

Organizational Prowess and Development of Institutional Performance of Workers in Social Solidarity Departments

Emi Mohamed Saad El-Deen Mohamed.

Associate Professor of Community Organization
Higher Institute of Social work, 6th of October

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the level of organizational prowess among workers in social solidarity departments, the extent of institutional performance development, and the relationship between these two constructs. Employing a descriptive research design and comprehensive social survey method, data were collected from 67 employees in the Social Solidarity Directorate of Giza Governorate. The study findings indicated high levels of both organizational prowess and institutional performance development among workers. Moreover, a statistically significant positive correlation exists between flexible organizational structure, investment in available resources, exploration of external support resources, and dimensions of institutional performance, including efficiency, justice, rewards and incentives, and participation in decision-making. These results validate both the main hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses.

KEYWORDS:

Developing Institutional Performance, Organizational Prowess, Social Solidarity Departments

INTRODUCTION:

Organizations increasingly recognize that employees are foundational to achieving their objectives; thus, significant resources are allocated to identify, empower, and train the most efficient personnel. These investments enhance organizational capacity by granting employees the authority to make work-related decisions (Al-Shammari, 2018, p. 6). Moreover, distinguished institutions prioritize turning their vision, mission, and strategic goals into actionable plans to promote excellence in various activities. High institutional performance is not an option, but a necessity shaped by diverse circumstances, challenges, and external forces (Darling & Walker, 2019, p. 46).

Social Solidarity departments focus on enhancing institutional performance as a critical administrative process vital for planning development initiatives. Arnold and Publick (2021) stated that this enables senior management to craft relevant developmental programs aligned with institutional needs and capacities, making it essential to evaluate current conditions for effective future planning (p. 18). According to Al-Mahasneh (2013), developing institutional performance encompasses several components: organizational structure, work design, human resources, technology, administrative skills, goals, and the environment. The concept of institutional performance is intrinsically linked to achievement and an organization's success in meeting its objectives (Al-Mahasneh, 2013, p. 110).

Ismail et al. (2020) underscored the necessity of adopting innovative strategies to enhance employee efficiency, focusing on functional empowerment through targeted work plans, annual training programs, and employee involvement in training activities. These efforts positively impact the overall institutional performance. Employee participation in decision-making and collaboration within teams are fundamental to improving institutional performance and enhancing their capacity to realize organizational goals (Ayodeji & Odunayo, 2015). Additionally, Taylor (2018) identified a correlation between demographic variables—age, gender, and job status—and institutional performance development in social organizations, emphasizing its significant influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The advancement of the employees' institutional performance in social solidarity departments closely relates to organizational dexterity. This enables the organizations to maintain strategic flexibility in response to potential disturbances in the work environment (Heracleous et al., 2017, p. 12).

To foster organizational dexterity within social solidarity departments, it is essential to establish a flexible organizational structure and a conducive environment that promotes healthy competition, creativity, and the appreciation of innovative contributions. Recognition of diverse service provisions and openness to new task execution methods while valuing employee feedback is fundamental (Bureau, 2018). Perusal (2020) highlighted the importance of bolstering opportunities for organizational excellence at various administrative levels within social organizations. Addressing issues related to self-sufficiency and the investment of external resources is critical for sustainable success. Comprehending organizational excellence and identifying opportunities and challenges is imperative for future exploration of requirements to maintain the organization's stature. Failure to adequately seek and utilize resources can lead to organizational decline and hinder longevity (Fang, 2020, p. 625- 642).

Organizational agility is essential in enhancing the capacities of social organizations, enabling them to meet the needs of their target demographic. It serves as a strategy for supporting and developing talented professionals, representing a critical investment in human resources. According to Radwan (2020), this fortifies organizations' adaptability, allowing them to respond effectively to societal changes, manage knowledge, and address anticipated risks. This agility

empowers organizations to synergize existing opportunities with future aspirations (Datta, 2011, p. 6). The VARIO study (2017) confirmed that non-profit entities innovate to ensure their sustainability and financial viability while balancing exploration and resource investment. The study emphasized the significance of organizational prowess through a balanced approach in non-profit settings. Recommendations included focusing on innovation and exploring new avenues for partnership enhancement over the long term.

To foster organizational prowess, Nassef et al. (2023) proposed establishing research centers affiliated with organizations, enhancing their capability to conduct community-relevant research, and implementing periodic evaluations to maintain work quality. The social service profession operates through institutional frameworks to address individual and societal needs, so adequate preparation and training of practitioners are essential. Consequently, the organization of society is a method aimed at enhancing worker efficiency through training programs and the provision of diverse skills, thereby improving institutional performance across various fields.

The purpose of this study is to assess the level of organizational proficiency and enhance the institutional performance of workers in social solidarity departments.

Research Importance:

The significance of the study is represented in the practical and theoretical implications indicated below:

- 1- The application of organizational excellence helps to increase the competitive advantage in providing high-standard services to the beneficiaries of the Social Solidarity Directorates.
- 2- The Social Security Directorates are some of the agencies in which social specialists play an essential role in improving the quality of services provided to the beneficiaries.
- 3- The study focuses on increasing the percentage of social workers in the Social Solidarity Directorates to 21%, which can benefit from their expertise and professional skills in developing institutional performance.
- 4- It also addresses the interest of the Social Solidarity Directorates in training social specialists and providing them with the expertise and skills that enable them to develop institutional performance in these directorates.

- 5- This research may contribute to consolidating the concept of developing comprehensive institutional performance in the Social Solidarity Directorates, which increases their ability to provide high-quality services.
- 6- This study can add to the theoretical structure of social service in general and the method of organizing a society in particular, with regard to organizational excellence and developing the institutional performance of workers in the Social Solidarity Departments.

Research Objectives: This study aims to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Assessing the level of organizational proficiency among workers in social solidarity departments.
2. Evaluating the level of development in the workers' institutional performance in these departments.
3. Analyzing the relationship between organizational proficiency and institutional performance development.
4. Identifying challenges hindering organizational proficiency contributions to institutional performance development.
5. Proposing strategies for enhancing organizational proficiency and institutional performance in these departments.

Hypotheses of the Study: The primary hypothesis of the current study is as follows: "There is a statistically significant direct effect relationship between organizational prowess and the development of institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments."

From this main hypothesis, the following sub-hypotheses arise:

1. There is a statistically significant direct causal relationship between flexible organizational structure and the development of the institutional performance of the employees in social solidarity departments.
2. There is a statistically significant direct causal relationship between the investment of available resources and the development of the institutional performance of the employees in these departments.
3. There is a statistically significant direct causal relationship between exploring supportive external resources and the development of the institutional performance of the employees in these departments.

Theoretical Guidelines of the Research: The study is grounded in the institutional excellence model, which aims to enhance the competitiveness of community institutions and improve service quality. This requires flexible organizational structures that align with high-performance standards and human resources capable of fostering adaptability and promoting creativity while moving away from routine practices (Costa, 2012, p. 7256).

By applying this model, the researcher can enforce the employees' awareness in social solidarity departments regarding organizational excellence and its dimensions (i.e., flexibility, resource investment, external resource exploration). The model can also help utilize best practices from other fields to develop a strategic vision for fostering organizational excellence and enhancing employee performance. Moreover, employee efficiency can be improved through equitable practices, reward systems for innovation, and involvement in decision-making processes related to departmental advancements.

Concepts:

1- Organizational Prowess: Organizational prowess is defined as the ability of team members to find creative solutions to problems based on shared vision, mutual trust, and the integration of their activities (Tempelaar, 2010, p.75). It also refers to the organization's capacity to achieve its goals by exploring and investing resources efficiently, maximizing its potential, innovating in service delivery, eliminating administrative constraints, solving organizational issues, and building a clear vision to elevate its standing in society (Al-Obeidi, 2020, p.146).

In this study, the researcher defines organizational prowess as the ability of Social Solidarity Departments to enhance employee performance through flexibility and speed. It is also determined by the ability to invest available resources, explore supportive external resources, and maintain a flexible organizational structure, all of which aim at sustainability and improving service quality.

Achieving organizational prowess in social organizations is based on three dimensions (Piets, 2022, p.39). **First, flexible organizational** structure describes the organization's ability to select the most qualified human resources and provide them with the necessary support to foster creativity. This can occur through adequate training that equips them with the skills required for improving the organization's performance. **Second, exploration** refers to the

organization's knowledge of its capabilities and its search for the resources it needs. It also entails the desire for experimentation, innovation, radical change, calculated risk-taking, and diversity in service provision, supported by continuous evaluation and assessment. **Third, investment** denotes the organization's understanding of what it requires for constant improvement, adjustment, gradual change, and sustainable human resources development. It mainly focuses on achieving results, improving performance, utilizing technological systems, and benefiting from experts in specialized fields to enhance organizational performance.

Institutional Performance Development:

Institutional performance development is defined as the execution of tasks and responsibilities assigned to the employees by the organization or the entity with which their role is associated (Murray & Chapman, 2020, p.35). It is also considered the means through which the institution achieves its long-term and short-term goals by interacting with its internal and external environments. It represents the ultimate outcomes the institution aims to reach (Jabouri, 2019, p.75).

In this study, institutional performance development refers to the achievements or outcomes generated by social specialists in the Social Solidarity Departments, contributing to the improvement and competitiveness of the departments in service provision and attaining the best possible tangible results. This can be achieved through efficiency, fairness, rewards and incentives, and participation in decision-making (Roman, V., 2012, p.145). First, efficiency, the ability to achieve quality, encompasses outputs relative to the inputs needed to achieve them. Second, fairness is obtained by ensuring equality and non-discrimination in distributing all types of services and rights for all society members, including the social, economic, educational, health-related, and political ones. Third, rewards and incentives refer to the benefits provided to the employees in exchange for their effort and contribution to work development.

Participation in Decision-Making: Providing equal opportunities for all employees in the organization to express their opinions freely and involve them in decisions related to performance improvement.

Methodology: This study is descriptive; it collects detailed and accurate information to depict and analyze the phenomenon under study. The current research seeks to determine the relationship

between organizational prowess (i.e., the independent variable) and the development of institutional performance in Social Solidarity Departments (i.e., the dependent variable). The study employed a comprehensive social survey method on 67 employees from the Social Solidarity Directorate in Giza.

1- Study Tools: The data collection tools included a questionnaire administered to the employees about organizational prowess and institutional performance development in the Social Solidarity Departments. The researcher designed the questionnaire based on the theoretical framework of the study and previous related research. **It focused on four main dimensions, with (51) statements distributed, as shown below in Table 1.**

Table 1: Distribution of the statements in the questionnaire for the employees in the Social Solidarity Departments

M	Main dimensions	Sub-dimensions	Number of ferries	Ferry numbers
1	Dimensions of organizational Prowess among employees of social solidarity departments	Flexible Organizational Structure	5	1 – 5
		Investing available resources	5	6 – 10
		Explore external supporting resources	5	15 – 11
2	Dimensions of developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments	Efficiency	5	16 – 20
		Justice	5	21 - 25
		Rewards and incentives	5	26 - 30
		Participation in decision-making	5	35 - 31
3	Difficulties facing the contributions of organizational Prowess in developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments		8	43 – 36
4	Proposals to activate the contributions of organizational Prowess in developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments		8	44 – 51

The employees' questionnaire was based on a three-point Likert scale, where the response to each statement was categorized and weighed as "Yes"(three points), "To some extent" (two points), and "No" (one point). The researcher relied on logical validity for the employees' questionnaire by reviewing theoretical literature and previous related research. The tool was then presented to five experts from the Faculty of Social Work at Helwan University to assess its

validity in terms of language and its relevance to the study dimensions. Some statements were deleted, and others were rephrased, leading to the final version of the tool. In addition, the researcher assessed the internal consistency validity of the employees' questionnaire by calculating the correlation between each dimension of the tool and the total score using a sample of 10 employees (outside the study population). The results were found to be significant, and the reliability coefficient was acceptable, as shown in the following table.

Table 2: Internal consistency between the dimensions of the employees' questionnaire and the overall score (n=10)

M	Dimensions	Correlation coefficient	Significance
1	Dimensions of organizational Prowess among employees of social solidarity departments	0.769	**
2	Dimensions of developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments	0.945	**
3	Difficulties facing the contributions of organizational Prowess in developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments	0.765	**
4	Proposals to activate organizational Prowess in developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments	0.865	**

Table 2 indicates that the dimensions of the tool are statistically significant at the (0.01) level for each dimension individually, which confirms the reliability of the tool and its dependability in producing valid results.

The researcher also conducted a statistical reliability test for the employees' questionnaire using a sample of 10 participants (outside the study population). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used to estimate the reliability values, as shown in the following table.

Table 3: Results of the reliability test for the employees' questionnaire using Cronbach's Alpha (n=10)

M	Dimensions	coefficient (Alpha Cronbach)
1	Dimensions of organizational Prowess among employees of social solidarity departments	0.85
2	Dimensions of developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments	0.90
3	Difficulties facing the contributions of organizational Prowess in developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments	0.82
4	Proposals to activate organizational Prowess in developing the institutional performance of employees in social solidarity departments	0.96
Consistency of the employee questionnaire form as a whole		0.95

The previous table shows that the reliability coefficients for the dimensions demonstrate a high level of consistency, indicating that the tool is reliable and can be trusted for accurate results. Thus, the tool has been finalized.

(2)Determining the Levels of Organizational Prowess Dimensions and Institutional Performance Development for Employees in Social Solidarity Departments: To evaluate the levels of the organizational prowess dimensions and the institutional performance development of employees in the Social Solidarity Departments, the three-point scale responses were categorized as follows: "Yes" (3 points), "To some extent" (2 points), and "No" (1 point). The data was encoded and entered into a computer system. The range of the three-point scale (minimum and maximum boundaries) was calculated as follows: Range = Maximum value - Minimum value (3 - 1 = 2). This range was then divided by the number of scale categories to obtain the corrected cell length. This value was added to the minimum value of the scale (1) to determine the upper limit of each category. Accordingly, the categories were defined as follows:

Table 4: The mean value levels for the study dimensions.

Values	Level
If the average value of the statement or dimension ranges from 1 to 1.67	Low level
If the average value of the phrase or dimension ranges from 1.68 to 2.34	Intermediate level
If the mean value of the phrase or dimension ranges from 2.35 to 3	High level

Data collection occurred between August 3, 2024, and October 20, 2024. The data was processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24.0. The following statistical methods were applied: Frequencies and percentages, Arithmetic mean, Standard deviation, Range, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for reliability, Simple regression analysis, Pearson correlation coefficient, Coefficient of determination, T-test for two independent samples, and One-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance).

Field Study Results:

Table 5: Describes the employees in the study population (n=67)

M	Quantitative variables	M	S.D
1	Age	41	6
2	Number of years of experience	12	5
M	Gender	K	%
1	male	46	68.7
2	female	21	31.3
M	Education	K	%
1	University degree	40	59.7
2	Postgraduate Diploma	15	22.4
3	Master's/PhD	12	17.9
M	Job in management	K	%
1	Director of Solidarity Department	5	7.5
2	Administrative	25	37.3
3	Systems and Information Specialist	17	25.4
4	Social Worker	20	29.9
Total		67	100

M: mean **SD:** standard deviation

Table 5 illustrates that the average age of the employees was 41 years, with a standard deviation of approximately 6 years. The average years of experience was 12, with a standard deviation of approximately 5 years. Most employees were males, representing 68.7%, while females constituted 31.3%. The highest percentage of employees held a university degree (59.7%), followed by those with a postgraduate diploma (22.4%), and lastly, those with a Master's or Doctorate degree (17.9%). The majority of employees in the Social Solidarity Departments were administrative staff (37.3%), followed by social workers (29.9%), and finally, department managers (7.5%).

Table (6): The overall level of organizational prowess among employees in Social Solidarity Departments (n=67)

M	Dimensions	M	S.D	Level	Order
1	Flexible Organizational Structure	2.61	0.45	High	1
2	Investing available resources	2.54	0.41	High	3
3	Explore external supporting resources	2.57	0.51	High	2
Dimensions of organizational ingenuity as a whole		2.57	0.40	High level	

M: mean **SD:** standard deviation

The previous table indicates that the overall level of organizational prowess dimensions among employees in the Social Solidarity Departments was high, with an arithmetic mean of 2.57. According to the given means, flexible organizational structure, with a mean of 2.61, occupied the first rank, followed by the exploration of external supportive resources, with a mean of 2.57, and finally, the investment in available resources, with a mean of 2.54.

Table (7): The overall level of institutional performance development among employees in Social Solidarity Departments (n=67)

M	Dimensions	M	S.D	Level	Order
1	Efficiency	2.63	0.38	High	2
2	Justice	2.52	0.56	High	4
3	Rewards and incentives	2.60	0.40	High	3
4	Participation in decision-making	2.71	0.34	High	1
Dimensions of the development of institutional performance as a whole		2.62	0.36	High level	

M: mean **SD:** standard deviation

Table 7 demonstrates that the overall level of the institutional performance development dimensions among the employees in the Social Solidarity Departments was high, with an arithmetic mean of 2.62. Based on the given means, participation in decision-making, with a mean of 2.71, attained the first rank, followed by efficiency, with a mean of 2.63; rewards and incentives, with a mean of 2.60; and finally, fairness, with a mean of 2.52.

Table (8): The challenges facing the contributions of organizational prowess in developing institutional performance for the employees in the Social Solidarity Departments (n=67)

M	Phrases	M	S.D	Order
1	Lack of material and human resources necessary to develop work in the administration	2.4	0.63	2
2	Lack of experience and skills of employees in social solidarity departments	2	0.58	7
3	Employees adhere to traditional methods and not follow modern methods in developing work in management	2.13	0.57	5
4	Weak management interest in developing the spirit of loyalty and belonging among employees	2.22	0.57	4
5	Poor clarity of the meaning of organizational ingenuity for management employees	2.1	0.63	6
6	Weak values of organizational Prowess that increase employee loyalty to management	2.36	0.67	3
7	The small number of employees trained in the use of modern technology in the administration	2.67	0.53	1
8	Selection of inappropriate leadership for management positions in management	1.9	0.56	8
Difficulties as a whole		2.22	0.37	Intermediate level

M: mean **SD:** standard deviation

The previous table illustrates that the level of challenges facing the contributions of organizational prowess in developing institutional performance for the employees in the Social Solidarity Departments was moderate, with an arithmetic mean of 2.22. These challenges, according to the mean values, were as follows: First, the lack of employees trained in using modern technology in the administration, with a mean of 2.67, followed by the lack of material and human resources necessary to improve the work in the administration, with a mean of 2.4, and finally, in the eighth place, the inappropriate leadership selection for administrative positions in the department, with a mean of 1.9.

Table 9: Proposals for activating organizational prowess and developing institutional performance for employees in Social Solidarity Departments (n=67)

M	Phrases	M	S.D	Order
1	The Department's endeavor to provide the necessary financial resources to develop its work	2.6	0.6	3
2	The management adopts a methodology for continuous improvement of its employees	2	0.65	7
3	Highlight the talents of employees at all levels in relation to the application of organizational Prowess at work	1.9	0.58	8
4	Urging employees to put forward new ideas related to management development	2.55	0.56	4
5	Holding continuous training courses for workers on how to use modern technology at work	2.51	0.61	5
6	Spreading the concepts of organizational Prowess among all employees of the department	2.66	0.57	2
7	The use of experts in the development of programs and training of management staff to use them	2.73	0.57	1
8	Choosing the right leadership to work in management	2.07	0.64	6
Proposals as a whole		2.38	0.31	High level

M: mean **SD:** standard deviation

Table 9 shows that the level of proposals for activating organizational prowess and developing the institutional performance of the employees in Social Solidarity Departments is high, with an arithmetic mean of 2.38. Based on the mean values, seeking experts to develop programs and train employees in their usage, with a mean of 2.73, attains the first rank, followed by spreading the concepts of organizational prowess among all employees in the administration, with a mean of 2.66, and finally, in the eighth place, highlighting the talents of employees at various levels in applying organizational prowess at work, with a mean of 1.9.

Table 10: The significant differences in responses between male and female employees regarding their perception of the level of organizational prowess in Social Solidarity Departments (n=67)

M	Dimensions	Gender	Number (n)	M	S.D	Degrees of Freedom (df)	T value	Significance
1	Flexible Organizational Structure	male	46	2.61	0.48	63	-1.454	Non D
		female	21	2.75	0.30			
2	Investing available resources	male	46	2.51	0.59	63	2.194-	
		female	21	2.69	0.29			
3	Explore external supporting resources	male	46	2.47	0.51	63	0.073	Non D
		female	21	2.43	0.5			
Dimensions of organizational prowess as a whole		male	46	2.53	0.47	63	-1.587	Non D
		female	21	2.62	0.31			

M: mean **SD:** standard deviation **df:** degree of freedom **Sig:** significance

The previous table shows statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) between the male and female employees' responses regarding their perception of the level of investment in available resources in Social Solidarity Departments, with male responses showing higher significance. There are no statistically significant differences between the male and female employees' responses regarding their perception of the levels of flexible organizational structure, exploration of external supportive resources, and the overall dimensions of organizational prowess in Social Solidarity Departments.

Table 11: The significant differences in responses between male and female employees regarding their perception of the level of institutional performance development among employees in Social Solidarity Departments (n=67)

M	Dimensions	Gender	Number (n)	M	S.D	df	T value	Sig
1	Efficiency	male	46	2.51	0.53	63	-0.262	Non D
		female	21	2.49	0.69			
2	Justice	male	46	2.6	0.65	63	-0.218	Non D
		female	21	2.56	0.67			
3	Rewards and incentives	male	46	2.53	0.43	63	0.412	Non D
		female	21	2.57	0.34			

M	Dimensions	Gender	Number (n)	M	S.D	df	T value	Sig
4	Participation in decision-making	male	46	2.84	0.29	63	2.032	Non D
		female	21	2.63	0.40			
	Dimensions of the development of institutional performance as a whole	male	46	2.62	0.3	63	0.891	Non D
		female	21	2.56	0.46			

M: mean **SD:** standard deviation **df:** degree of freedom **Sig:** significance

The previous table indicates no statistically significant differences between the male and female employees' responses regarding their perception of efficiency, fairness, rewards and incentives, participation in decision-making, and the overall dimensions of institutional performance development in Social Solidarity Departments.

Table 12: The simple regression analysis of the relationship between organizational prowess and institutional performance development among the employees in Social Solidarity Departments(n=67)

Independent variables	Regression coefficient B	T-Test	F-Test	Correlation coefficient R	Coefficient of determination R ²
Flexible Organizational Structure	0.503	3.784	14.321	0.436	0.193
Investing available resources	0.436	3.794	14.396	0.437	0.194
Explore external supporting resources	0.306	3.003	9.018	0.359	0.135
Dimensions of organizational ingenuity as a whole	0.525	4.390	19.261	0.494	0.249

The previous table illustrates a positive correlation coefficient between the independent variable, i.e., the flexible organizational structure, and the dependent variable, i.e., institutional performance development of employees in Social Solidarity Departments. The F-test result confirms the significance of the regression model, with a coefficient of determination (R²) value of 0.193, meaning that the flexible organizational structure contributes 20% to the development of institutional performance. This supports the first sub-hypothesis:

“There is a statistically significant positive relationship between flexible organizational structure and the development of the institutional performance for the employees in Social Solidarity Departments.”

The correlation coefficient between the independent variable, i.e., the investment in the available resources, and the dependent variable, i.e., the institutional performance development, also shows a positive relationship. The F-test confirms the regression model’s significance, with an R^2 value of 0.194, meaning that resource investment contributes 20.2% to the development of institutional performance. This supports the second sub-hypothesis: “There is a statistically significant positive relationship between investment in available resources and the development of the institutional performance for the employees in Social Solidarity Departments.”

The correlation coefficient between the independent variable, i.e., the exploration of external supportive resources, and the dependent variable, i.e., the institutional performance development, reveals a positive relationship. The F-test indicates significance, with an R^2 value of 0.135, meaning that external resource exploration contributes 12.8% to institutional performance development. This supports the third sub-hypothesis: “There is a statistically significant positive relationship between exploration of external supportive resources and the development of the institutional performance for the employees in Social Solidarity Departments.”

The correlation coefficient between the overall dimensions of organizational prowess and institutional performance development shows a positive relationship, with an R^2 value of 0.249, indicating that 26% of the development in institutional performance can be attributed to organizational prowess. This supports the main hypothesis: “There is a statistically significant positive relationship between organizational prowess and the development of the institutional performance for the employees in Social Solidarity Departments.”

General Discussion of the Research Issues in Light of the Results:

The study’s results confirmed the validity of its hypotheses and objectives. First, the study found that the level of organizational prowess among the employees in Social Solidarity Departments is high. Consistent with Bureau (2018), the results demonstrated that the presence of a flexible organizational structure and an encouraging organizational climate foster organized competition, constructive collaboration, creativity, and the appreciation of innovative efforts, as well as new solutions and diverse services.

Second, pursuing external supportive resources helps activate organizational prowess within the administration, addressing some issues related to resource exploration and investment. It also highlights the importance of integrating knowledge of organizational prowess and identifying the opportunities and challenges for maintaining the organization's future position, as Perusal (2020) emphasized.

Third, the administration's efforts to invest in available resources or resources that can be made available enable the organization to achieve its goals. This finding aligns with Vario's (2017), supporting the acceptance of the study's first hypothesis.

Fourth, the study's results demonstrated that the overall level of institutional performance development among the employees in the Social Solidarity Departments is high. This development is linked to the efficiency of the employees and their possession of the necessary experience and skills to perform their tasks efficiently and effectively. Ismail et al. (2020) emphasized the importance of adopting a new strategy to enhance employee efficiency, focusing on training them in job empowerment by implementing specific development plans and annual training programs and motivating them to participate in activities and training courses. This approach positively impacts the overall institutional performance.

Furthermore, employee participation in organizational decision-making and working through teams is fundamental to institutional performance development. It enhances their experience and ability to achieve organizational goals, as highlighted in Ayodeji and Odunayo (2015). This supports the acceptance of the study's second hypothesis.

Finally, the study also found a positive relationship between organizational prowess and institutional performance development among employees in the Social Solidarity Departments. In line with Taylor (2018), the more the organization emphasizes activating the dimensions of organizational prowess, the more it leads to the development of institutional performance, supporting the acceptance of the study's main hypothesis.

References:

- Al-Mahasneh, Ibrahim.** (2013). *Managing and Evaluating Job Performance between Theory and Practice*, Jordan, Dar Jarir for Publishing and Distribution.
- Al-Obeidi, Raafat Aasi Hussein.** (2020). *The Role of Technological Capabilities in Enhancing Dimensions of Organizational Prowess*, Published Research, *The Arab Journal of Management*, 40(3).
- Al-Shammari, Aaid Aaref.** (2018). *The Impact of Administrative Empowerment in Achieving Competitive Capabilities: A Case Study of Kuwait University*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Al al-Bayt University, Jordan, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences.
- Arnold, B. & Publick, K.** (2021). *Servant Leadership: A Crass-Cultural Study between India and The United States*, *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 1 (1).
- Ayodeji, B. & Odunayo, T.** (2015). *Psychological Empowerment in Workplace: Implications for Employees' Career Satisfaction*, *North American Journal of Psychology*, Vol 17, Nigeria.
- Bureau, Bates.** (2018). *Organizational Climates of Innovation Across Federal Statistical Agencies*, Census Bureau Staff, Washington D.C.
- Christina Fang, Jeho Lee & Melissa Schilling.** (2010). *Balancing Exploration and Exploitation through Structural Design: The Isolation of Subgroups and Organizational Learning*, *Organization Science*, 21(3).
- Costa, R.** (2012). *Assessing Intellectual Capital Efficiency and Productivity: An Application to the Italian Yacht Manufacturing Sector*, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(8).
- Darling, J. & Walker, W.** (2019). *Foundations of Organizational Excellence: Leadership Values, Strategies, and Skills*, *LTA*, 2(1).
- Datta, Vimanyu.** (2011). *Review and Extension of Ambidexterity's Theoretical Model Integrating Networks and Absorptive Capacity*, *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 2(1).
- Heracleous, L. et al.** (2017). *Structural Ambidexterity and Competency Traps: Insights from Xerox Parc*, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 117, pp. 327-338.
- Jabouri, Mohammad.** (2019). *Measuring the Impact of Organizational Culture Determinants on Job Performance*, Basra Center for Research and Educational Services.
- Murray, P. & Chapman, R.** (2020). *From Continuous Improvement to Organizational Learning: Developmental Theory*, Emerald, *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 10, New York.
- Nassef, Morte Saleh & Others.** (2023). *Achieving Organizational Prowess in Egyptian Universities*, *Journal of Educational Administration*, Issue 39, July.
- Piets, S.** (2022). *How External Learning and Reflexivity Affect the Simultaneous Exploration and Exploitation of NPD Teams*, Master's Thesis in Business Administration, University of Amsterdam.

- Radwan, Tarek Radwan Mohammad.** (2020). The Impact of Talent Management Dimensions on Organizational Prowess, Published Research, The Arab Journal for Commercial Research, Faculty of Commerce, University of Menoufia, 7(1).
- Roman, V.** (2012). Efficiency Theory: A Unifying Theory for Information Computation Intelligence, Computer Engineering & Computer Science Publication, USA, Louisville.
- Taylor, Scheherazade. (2018). Relational Demography, Perceptions of Organizational Culture, and Affective Outcomes among Registered Nurses, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, USA.
- Tempelaar, M.P.** (2010). Organizing for Ambidexterity: Studies on the Pursuit of Exploration and Exploitation through Differentiation, Integration, Contextual, and Individual Attributes, Ph.D. Thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Vario, Albert.** (2017). Organizing for Ambidexterity in Non-Profit Organizations: A Descriptive Case Study to Uncover Innovative Practices by Key Organizational Decision Makers, Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education, College of Professional Studies, Northeastern University, Boston.

