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This study examines the determinants of organizational performance in trade associations with specific reference to professional bodies in Nigeria. Based on a purposive sampling framework, 10 professional bodies in Nigeria were selected as sample for the study. The procedure was adopted because of paucity of data that cover the area of interest. Seventy-five questionnaires were administered on the sampled professional bodies, and data collected were analysed using multiple regression with the aid of Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. Findings indicate that stakeholders' relation, public perception and effectiveness of strategic planning play vital roles in shaping the performance of an organization. Specifically, the results show that all these variables are significant and positively impact professional bodies performance. This result has important implication for professional bodies, in that professional bodies stand to benefit from a good relation with its stakeholders. It is therefore recommended amongst others that professional bodies should ensure professional competence by ensuring increase in sense of belonging and satisfaction that accompanies stakeholders' good relation to their professional bodies.
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INTRODUCTION

Organizational performance comprises the actual output or results of an organization as measured against its intended outputs. Organisational performance of professional bodies depends on the nature of information technology, human resources, customer relations and public perception in place (Liviu, 2015). Thus, effective performance of professional bodies requires that they embrace technology orientation, consider human resource outcomes (skills, attitudes, behavior), customer relations and stakeholders’ perception of their conduct (Ford & Anderson, 2017; Ali, Mansoorii, Ali, & Ferdous, 2017).

According to Jui and Wong (2013), a professional is characterized by having a professional organization, a Code of Conduct and Ethics, a body of knowledge and research activities. Professional bodies, for example the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria (ICAN), are responsible for among others, development and dissemination of codes of ethics and conduct for its professionals. This group of bodies has been neglected in the literature. They represent a disciplined group of individuals who adhere to high quality of ethical standards and uphold themselves to, and are accepted by, the
public as possessing special knowledge and skills in a widely recognized, organized body of learning derived from education and training at a high level, and who are prepared to exercise this knowledge and these skills in the interest of others.

Understanding the determinants of organizational performance is necessary because professional bodies like accounting bodies, chartered institute of stockbrokers are increasingly being challenged to demonstrate their relevance in the money and capital market; and their ability to face new challenges as they emerged. Public expectations about professional bodies are high especially in their ability to seek employment for new young members. The value of professional bodies is measured simply by the extent to which they are perceived to be accountable not only to their own organizations but more importantly to the public. Members of reputable professional bodies are perceived to be a key pillar in organizations that employ them by helping to create and sustain value and growth. Their ability to continue to fulfill these roles in the face of constant environmental changes is vital to their continued relevance of their main bodies.

Over the last couple of decades, studies (Gavrea, Illies & Stegerean, 2011; Oladimeji & Akingbade, 2012) have devoted empirical effort in understanding the determinants of organizational performance. They argue that the main determinants are either not clear or statistically weak. In contrast, other scholars empirically support the view that these determinants are robust (Zahir, Murceldili, Akyuz & Celep, 2010). These variations might come up simply because of sample characteristics and research designs used, making the results of the whole effort difficult to be consistent (Katou, 2017). This implies that there is need for further investigation.

In addition to the above motivation for this study, a number of studies have been conducted on organizational performance (Nohria, Joyce, Roberson, 2003; Tangen, 2004; Euske, 2006; Pinar, Girard, 2008) but none of them has specifically focused on professional bodies. It is this gap that the authors intends to fill, by carrying out an empirical study with a view to establishing determinants of organizational performance using data sources from professional bodies in Nigeria.

This paper is divided into five. The next section discusses the theoretical framework and hypothesis of the study derived from the literature. Section three provides the methodology of the study. Section four discusses the results while section five provides conclusion of the study and recommendations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews literature on the variables determining organizational performance in relation to organizational performance. From this relationship, some assumptions (hypotheses) were developed. The theory underpinning the study was also presented.

Information Technology and Organizational Performance

Several studies (Albadui, Keramati & Razmi, 2007; Zahir, Murceldili, Akyuz, & Celep, 2010; Holotiuk, Beimborn & Jentsch, 2018) examined the relationship between Information Technology (IT) and performance with mixed conclusion, Albadvi, Keramati and Razmi (2007) analyzed the instruments to be used to investigate the relationship between information technology and firm performance. The study used data sourced through administration of 200 questionnaires to car part manufacturers. It was discovered that constructed measures demonstrated the key psychometric properties including reliability and validity. The findings also showed that use of IT in terms of business processes reengineering impacts significantly on firm performance.
In a related work, Zehir, Muceldili, Akyuz and Celep (2010) examining the nexus among information technology investment level, IT usage, IT perception, technology orientation and firm performance in the comprehensive competitive environment. They obtained their data from a sample of 94 different National and Multinational Companies in Turkey using questionnaire designed for that purpose. The results showed that IT investments are vital component of firm performance after using multivariate methods of analysis. If firms manage IT investments successfully, they will enhance firm performance.

Lee, Huang, Barnes and Kao (2010) studied the relationship among information technology (IT), organisational contingency, business process re-engineering and organisation performance in the Taiwanese manufacturing industry found out that there is a positive and significant relationship between IT and organizational performance. In the course of their study, they surveyed 800 companies listed on the Taiwan Stock Exchange, 2005; taking into cognizance IT route integration, information sharing, supply chain integration, business extension, decentralization and integration in IT within an organization. In tandem with earlier studies (Albadvi et al, 2007; Zahir et al, 2010; Farhanghi, Abbaspour, Ghassemi (2013) examining the effect of information technology on firm performance, it was observed that IT has a direct and indirect impact on firm performance. Following the previous studies, we hypothesize that:

\[ H_0: \text{There is a positive relationship between Firm's Information Technology and the performance of professional body in Nigeria} \]

**Human Resources and Organizational Performance**

Human resources have always been a great asset in an organization. In this case, researchers (Katou, 2008; Cania, 2014) have been trying to examine the effect of such assets on organizations’ performance. The work of Katou (2008) represents of such study which analysed and measured the impact of human resources on organizational performance in Greece. Data were collected from 178 organisations using an questionnaire survey in the Greek manufacturing sector, and analysed using the ‘structural equation modelling’ methodology. The results indicate that the relationship between human resources and organisational performance is partially mediated through human resource outcomes (skills, attitudes, behaviour), and it is influenced by business strategies (cost, quality, innovation). In this case, it can be said that human resource is the key for keeping the organization as a pace setter in a competitive market which needs to be managed effectively to achieve the required performance of the organization. The study of Cania (2014) showed that through the skills, behaviors and attitudes acquired by personnel resources within an organization, performance can be enhanced. The result of the study by Cania (2014) is in tandem with that of Katou (2008).

Drawing on the contingency perspective between business strategies and human resource practices, Katou (2017) further examines the effect of Human Resource management (HRM) system (which integrates both content and process of HR practices) on both proximal organisational outcomes (such as job satisfaction, motivation, and organisational commitment) and distal organisational outcomes (such as employee engagement, Organisational Citizen Behaviour (OCB), co-operation among employees, intention to quit, and operational performance). The analysis is based on a sample of 996 Greek employees working in 108 private organisations and the statistical method employed is structural equation modelling with bootstrapping estimation. Findings indicate that HRM content is more positively related to job satisfaction and motivation and less related to organisational
commitment than HRM process. Also, HRM system is related to organisational outcomes (both directly and indirectly) and significantly influences employee job satisfaction and motivation, as well as OCB and co-operation among employees, and operational performance. As the literature indicates, we propose that:

**H**: There is a positive relationship between Human Resources and the performance of professional body in Nigeria

### Customer Relation and Organizational Performance

A customer relation is concerned with the process or manner in which a business organisation develops, and establishes relationships with its customers. Having realized that businesses can rise and fall through the support of its customer base, Ambro and Praprotnik (2008) examine a test of the relationship between organizational culture as a crucial indicator of organizational effectiveness and customer satisfaction using service-unit data from two health resorts. They observed that when trying to predict the comparative degree which organisational effectiveness factors have in satisfying customers’ needs, performance, adaptability and mission can be of the highest importance. Some effects like performance are uniform for employees and customers, while others varied depending on the organisation and the customer or employee group. Furthermore, findings suggest that service performance and organisation mission of the service organisation predict customer satisfaction based on established and proven health services.

In a study by Mozaheb, Alamolhodae and Ardakani (2015), it was observed that CRM significantly influence firm performance. Wachira and Were (2016) seeking to determine the effect of customer relationship management on organisational performance, adopts a descriptive research design to address the research objectives. In this case sampling was done using a systematic random sampling technique to select the participating staff in all the bank branches covered. Data were collected in form of both primary and secondary data. The collected data were analysed using both qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques. The study found that customer relationship management has a positive effect on the performance of sampled banks. It concludes that service quality management was the dimension of CRM that affected the performance of sampled banks to a very great extent. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

**H**: There is a positive relationship between stakeholders’ relation and the performance of professional body in Nigeria

### Public Perception and Organizational Performance

Public perception is best known through the type of information obtained from a public opinion survey. It relates to what is termed "public opinion" which is merely the aggregate views of a group of people who are asked directly what they think about particular issues or events of an organization. Some researchers (Jacobsen & Jakobson, 2017) have examined the effect of public perception on firm performance. Vigoda-Gadot and Danit Kapun(2005) carried out a theoretical model and empirical examination of the relationship between organisational politics and perceived employees’ perception across two separate settings: the private sector and the public sector. 700 employees of private sector and public sector organisations provided data on perceptions of organisational politics, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job distress and burnout, as well as self-reported turnover intentions, negligent behaviour and absenteeism. Their findings indicate that public perceptions differ substantially across sectors and prove higher in the public than in the private sector.
Likewise, Jacobsen and Jakobsen (2017) empirically analyze how perceived organizational red tape among managers and frontline staff relates to objectively measured performance. The data consist of survey responses from teachers and principals at Danish upper secondary schools combined with grade-level administrative performance data. Based on theories of red tape and motivation crowding, the authors hypothesize that perceived organizational red tape reduces performance within such organizations. The empirical result reveals a negative relationship between staff perception of red tape and performance and no relationship between manager-perceived red tape and performance.

H0: There is a positive relationship between public perception and the performance of professional body in Nigeria

Effective Strategic Planning and Organizational Performance

There are copious literatures (e.g. Ridwan & Marti, 2012) that have attempted to provide definitions for the concept of strategic planning. While nuances exist amongst these varied definitions, the common theme running through them suggests that strategic planning entails envisioning of the future by an organization and developing deliberate actionable steps towards arriving at the envisioned future, with measurable yardsticks to assess achievement of set objectives.

As organizations grow, strategic planning becomes a veritable tool to measuring growth and performance. A number of authors (e.g. Ansoff, 1965) have identified reasons for the increasing interest in strategic planning. These include the importance of establishing and improving standard practices and work processes; a veritable tool for effective monitoring especially as business expands and number of staff increases, becoming more difficult for managers to directly or personally control subordinates; the imperative of ensuring that employees with different backgrounds and work ethics agree on common and collective goals; the need to attune employees to emerging techniques and changing work environment; to avoid a recourse to crisis management approach to issues due to organization’s inability to be proactive in anticipating challenges and developing survival strategies and; a means for maintaining effective communication channel between the employer and the employee. Other authors have also looked at the planning horizon of Strategic Plan and its impact on firm’s performance. One stream of strategic planning research has raised the issue of whether the length of time a firm or organization has been involved in the strategic planning process has any impact on performance. In their study of the banking industry (Gup & Whitehead, 2000) tested the notion that strategic planning only pays off after a period of time. They found no statistically significant relationship between the length of time banks had been engaged in the strategic planning process and their financial performance. Opinions are however polarized among researchers on the direction of the impact of strategic plan on an organization’s performance, measured more frequently by firm’s profitability. While some authors reported a positive relationship (Taiwo & Idunnu, 2010):

H0: There is a positive relationship between effective strategic planning and the performance of professional body in Nigeria

Business Processes and Organizational Performance

Business models are changing from reliance on movement (production) of tangible materials or items to the strategic exploitation of information and data to improve processes and deliver optimal service. Incidentally, this change has not only improved, over the years, the quality of goods and
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services but has also impacted positively on efficiency and cost reduction.

This has therefore led to the growing interest and research on the subject of process reengineering and how it is impacting organizational performances. Improved business processes adequately exploit developments in technology to improve performance; properly harness advances in education and staff potentials and capacity; provide a seamless marriage between organizational strategy and information flow; fill the gaps between organizational strategy and information system design; bring into a coherent perspective organizational objectives, human resources, information technology and organizational culture (Lenk 1997; Beckford 1998; Glavan & Vukšić, 2017). We finally state that

\[ H_0: \text{There is a positive relationship between effective business processes and the performance of professional body in Nigeria} \]

Theoretical Framework

One of the theoretical frameworks normally used to analyze the effect of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) on firm performance is the Resource Based View (RBV) of the firm. Based on this theory, the evaluation of firm weaknesses and strengths should start internally, by looking at the unique resources that could help it to achieve competitive advantage over others in the industry. The ICT of the firms and its capabilities have been scrutinized and identified by number of studies where it is regarded as one of the main resources that could bring competitive advantage to the firm (Breznik, 2012; Gu & Jung, 2013). However, in most of these studies, the approach to the subject of Information Technology (IT) business value and its relation to the firm performance are considered under many different aspects. The economic view/perspective regards IT as an input in the production process and its interaction with other inputs. Based on this perspective, IT provides benefit to the organizations more than capital and labour. Its benefits and other related advantages could be evaluated at the organizational, industrial and nation level. For providing performance, organizations should invest and coordinate IT effectively (RMS, 2008).

On the theory of performance, the theory explains the basic concepts upon which an explanation is given as to how and why performance can be strengthened in an organisation. Performance can be described as the ability to produce valued results. In this theory, performance could be improved by taking a considerable amount of time and effort. Performance improvement is a journey and the performance level is the location in the journey. Performance of an organisation according to Liviu (2015) may be determined by some components; the personal factors of the respective individual(s), fixed factors, human resource-knowledge, skill, IT, consumer relation and public perception. These factors are crucial since they determine the ease with which performance of the individuals and thus the firm in general can be improved. In this case, IT and human resources can improve the level of performance of every organisation. In addition, good customer/human relation and IT represent the most dynamic resources which can contribute to the technical progress and performance of an organization.

METHODOLOGY

The study aimed at investigating the determinants of organizational performance: The case of professional bodies in Nigeria. As of the time of carrying out this study, there are twenty-eight (28) professional bodies registered with Association of Professional Bodies in Nigeria (APBN).

Due to paucity of data, the purposive sampling technique was adopted. Based on this sampling
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technique, ten (10) professional bodies were sampled for the study. These professional bodies include: the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria (ICAN), Chartered Institute of Taxation of Nigeria (CITN), Nigerian Institute of Management (NIM), Chartered Institute of Purchasing & Supply Management of Nigeria, Pharmaceutical Society of Nigeria, Institute of Chartered Chemists of Nigeria (ICCON), Institute of Public Analyst of Nigeria, Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS), Institute of Chartered Secretary & Administrators of Nigeria (ICSAN) and Chartered Institute of Bankers of Nigeria (CIBN). Of the 100 questionnaires distributed, seventy-five (75) copies were retrieved and reported in this paper. The questionnaires are pre-tested, using a small number of respondents (10 respondents; the pre-test participants do not participate in the final data collection). The revised questionnaire is administered to the respondents to the above bodies, during normal official hours and finalised between during the month of June and August 2018.

The measures used in this study are described below:

• Organizational performance is the explained variable and is measured using six items adapted from previous studies (Gavrea et al. 2011, Jacobsen & Jakobsen, 2017 among others) on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree’) to 5 (‘strongly agree’). The overall reliability (α) of the scale is 0.725.
• Information Technology is measured using nine items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree’) to 5 (‘strongly agree’). The overall reliability (α) of the scale is 0.688.
• Stakeholder’s Relation is measured using nine items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree’) to 5 (‘strongly agree’). The overall reliability (α) of the scale is 0.758.
• Public Perception is measured using nine items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree’) to 5 (‘strongly agree’). The overall reliability (α) of the scale is 0.581.
• Other Variables include strategic planning measured ten items and effective business processes using six items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree’) to 5 (‘strongly agree’). The overall reliability (α) of scale two variables are 0.806 and 0.636 respectively.

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The factor analysis applied to all the scales used in the study shows that Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value of each component is greater than 0.7. This shows that our sampling size is adequacy. We apply Bartlett’s test of sphericity to each component. This yields a significant value at 0.01 levels. We compute the mean, standard deviation, t-statistic among the variables used (see Appendix A). It can be observed that the t-statistics of all the variables are significant while the most volatile variable is the human resource policies and practice. The mean column shows that the average response ranges from 0.97 to 4.3.

Regression Analysis

In order to perform our regression analysis to test the hypotheses developed, we first examine if there is any possible correlation between the variables in line with Hair et al (2010) after we transformed data using principal component analysis (PCA). Table 1 & 2 indicates correlation between all the variables to be included. All the variables are significant and positive in relation to organizational performance (OP).
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Appendix

Table 1: Pearson correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology (IT)</th>
<th>Rate of Operation</th>
<th>Significantly Expand</th>
<th>Stakeholders Base</th>
<th>Reduction of Cost</th>
<th>Repeat Business</th>
<th>Capacity Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Advantage</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction and Retention</td>
<td>0.229*</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximization</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>0.249*</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Enabler</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Coordination</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>-0.305**</td>
<td>-0.342**</td>
<td>-0.315**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt Detection</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception on Technology</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.243*</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources (HR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Policies and Practices</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.342**</td>
<td>-0.280*</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking Relevant Needs</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.253*</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.312**</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Pay</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Cooperation</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud to Tell</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.355**</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.263**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Helping</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.286*</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.313**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.381**</td>
<td>0.259*</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.391**</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal Practices</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.270*</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.284*</td>
<td>0.287**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder’s Relation(SR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders Relations Management</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.258*</td>
<td>.280*</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>.288*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Stakeholders Loyalty</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.270*</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.252*</td>
<td>-0.333**</td>
<td>-0.313**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated and Coherent</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.286*</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.291*</td>
<td>0.533**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining Stakeholders Loyalty</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.242*</td>
<td>0.354**</td>
<td>0.252*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied Services</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Perception (PP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Selling Point</td>
<td>.369**</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.382**</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>.316**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and Procedures</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>.264*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Creation</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organization</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>.356**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Strategic Planning (SP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Document</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>.270*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust Document</td>
<td>.345**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>.323**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>.309**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevailing Factors</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Document Development</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>.451**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Management</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>.271*</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>.332**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Structure</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.466**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient Financial Resources</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.402**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Horizon</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>.354**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary Infrastructure</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>.263*</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Business Process (BP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently Robust</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>.241*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Process</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>.266*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resist</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Channels</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>.235*</td>
<td>.277*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>.362**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Simplification</td>
<td>.266*</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
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Table 2: Correlations among the variables of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>OP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.275*</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.601**</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td>.442**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.601**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.579**</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.275*</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.579**</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.547**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

IT is information Technology, HR is Human resources, SR is stakeholder’s relation, PP is public perception, BP is effective business process, OP is organizational performance.

This implies that a regression analysis is feasible (Khokher & Raziq, 2017). Hence, we subject all the variables to regression estimation as reported in Table 3.

Table 3: Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>.429*</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>3.014</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: OP, F-STAT=8.427(PV=0.000), Method -OLS

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 3 reports the regression in order to test the hypotheses developed for the study as a way of clarifying the main determinants of professional body’s performance. The first hypothesis (H1) states that there is a positive relationship between Firm’s Information Technology and the performance of professional body in Nigeria. In this case, the coefficient (0.08) in the regression table is positive and but not statistically significant in determining organizational performance.

The second hypothesis (H2) states that there is a positive relationship between Human Resources and the performance of professional body in Nigeria. The coefficient (0.02) is positive but not significant. Also, the third hypothesis (H3) states that there is a positive relationship between stakeholders’ relation and the performance of professional body in Nigeria. In this case, the coefficient (0.34) in the regression table is positive and significant.
professional body in Nigeria. The coefficient (0.342) is positive and significant. In this case, we can emphatically state that stakeholder’s relation seems to be very important in the performance of professional bodies in Nigeria. A one-percent increase in stakeholder’s relation would increase performance by 34.2 percent in Nigeria. The forth hypothesis (H4) states that there is a positive relationship between public perception and the performance of professional body in Nigeria. This coefficient (0.429) is significant and positive in relation to organizational performance. Organization performance would increase by 42.9 percent if public perception is monitored and good image is maintained by all professional bodies in Nigeria. The first hypothesis (H5) states that there is a positive relationship between effective strategic planning and the performance of professional body in Nigeria while the coefficient (0.175) is positive and significant. This shows that organizational performance relies heavily on management strategic planning. A well-planned organization would improve in performance dramatically. Repositioning of every organization serves as one of the key areas management should look into. The coefficients of the last hypothesis (H6) which states that effective business planning is positive in relation to organizational performance seems not to be significant, but positive.

Discussion

The bases of studying performance determinants can be discussed in two views Industrial organization and resource-based views. Studies provide that different features account for different determinants of organizations’ performance. This means that organizational performance are determined by the forces within the structure of the industry that an organisation operates and contending that the internal environment is the main driver of its competitive advantage (Porter 1980). Therefore, organisations within the same industry can perform differently based on differential features within them.

Many attempts have been made to understand the sources or causes of performance differentials between or within organizations which have generated not only empirical conflicts but also empirical arguments in business economics literatures.

This study examines the determinants of organizational performance using professional bodies in Nigeria as a study ground. There are many reasons for the needs to examine the performance determinants of professional bodies. First of all, professional bodies regulate the conducts of members and as well protect interests of the public. This makes it unique from other organizations. Professional bodies perform one of the most difficult services because of the complexity involving regulating the activities of human beings. The difficulty of this complexity shows a need to improve their effectiveness to become more relevant and competitive in the sectors in which they regulate. Also, factors that affect the performance of profit-oriented organizations are different from the non-for –profit organisations like professional bodies. Professional bodies depends more on the register by always trying to add more members for efficient regulation, improve competence and monitoring through the organization of Mandatory professional continuing education and training. Professional bodies protect the interest of profession as well as the public.

Based on the above, we develop six hypotheses, we confirm through regression results that all the variables (IT, HR, SR, PP, SP & BP) have positive relation with organizational performance (OP). However, stakeholders’ relation (SR), Public Perception (PP) and effective strategic planning have significant effect on organizational performance in Nigeria. These results are consistent with previous studies (Oladimeji & Akingbade, 2012; Emerole, Kenneth & Edeoga, 2013; Aminu, 2015). Our result is in line with the recent work of Ford and Andersson (2017) who use public sector organization and Higher educational institutions as a study ground.
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(Mudzakkir, Sarwoko & Nurdiana, 2017). In this sense, organizational performances are influenced mainly through public perception, effective strategic planning and good stakeholder’s relation.

CONCLUSION

This study examines the determinants of organizational performance for a sample of professional bodies in Nigeria. It shows that stakeholders’ relation, public perception and effectiveness of strategic planning play vital role in shaping the performance of an organization. Specifically, the results show that all these variables are significant and positively impact the organizational performance in Nigeria.

These results have important implications for professional bodies, which stand to benefit from a good relation with its stakeholders and its strategic planning. The increase in trust, sense of belonging, motivation and satisfaction that accompanies stakeholders’ relation contributes significantly to its effective performance. The top management officers are, therefore, responsible for ensuring that a good customer or stakeholders’ relation is maintained within the professional bodies’ cycle. Also, public perception about the professional bodies also matters in efficient delivery. Strategic repositioning of professional bodies would help in wooing stakeholder loyalty. Although this study has used professional bodies in Nigeria, Future research could extend the study hypothesis to religious organizations depending on access, time and convenience.
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### APPENDIX A: T-TEST AND STANDARD DEVIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tail)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization uses IT for competitive advantage</td>
<td>33.317</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.7467</td>
<td>0.97389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of IT in my Organization has improved clients</td>
<td>41.324</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.83827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction and retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT is a valuable resource to any organization</td>
<td>50.763</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.3067</td>
<td>0.73472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in IT has enhanced my organization’s productivity</td>
<td>38.025</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.9467</td>
<td>0.89885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT is an enabler of organizational changes that can lead to</td>
<td>55.223</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.2933</td>
<td>0.6733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a synergy between my organization's IT infrastructure</td>
<td>7.377</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.1081</td>
<td>4.79031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other organizational resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization’s IT is coordinated effectively.</td>
<td>29.95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.4054</td>
<td>0.9781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT improves prompt detection of the problems encountered in</td>
<td>32.736</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.92063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my daily activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perception on technology is different from individual to</td>
<td>46.539</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.1351</td>
<td>0.76435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was attracted to my organization because of its good HR policies and practices</td>
<td>25.479</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.9595</td>
<td>0.99917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HR department undertakes those actions that meet our needs</td>
<td>28.609</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.2933</td>
<td>0.99693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(relevance).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my pay</td>
<td>23.515</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.0267</td>
<td>1.11468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is cooperation among Junior and Senior employees/staff</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.4667</td>
<td>0.94916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel proud to tell people the organization I work for.</td>
<td>46.679</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.7718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a culture of helping colleagues who have challenges in</td>
<td>35.22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.89503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their activities in my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the amount of influence I have on my job</td>
<td>36.299</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.5867</td>
<td>0.85572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Job autonomy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff training and other development programmes in my</td>
<td>25.467</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.12898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization are empowering staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance appraisal practices in my organization</td>
<td>22.969</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.0135</td>
<td>1.12862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ relations management is a crucial part of strategic</td>
<td>33.501</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.6622</td>
<td>0.94037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning in my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization stakeholders’ relations have led to improved</td>
<td>33.012</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.9444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders’ loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholders relations’ method in my organization is</td>
<td>36.495</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.5811</td>
<td>0.84411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrated and coherent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization’s stakeholders’ strategies are adequate to sustain</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.73961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders’ loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders are satisfied with the services they receive from</td>
<td>33.653</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.90584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization’s image serves as one of its unique selling</td>
<td>44.556</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.1067</td>
<td>0.7982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and procedures make work processes in my organization</td>
<td>26.544</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.4667</td>
<td>1.13105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more complex than necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tail)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer my organization because of its outstanding and long standing image.</td>
<td>38.506</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.88164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of awareness creation by my organization is currently poor.</td>
<td>20.254</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.8378</td>
<td>1.20532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization’s relations with international organizations are excellent</td>
<td>35.667</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.91297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very familiar with my organization’s Strategy Document.</td>
<td>36.821</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.82789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategy Document is robust enough to place my organization as a leading global body.</td>
<td>34.061</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.91533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prevailing economic environment is helping my organization’s achievement of its Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>29.791</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.2533</td>
<td>0.94573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prevailing social and environmental factors</td>
<td>34.506</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.2568</td>
<td>0.81191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of my organization’s Strategy Document was participatory.</td>
<td>33.586</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>0.8595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization’s Management is committed to pursuing the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.7067</td>
<td>0.81826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure is supportive to achieving the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>35.464</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.5733</td>
<td>0.87261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization is committing sufficient financial resources towards achieving the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>34.367</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.5333</td>
<td>0.89039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategy Document planning horizon is adequate for its achievement.</td>
<td>33.78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.3867</td>
<td>0.86826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization possesses the necessary infrastructure and technology to achieve its Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>32.246</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.4133</td>
<td>0.91671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization’s business process is sufficiently robust to achieve its mandate.</td>
<td>34.442</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.5867</td>
<td>0.90185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management is showing the required interest in improving the business process.</td>
<td>38.932</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.6933</td>
<td>0.82156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a cultural resistance to change in my organization.</td>
<td>25.373</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.06492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The communication channels in my organization are good for achieving its objectives.</td>
<td>41.642</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.6133</td>
<td>0.75146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy my organization’s work environment</td>
<td>41.257</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.80606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has been able to simplify its methods to ensure that results are achieved effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td>32.077</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.5946</td>
<td>0.96399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the years, my organization has increased its rate of operating surplus on the average.</td>
<td>34.906</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.7432</td>
<td>0.92249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the past 5 years, my organization has significantly expanded the scope of services rendered.</td>
<td>36.346</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.9865</td>
<td>0.96486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past 5 years, my organizational stakeholders’ base has increased significantly.</td>
<td>33.855</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.027</td>
<td>1.01998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has experienced reduction in cost of transacting with customers in the last 5 years.</td>
<td>25.529</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.4521</td>
<td>0.86668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of repeat business with valuable customers is expanding.</td>
<td>34.031</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.8378</td>
<td>0.93672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization is developing its capacity to meet future opportunities and challenges.</td>
<td>35.244</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>