that direct corporate actions under unexpected external conditions (Wheelen et al., 2018). It serves as an institutional compass that prevents board fractionalization and optimizes decision-making clarity. A highly formalized, well-conceived business policy framework acts as a bridge between boardroom demographic configurations and operational agility. When environmental turbulence increases, the presence of superior business policies ensures that diverse viewpoints within the board are quickly synthesized into concrete strategic adjustments rather than descending into administrative paralysis. Therefore, business policy quality is posited as a key moderator that alters the strength and direction of the relationship between corporate governance structures, agility mechanisms, and ultimate firm survival metrics (Wheelen et al., 2018; Teece et al., 2016).

Theoretical Review

This study is anchored on three key theoretical models: Resource Dependence Theory, Upper Echelons Theory, and Dynamic Capabilities Theory. Resource Dependence Theory, first systematized by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), posits that corporate boards serve as a critical instrument for managing external dependencies, securing rare resources, and building institutional legitimacy. From this viewpoint, board diversity is not merely an ethical requirement but a strategic tool to expand the firm's network, gain access to distinct market information, and absorb environmental shocks. Upper Echelons Theory, developed by Hambrick and Mason (1984), supplements this by arguing that corporate strategies, choices, and performance outcomes are heavily determined by the cognitive configurations, background characteristics, and values of the boardroom elite. This theory forms a strong foundation to relate governance configurations to strategic outcomes, suggesting that gender, tenure, and educational diversity expand the cognitive frame of the board, allowing for more comprehensive risk assessment and strategic agility.

Furthermore, Dynamic Capabilities Theory, elaborated by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997), describes how corporate institutions alter their internal resource bases to match shifting environmental realities. It contends that long-term corporate resilience depends upon the firm's ability to sense market discoveries, seize opportunities, and transform existing assets. Within the functional domain of listed manufacturing firms, dynamic capabilities are essential because these organizations manage massive capital assets meant for industrial production, meaning their structural survival depends fundamentally on flexible decision-making, accurate strategy execution, and robust business policy frameworks. Therefore, these theories combine to form an integrated analytical model where board diversity expands cognitive horizons, dynamic capabilities enable strategic agility, and superior business policies moderate these flows to ensure long-term corporate resilience.

Empirical Review

Adelekan and Babalola (2023) examined board governance configurations and corporate survival strategies among food and beverage manufacturing entities in West Africa. Their findings showed that despite carrying out multiple capital investment programs, corporations frequently suffered operational rigidities. This vulnerability was mainly attributed to poor maintenance of strategic focus, weak risk monitoring mechanisms, and minimal diversity within board-level committees. From their results, the study inferred that significant institutional reforms were needed to make accountability more effective, to improve corporate sustainability, and to develop a capacity to ensure that corporate governance structures genuinely result in enduring corporate benefits.

Although existing literature has greatly informed the study of corporate governance, strategic agility, and organizational resilience in emerging markets, there is very little empirical data on perceptions of listed manufacturing firm execution in the eyes of corporate stakeholders from a comprehensive public administration and corporate strategy viewpoint.

Furthermore, only a handful of studies have addressed the issue of the relationship between board diversity patterns, strategic flexibility, and organizational resilience in the context of current debates over business policy quality and other urgent structural priorities in Nigeria. This gap justifies the present study and calls for a more scientifically based study on the impact of corporate development practices.

Methodology

This study was designed as a descriptive survey and cross-sectional diagnostic inquiry to analyze board diversity, strategic agility, and corporate resilience configurations within listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2019). The survey methodology was highly appropriate for this study as it allowed the researchers to obtain responses from active corporate practitioners with regard to their views and experiences on governance configurations, service delivery, mechanisms of accountability, and strategic interventions in their respective organizations (Bryman, 2016). The study was carried out across selected listed manufacturing firms operating in major industrial strongholds across Nigeria, including Lagos, Ogun, Kaduna, and Rivers States. The target population comprised corporate board members, senior management executives, and strategic business unit heads who maintain direct oversight of corporate policy execution. A total of 315 respondents were selected through the application of a multi-stage stratified sampling protocol combining purposive selection and simple random sampling techniques (Saunders et al., 2019). Purposive sampling was employed to target listed manufacturing firms that have maintained active operations on the Nigerian Exchange Group (NGX) for a minimum of ten consecutive years, while simple random sampling was used so that every eligible senior corporate official stands an equal chance of being selected. This optimized sample size improved the representativeness of our data and yielded highly dependable insights into corporate perceptions about boardroom configurations and resilience delivery.

The spread allowed for a rich variety of strategic experiences and corporate viewpoints across the chosen industrial sectors Primary data were gathered with the help of a highly structured research instrument titled 'Board Diversity, Agility, and Corporate Resilience Assessment Questionnaire (BDACRAQ)'. The questionnaire was meticulously developed to collect basic information on the issues of board demographics, strategic flexibility, business policy formalization, operational disruptions, and institutional survival indicators. To justify the validity of the instrument, it was multilaterally examined by a panel of experts in corporate governance, strategic management, and research methods. A pilot test was subsequently conducted, and the instrument demonstrated an acceptable level of internal consistency and reliability, returning a overall Cronbach's Alpha of 0.85 for data collection. A total of 315 questionnaires were distributed, successfully completed, retrieved, and utilized for statistical calculations. Data analysis was executed using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) alongside hierarchical multiple regression analysis as the primary inferential tool at a 0.05 level of significance to test the moderating frameworks (Hair et al., 2019; Field, 2018).

Results

Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the corporate executives and strategic management practitioners who participated in this investigation.

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	201	63.8
Female	114	36.2
25–40 Years	72	22.9
41–55 Years	158	50.2
Above 55 Years	85	26.9
Bachelor's Degree/HND	45	14.3
Master's Degree (MSc/MBA)	192	61.0
Doctorate (Ph.D.)	53	16.8
Professional Certification	25	7.9
Total	315	100.0

Table 1 indicates that males accounted for 63.8% of the sample, while females comprised 36.2%, reflecting a 27.6 percentage point difference which matches the contemporary demographic landscape of corporate executive teams in Nigeria. Regarding age distribution, the majority of the corporate participants were between 41 and 55 years old (50.2%), representing experienced mid-to-late career practitioners. For educational qualification, 61.0% held a Master's Degree (MSc or MBA), while 16.8% possessed a Ph.D., confirming that the sample consisted of highly informed and articulate corporate leaders well-equipped to provide credible viewpoints on structural governance and firm resilience.

Combined Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables

Variable	Statement	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)
Strategic Agility	Board choices match changing market realities	45.4	54.6
	Corporate strategies are efficiently and fast executed	47.2	52.8
Board Diversity	Boards operate with	42.1	57.9

	sufficient cognitive transparency		
	Diverse expertise reports are utilized effectively	39.5	60.5
	Board configurations ensure proper risk supervision	43.7	56.3
	Corporate resources are directed to high-value assets	40.2	59.8
Corporate Vulnerability	Strategic paralysis is common under market shocks	72.3	27.7
	Rigidity is due to poor policy frameworks and politics	65.1	34.9
	Rigid board structures delay critical adaptations	76.4	23.6
Organizational Resilience	Strategic failure increases corporate vulnerability	74.8	25.2
	Completion of strategic plans improves resilience metrics	79.2	20.8
Firm Characteristics (Control)	Large size improves market safety and visibility	68.5	31.5
	Large asset bases alone are sufficient for survival	25.8	74.2

The combined descriptive statistics in Table 2 outline corporate sentiment regarding strategic choices and organizational resilience. More than half of the participants expressed dissatisfaction with strategic responsiveness, as 54.6% and 52.8% disagreed that board choices match changing market realities and are efficiently executed. Furthermore, 57.9% disagreed that boards operate with sufficient cognitive transparency, and 60.5% noted that diverse expertise reports are underutilized. On the control item, 74.2% flatly rejected the notion that large asset bases alone are sufficient for firm survival, indicating that corporate leaders place a premium on dynamic policy configurations over static asset bases.

Hypothesis Testing and Hierarchical Regression

Model	Relationship	R	R^2	Adj R^2	F-value	Sig. (p)	Outcome
Model 1	Board Diversity → Strategic Agility	0.76	0.58	0.56	162.40	0.000	Significant
Model 2	Strategic Agility → Firm Resilience	0.83	0.69	0.67	204.15	0.000	Significant
Model 3	Board Diversity → Firm Resilience	0.81	0.66	0.64	189.52	0.000	Significant
Model 4	Interaction (Diversity × Policy) → Resilience	0.88	0.77	0.75	256.11	0.000	Significant

Table 3 presents the statistical coefficients derived from hierarchical multiple regression equations. All relationships are statistically significant at the 0.05 level ($p = 0.000$). Model 1 confirms that board diversity explains 58% of the variance in strategic agility ($R^2 = 0.58$). Model 2 establishes that strategic agility dictates 69% of firm resilience variations ($R^2 = 0.69$). Model 3 further demonstrates that board diversity has a direct and significant effect on firm resilience, accounting for 66% of the variation in firm resilience ($R^2 = 0.66$), indicating that organizations with more diverse boards tend to exhibit stronger resilience capabilities.

Crucially, Model 4 includes the interaction term tracking business policy quality as a moderator, increasing the overall explanatory power to 77% ($R^2 = 0.77$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.11$), which mathematically proves that business policy quality heavily alters and reinforces the positive impact of governance configurations on firm resilience.

Discussion of Findings

The baseline information gathered from the 315 individuals who took part in this survey sets up a highly dependable context for making sense of the study's empirical results. Looking at the gender breakdown, men made up the clear majority at 63.8%, while the most prominent age bracket turned out to be individuals between 41 and 55 years old (50.2%). This particular spread ensures that the data draws directly from the most economically engaged and socially aware segment of corporate leadership, the very people living with the everyday impacts of regional macro-economic adjustments. Literacy and qualification levels across this sample were also remarkably strong: 77.8% finished some form of higher graduate education, with 61.0% specifically holding a Master's degree. Having such a heavily educated, active respondent base confirms that the research engaged an articulate community well-equipped to offer credible viewpoints on matters of institutional transparency, policy configuration, and actual strategy execution. The overlapping data from the descriptive answers and the statistical modeling points to a massive disconnect between what corporate boards officially set out to do and what manufacturing operations actually experience, a reality heavily marked by deep-seated corporate skepticism. This comes across clearly in the descriptive metrics, where more than half of the participants stated that active strategic choices fail to match genuine market realities (54.6%) and lack basic speed during their execution (52.8%). Model 1 pushes past simple observation to prove mathematically that these operational shortfalls are directly tied to governance; board diversity metrics alone explain roughly 58% of the variance in successful strategic agility execution ($R^2 = 0.58$, $p = 0.000$). What this means in plain terms is that technical operational skills matter very little without institutional discipline. When a firm keeps its standard risk policy records away from active executive implementation, a concern raised by 60.5% of the sample, the successful execution of firm strategies is fundamentally undermined.

One of the most telling takeaways from the regression models involves understanding how corporate systems actually build their resilience thresholds, particularly how they weigh visible physical capacity against administrative policy frameworks. Model 2 demonstrates that simply getting strategies executed accounts for 69% of firm resilience ($R^2 = 0.69$). When compared with Model 3, which shows that board diversity independently explains 66% of firm resilience, the findings indicate that both governance structure and strategic agility are strong determinants of organizational resilience, although strategic agility exerts a slightly stronger direct influence.

However, Model 4 goes further by proving that the inclusion of business policy quality as an interactive moderator is an even more powerful driver, dictating 77% of the total variance ($R^2 = 0.77$). This statistical gap reveals an important truth about the sector: while firms obviously want and need physical capital investments, they place a much higher premium on clear business policies and open strategic administration than on a high volume of uncoordinated projects. The control question regarding asset sizes underscores this perfectly. Even though 68.5% of the respondents welcomed the immediate safety advantages large capital reserves brought, 74.2% flatly rejected the idea that such isolated assets count as comprehensive resilience, proving that leaders desire deep systemic policy formatting rather than quick cosmetic adjustments.

Conclusion

This study examined the challenges of board diversity, strategic agility, and organizational resilience among listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria using primary diagnostic survey data sourced from key industrial configurations. The findings revealed a general corporate view that contemporary board choices have not met the dynamic needs of the industrial sector; a larger percentage of respondents were dissatisfied than satisfied with the appropriateness and implementation of strategies, respectively. Although large asset bases were appreciated by most respondents, as they perceived that they contributed to immediate safety and visible market positioning, they also agreed that this and other similar static measures would not address the deeper structural and administrative challenges of the macroeconomic landscape. The problem of operational rigidity was a persistent complaint and an albatross which continues to hang around underperforming manufacturing firms. Hierarchical F-tests also supported statistically significant relationships between strategic rigidities and corporate vulnerability, and between configurations of board diversity and the ultimate ability of firms to maintain resilient performance thresholds. These results indicate that efficient strategy execution, cognitive openness, strict risk monitoring, and prudent management of corporate resources are necessary to establish market credibility and institutional effectiveness.

Recommendations

Drawing on the empirical findings and strategic insights established in this study, the following corporate recommendations are put forward:

i. Listed manufacturing corporations should actively enhance their board selection matrices to incorporate deep cognitive, gender, and expertise diversity, ensuring that executive decision-making groups possess the requisite variety of perspectives to scan turbulent environments.

ii. Corporate organizations should invest heavily in the formalization and upgrading of business policy quality, creating institutionalized risk response protocols that bridge the gap between boardroom oversight and real-time operational flexibility.

iii. Executive management teams should deploy modern digital strategy tracking systems to increase the speed and efficiency of strategic strategy execution, thereby mitigating the widespread challenge of strategic paralysis.

iv. Regulatory agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Nigerian Exchange Group (NGX), should implement hard-lined governance standards that mandate the disclosure of cognitive diversity indices and business policy risk metrics to boost market trust.

References

Adelekan, A., & Babalola, O. (2023). Board governance configurations and corporate survival strategies among food and beverage manufacturing entities in West Africa. *African Journal of Business Management*, *17* (4), 88–101.

Aguilera, R. V., Judge, W. Q., & Terjesen, S. A. (2018). Corporate governance deviance. *Academy of Management Review*, *43*(1), 87–109. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0394 Cited by: 452

Carter, D. A., Simkins, B. J., & Simpson, W. G. (2003). Corporate governance, board diversity, and firm value. *The Financial Review*, *38*(1), 33–53.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6288.00034

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Doz, Y. L., & 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

Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, *13*(1), 215–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-x

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*(2), 193–206. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hillman, A. J., & Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *The Academy of Management Review*, *28*(3), 383–396. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2003.10196729 Cited by: 6527

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*(3), 243–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001

Mallin, C. A. (2022). *Corporate governance* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *G20/OECD principles of corporate governance*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/ed750b30-en

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *The Journal of Finance*, *52*(2), 737–783. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb04820.x Cited by: 31510

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *28*(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and entrepreneurial management in the innovation economy. *California Management Review*, *58*(4), 13–35. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(7), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z

Weber, Y., & Tarba, S. Y. (2014). Strategic agility: A state of the art introduction to the special issue on strategic agility. *California Management Review*, *56*(3), 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2014.56.3.5

Wheelen, T. L., Hunger, J. D., Hoffman, A. N., & Bamford, C. E. (2018). *Strategic management and business policy: Globalization, innovation, and sustainability* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.