

Project Title

**“The Impact of Strategic Management Practices on
Organizational Performance in Healthcare Institutions”**

Prepared by:

Student name: Yousef Mohammed Alnefaie

ID Number :252001271

Supervised by:

Dr. Fayez Jrad

Dr. Alfaisal Hasan

Academic Year

2025

Introduction:

Healthcare institutions operate amid accelerating clinical complexity, cost pressures, and public expectations for equitable, high-quality services. In this context, strategic management provides a disciplined way to align decisions, resources, and capabilities with mission-critical outcomes such as safety, access, efficiency, and patient experience. Recent reviews emphasize that strategic choices—grounded in analysis and implemented through coordinated action—shape both the quality of care and the attainment of organizational goals (*Andrieieva et al., 2024*). Strategic management in healthcare spans segmentation of the sector, development of enabling policies, and the systematic use of data and audits; taken together, these elements strengthen decision quality and institutional resilience, especially after the COVID-19 shock (*Andrieieva et al., 2024*).

A central thread in this literature is the move from fragmented, siloed delivery toward integrated management of services, information, and teams. Fragmentation undermines outcomes and generates waste, whereas integration improves early diagnosis, reduces error, and ensures continuity of care—benefits that are particularly salient for chronic and complex patients (*Alharbi et al., n.d.*). Integrated strategies also streamline care pathways, cut duplication, and optimize resource use, yielding measurable financial gains for providers and patients alike (*Alharbi et al., n.d.*). Yet, implementation faces barriers—legacy technologies, weak data-sharing standards, and organizational resistance—making leadership, policy alignment, and interprofessional training decisive for success (*Alharbi et al., n.d.*).

Beyond delivery models, specific strategic practices—planning, formulation, implementation, and evaluation—are repeatedly linked with performance in health systems. In Nigerian public healthcare, strategic planning is studied as a determinant of effectiveness and efficiency, with research questions and hypotheses explicitly probing its impact on organizational performance and its interaction with managerial, economic, and environmental factors (*Oludele, 2021*). Although staffing commitment frequently mediates planning success, the broader evidence base recognizes planning as an adaptive tool that should be tailored to sector needs and embedded across units to guide goal achievement (*Oludele, 2021*). Empirical hospital-level studies sharpen this picture. Using data from a large Nigerian teaching hospital, one study reports that strategy formulation ($r \approx .40$),

implementation ($r \approx .43$), and evaluation ($r \approx .42$) each have positive, significant effects on organizational performance, underscoring that disciplined execution and feedback cycles translate strategy into measurable gains (*Nnia, et al, 2023*).

The same study concludes generally that strategic management practices “affect the performance of organizations in a significantly positive way,” after applying descriptive and regression techniques to hospital staff responses (*Nnia, et al, 2023*). At the system level, strategic management now necessarily incorporates digitalization, auditing, and human-capital development. Reviews argue for internal and external audits grounded in reliable clinical and market information; these mechanisms, together with electronic records and digital channels, reduce bureaucracy, improve monitoring, and support higher-quality decision-making (*Andrieieva et al., 2024*). Countries with advanced systems pair these tools with robust insurance designs and social supports, highlighting the complementary role of governance, regulation, and logistics in sustaining quality (*Andrieieva et al., 2024*).

Non-governmental health providers and allied organizations face similar strategic imperatives: scanning environments, formulating and implementing strategy, and evaluating results. Comparative reviews synthesize these practices as the core independent variables that influence performance across contexts, reinforcing their relevance for health-sector NGOs and public agencies alike (*Odhiambo, 2021*). Evidence from multiple sectors suggests that comprehensive planning and rigorous evaluation are associated with productivity and sustainability, although sectoral differences and resource constraints mean designs must be context-specific (*Odhiambo, 2021*).

Taken together, the literature positions strategic management as both architecture and engine for performance in healthcare institutions. It provides the structure for aligning missions with measurable outcomes; the processes—planning, implementation, and evaluation—that turn intentions into operational change; and the enablers—digital tools, audits, and workforce development—that sustain improvement. As systems continue to confront post-pandemic recovery, supply vulnerabilities, and demographic shifts, strategic choices that integrate care, invest in managerial capability, and institutionalize evidence-informed oversight will be central to achieving superior clinical, operational, and financial performance (*Andrieieva et al., 2024; Alharbi et al., n.d.*).

Study Problem:

Healthcare institutions confront escalating clinical complexity, workforce shortages, and cost pressures that expose persistent weaknesses in governance, coordination, and decision support. Although strategic management is widely promoted as the mechanism that aligns resources and capabilities with mission-critical outcomes, many systems still lack the integrated practices—formulation, implementation, and evaluation—needed to reliably translate strategy into performance gains (*Andrieiev et al., 2024; Ike et al., 2023*). At the same time, the shift from siloed delivery toward integrated health management remains uneven: interoperable technologies, redesigned care pathways, and workforce training are often insufficient, impeding coordinated, patient-centred care and limiting efficiency improvements. The COVID-19 shock further magnified strategic deficits—revealing vulnerabilities in logistics, digital infrastructure, and audit/control mechanisms—while underscoring the need for evidence-informed, system-level choices that can sustain quality under duress (*Andrieiev et al., 2024*).

Despite policy prescriptions advocating digitalization, rigorous internal/external audits, and managerial capability-building, practical uptake remains inconsistent and the consequences for organizational performance are not well characterized across diverse healthcare contexts. Empirical findings at the hospital level suggest that strategy formulation, implementation, and evaluation each exert significant, positive effects on performance; however, questions persist about boundary conditions—such as environmental turbulence, resource constraints, and institutional capacity—that may moderate these relationships (*Ike et al., 2023*). In public-sector healthcare, the evidence on planning–performance linkages is mixed and often hampered by data and control-system limitations, pointing to unresolved methodological and contextual gaps (*Oludele, 2021*).

Accordingly, the problem this study addresses is the insufficiently specified and empirically fragmented understanding of how strategic management practices—deliberate planning, disciplined execution, continuous evaluation, and enabling infrastructures (digital, audit, and human capital)—jointly shape organizational performance in healthcare institutions. The field lacks integrative analyses that connect practice adoption to clinical, operational, and financial outcomes while accounting for implementation barriers in real-world settings characterized by complexity and change (*Andrieiev et al., 2024*). Establishing this linkage is essential for guiding managers and policymakers toward context-sensitive strategies capable of improving quality, efficiency, and resilience at scale.

Study Importance:

This study is scientifically significant because it consolidates and tests theorized linkages between core strategic management practices—formulation, implementation, evaluation—and multidimensional organizational performance in healthcare, a relationship that prior work identifies but often examines in isolation or without adequate contextual controls (Nnia, et al, 2023). It also advances the evidence base on enabling infrastructures—digitalization, audit systems, and workforce development—by translating broad prescriptions into analyzable constructs that can explain variation in quality, efficiency, and resilience across institutions (Andrieiev et al., 2024). In doing so, the study addresses explicit research calls for deeper inquiry into internal/external control mechanisms and their effective execution in healthcare settings (Andrieiev et al., 2024).

Practically, the study offers decision-makers a coherent playbook for moving from siloed delivery to integrated management—clarifying how strategy, technology, and governance can be aligned to improve patient outcomes, reduce duplication, and optimize resource use. By specifying the conditions under which strategic planning translates into measurable performance gains, particularly in public and resource-constrained systems, it provides actionable guidance for prioritizing audits, digital channels, and targeted training to strengthen implementation capacity (Andrieiev et al., 2024; Oludele, n.d.). The resulting framework can inform hospital boards and health authorities seeking to calibrate investments in interoperable information systems, segmented management units, and continuous evaluation cycles—interventions shown to underpin prudent decisions and sustained performance (Andrieiev et al., 2024). Collectively, these contributions support evidence-informed policy and managerial choices capable of elevating care quality and institutional competitiveness on scale.

Aims and Objectives:

The main study aim of the present study is “*To empirically determine the extent to which core strategic management practices—strategy formulation, disciplined implementation, and continuous evaluation—together with enabling infrastructures (digitalization, audit/control systems, and workforce capability) influence multidimensional organizational performance in healthcare institutions*”.

Objectives

1. To quantify the independent effects of strategy formulation, implementation, and evaluation on clinical quality, operational efficiency, patient experience, and financial sustainability.
2. To examine the mediating roles of enabling infrastructures—specifically, digital information systems, internal/external audit and feedback loops, and targeted managerial/clinical capacity-building—in translating strategic practices into measurable performance gains.
3. To test how environmental turbulence, resource constraints, ownership/governance models, and organizational scale moderate the relationships between strategic practices, enabling infrastructures, and performance.

Study Questions:

The main study question is *“To what extent—and through which mechanisms—do core strategic management practices, together with enabling infrastructures, influence multidimensional organizational performance in healthcare institutions?”*

Sub-Questions

1. What are the magnitudes and directions of the independent effects of strategy formulation, implementation, and evaluation on clinical quality, operational efficiency, patient experience, and financial sustainability in healthcare organizations?
2. Through which specific mediators—namely digital information systems, internal/external audit and feedback loops, and targeted managerial/clinical capacity-building—are the effects of strategic management practices transmitted to produce measurable performance gains?
3. How do environmental turbulence, resource constraints, ownership/governance models, and organizational scale moderate the relationships between strategic management practices, enabling infrastructures, and performance across public, private, and mixed-care settings?

Study Hypothesis:

Main Hypothesis (H₁): *“Enhanced adoption of core strategic management practices (formulation, implementation, evaluation), supported by enabling infrastructures (digitalization, audit/control systems, workforce capability), is associated with superior organizational performance across clinical, operational, experiential, and financial dimensions”.*

Sub-Hypotheses:

H_{1a} (Direct effects): *“Each practice—formulation, implementation, and evaluation—exerts a positive, statistically significant independent effect on multidimensional performance, controlling for context”.*

H_{1b} (Mediation): *“Enabling infrastructures partially mediate the effect of strategic practices on performance; higher levels of interoperable digital systems, robust audit/feedback loops, and targeted capacity-building transmit a significant share of the total effect”.*

H_{1c} (Moderation): *“Contextual conditions (resource availability, regulatory stability, governance strength, organizational scale) moderate these relationships; favorable conditions amplify, and adverse conditions attenuate, the performance effects of strategic practices”.*

Literature Review:

Theoretical Foundations and Conceptual Models:

Strategic management in healthcare can be anchored in four complementary lenses that link managerial practice to multidimensional organizational performance. First, the Resource-Based View (RBV) posits that valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable resources underpin sustained advantage; in health organizations this logic translates directly to human resources and HRM systems—recruitment, training, evaluation, and involvement—that cultivate competencies and commitment and thereby elevate operational, human, and financial results (*Rotea et al., 2023*). In empirical work, HRM practices are shown to shape performance both directly and through well-managed organizational change processes, with performance itself treated as a multidimensional construct spanning HR, operational, financial, and market outcomes (*Rotea et al., 2023*).

Second, the dynamic-capabilities perspective is reflected in the sector's need for “dynaxibility,” that is, the organizational ability to cope with high dynamics, complexity, and uncertainty characteristic of “Dynaxity Zone III.” In such environments, purely technical or hierarchical solutions are insufficient; leadership and teamwork must continuously adapt structures and innovate while maintaining mission coherence (*Huebner & Flessa, 2022*). Strategic management therefore becomes a future-oriented mindset supported by instruments (e.g., scenarios and simulations) that help organizations anticipate, learn, and reconfigure in real time (*Huebner & Flessa, 2022*).

Third, contingency theory underscores that there is no one best way to design control or performance systems in professionalized, multi-mission healthcare organizations. Rather, structures and tools must fit contextual contingencies—mission profiles, regulatory regimes, professional cultures, and technological infrastructures. Evidence from Italian research hospitals shows that sustaining a multidimensional control system requires top-management sponsorship, alignment with explicit mission statements, and IT architectures capable of handling extensive KPIs; crucially, BSC perspectives are adapted (e.g., adding research/teaching) to reflect local missions (*Prenestini, Calciolari, & Rota, 2024*).

Finally, the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) provides the integrating conceptual model that operationalizes these lenses by translating strategy into a coherent set of financial and non-financial measures. In healthcare's brain-intensive settings, the BSC's emphasis on intangible assets, strategy communication, and cause-and-effect logic supports execution while

balancing clinical, organizational, and economic priorities (*Prenestini et al., 2024*). The BSC's endurance, moreover, depends less on technical features than on knowledge-based assets and distinctive internal capabilities—precisely the types of resources and adaptive capacities highlighted by RBV and dynamic-capabilities theories (*Prenestini et al., 2024*). Taken together, RBV, dynamic capabilities, contingency theory, and the BSC offer a coherent theoretical scaffold: healthcare organizations perform best when they develop and align people-based resources, build adaptive capabilities for turbulent contexts, tailor systems to contingencies, and institutionalize strategy-focused, multidimensional measurement and learning.

Core Strategic Management Practices in Healthcare:

Core strategic management practices in healthcare cohere around three interdependent tasks—strategy formulation, disciplined implementation, and strategic control/evaluation—enabled by governance, clinical leadership, and stakeholder engagement. Formulation must be anchored in rigorous situational awareness and context–content–process alignment, selecting a few breakthrough priorities that address environmental pressures while preserving mission clarity (e.g., value, safety, access). Evidence from qualitative multiple–case research in U.S. health systems shows that leaders who structure formulation through integrative deployment logics (e.g., Hoshin Kanri) link enterprise goals to service lines and units via explicit targets, responsibilities, and timelines, thereby minimizing the well-documented formulation–execution gap (*Brown, 2020*).

Disciplined implementation translates strategy into coordinated action. Effective organizations cascade objectives vertically and horizontally, use “catchball” communication to negotiate goals with frontline teams, and synchronize resources, metrics, and review routines across functions; these mechanisms sustain focus, reduce initiative overload, and embed change in daily work (*Brown, 2020*). Implementation quality is shaped by leadership behaviors under complexity: a contemporary scoping review highlights future-ready competencies—vision setting, collaboration, trust building, and continual learning—that enable clinical and managerial leaders to reconfigure services (e.g., tele-leadership, rapid model redesign) without eroding safety or culture (*Spanos et al., 2024*).

Strategic control and evaluation require robust measurement architectures and iterative feedback. In practice, leaders specify key performance indicators and employ plan–do–check–act cycles and formal progress reviews to detect variance and adjust course

(Brown, 2020). At sector level, balanced, multidimensional scorecards operationalize this logic in hospitals and public health agencies; scoping evidence indicates that measurement, analysis, and knowledge management—alongside leadership and operations focus—are the quality-management elements most strongly associated with organizational performance (Wongsin et al., 2025).

Governance and leadership provide the institutional scaffolding that makes these practices consequential. Clinical governance—e.g., public/patient involvement, clinical audit, information use, education and training, staff management, risk management—integrates safety and quality into the strategic cycle. A recent cross-sectional study in a large Saudi medical city found high levels of implementation across these domains (with particularly strong patient/public involvement), underscoring how governance codifies expectations and drives improvement work across roles (Alsaedi et al., 2025). Clinical leadership, especially physician leadership, confers credibility to change, accelerates adoption, and sustains psychologically safe cultures essential for execution and learning (Spanos et al., 2024).

Finally, stakeholder engagement is not ancillary but constitutive of strategy. Methods that institutionalize two-way communication and co-production—catchball with staff, cross-functional management, and formal public/patient involvement—translate abstract priorities into workable pathways and strengthen commitment at the point of care (Brown, 2020; Alsaedi et al., 2025). When these practices are aligned, scoping evidence suggests a positive, capability-mediated link from strategic planning to multidimensional performance, clarifying how formulation, execution, and control/evaluation jointly yield clinical, operational, experiential, and financial gains (Wongsin et al., 2025).

Organizational Performance: Constructs and Measurement:

Organizational performance in healthcare is inherently multidimensional, encompassing clinical quality and safety, operational efficiency, patient experience, workforce outcomes, and financial sustainability. Conceptual frameworks such as Donabedian's structure–process–outcome model and the World Health Organization's quality dimensions (effectiveness, efficiency, accessibility, acceptability/patient-centeredness, equity, and safety) provide the scaffolding for comprehensive measurement; sector-adapted service quality models (e.g., SERVQUAL) and prioritization tools (Importance–Performance Analysis) further operationalize assessment of functional quality

alongside technical care (*Guzmán-Leguel & Rodríguez-Lara, 2025*). Clinical quality and patient safety are typically captured through structured indicators and balanced sets of measures aligned with processes and outcomes. Narrative evidence underscores that optimizing the interplay—rather than isolated gains—across structures (staffing, infrastructure), processes (communication, shared decision-making), and outcomes (health status) is essential to avoid misalignment and to reflect the real drivers of patient-perceived quality (*Guzmán-Leguel & Rodríguez-Lara, 2025*).

In parallel, validated patient-reported instruments translate patient experience into reliable metrics. A recently developed and culturally adapted 33-item questionnaire demonstrated strong psychometric properties (five-factor structure; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.97$; ICC = 0.89), enabling robust assessment of communication, service provision, information, comfort/environment, and emotional support within hospitals (*Nezamdoost et al., 2025*). Operational efficiency and throughput are monitored through key performance indicators (KPIs) that span the diagnostic and treatment cycle. Global laboratory benchmarking—based on a 44-item survey and factor-analytic scoring—identified three higher-order performance domains (Operational performance; Integrated clinical care performance; Financial sustainability), with wide adoption of turnaround-time (TAT) metrics but comparatively limited monitoring of employee productivity and diagnosis-to-treatment acceleration KPIs (*Huf et al., 2024*).

These findings highlight both the centrality of time-sensitive indicators (e.g., electronic ordering, auto-verification, IT functionality, and automation) and the persistent “quality indicator paradox,” wherein recognized measures are unevenly implemented (*Huf et al., 2024*). Workforce outcomes constitute a critical pillar of organizational performance. Longitudinal hospital survey data link workplace satisfaction, communication quality, leadership responsiveness, training, and structured promotion policies to retention and perceived performance, with high infection-prevention awareness but notable gaps in career development and resource management (*Bradacs et al., 2025*).

Integrating such staff-focused indicators with operational and clinical KPIs supports a more explanatory account of performance variation. Composite indicators and benchmarking synthesize multiple metrics into single scores to aid comparison and priority setting, but they require transparent methodology. A scoping review protocol consolidates best practice across 11 stages—from framework selection, indicator choice, normalization

and weighting to uncertainty analysis and post-implementation review—while noting risks of opacity, sensitivity to weighting schemes, and potential to obscure specific strengths or failings if poorly designed (*McDonnell et al., 2023*).

Finally, at the system and primary care levels, performance measurement systems (PMS) move beyond isolated KPIs to linked constructs and adaptable scorecards. Recent synthesis emphasizes heterogeneity of methods, the influence of regional and organizational contexts, and the value of established frameworks such as the Primary Health Care Performance Initiative and PHC-IMPACT, which map indicators across structure, process, and outcomes (*de Melo Santos et al., 2025*). Together, these approaches enable healthcare organizations to triangulate clinical quality and safety, efficiency, patient and workforce experiences, and financial viability through validated instruments, composite indices, and comparative benchmarking that are methodologically transparent and context-sensitive.

Mechanisms and Mediators of Impact:

Digital transformation, audit/feedback systems, knowledge management, workforce capability-building, and organizational culture function as pivotal transmission channels through which strategy is converted into measurable performance in healthcare organizations. Interoperable electronic health records (EHRs)—particularly at the semantic level—enable the exchange and reuse of high-fidelity clinical data across settings, increasing data availability, standardization, and care quality; systematic reviews emphasize that ontologies, terminologies, and dual/multimodel data architectures support harmonization and clinically useful reuse, with reported benefits clustered around improved data access, care quality, and secondary use for decision-making (*Palojoki et al., 2024*).

In parallel, telehealth success depends on the quality of health information and the EHR system; standards-based APIs and organizational/semantic interoperability enhance value-based, team-based care, mitigate clinician burden, and advance the “quadruple aim,” whereas fragmented systems raise safety and workload risks (*Zhang & Saltman, 2022*). Internal and external audit and feedback loops translate strategic intent into disciplined control. In health systems undergoing governance reforms, internal audit performance is strengthened by auditor competency, e-audit tools, and management support, thereby improving compliance, risk mitigation, and patient safety oversight—central mechanisms for aligning operations with strategic priorities (*Alghamdi & Kassim, 2025*). These audit

capabilities institutionalize review cycles that surface variance early and channel corrective action to frontline processes.

Knowledge management (KM) operates as a complementary mediator that mobilizes evidence, links learning to innovation, and leverages digital platforms to diffuse practice improvements. Meta-analytic synthesis shows KM and knowledge-oriented leadership foster collaborative climates and psychological safety, enabling green/digital innovation and resilience in public health systems; digital transformation amplifies these effects by accelerating exchange and analytics for equitable, efficient decisions (*Alemu, 2025*). Workforce capability and culture close the loop between systems and behavior. A bidirectional mediation model in hospitals demonstrates that an evidence-based practice (EBP) culture and unit-level implementation leadership mutually reinforce one another to raise nurses' EBP competencies and behaviors, even after accounting for experience—underscoring culture and leadership as joint conduits from strategy to bedside practice (*Hu et al., 2025*). Consistent with this, hospital studies show organizational culture fully mediates the effect of credible leadership on work engagement, indicating that leaders shape norms that sustain discretionary effort and reliable execution (*Srimulyani & Hermanto, 2022*).

Taken together, interoperable digital infrastructures (including telehealth), robust audit/feedback systems, purposeful KM, and capacity-building within a supportive culture operationalize strategic plans: they standardize information, focus attention, enable learning, and motivate professional action, thereby transmitting strategy into improved clinical, operational, and experiential outcomes.

Contextual Moderators and Boundary Conditions

Context conditions shape how—and how many strategic management practices translate into performance gains in healthcare. Ownership and governance arrangements provide the institutional “rules of the game” that enable or constrain execution. Evidence from locally implemented public–private partnerships (PPPs) shows that governance quality hinges on transparency in resource allocation, clear roles formalized in memoranda of understanding, and embedded monitoring and evaluation—elements that strengthen accountability and policy capacity and thereby amplify strategic effects (TAPIC) across diverse primary healthcare programs. Where resources are allocated opaquely or top-down, or where roles are undefined, participation falters and implementation stalls, underscoring governance as a first-order moderator.

Market and regulatory turbulence further conditions effect sizes. Reviews of PPPs emphasize that external accountability requirements and the strength of the surrounding health system must be integrated into strategy design because resource scarcity and competing oversight demands alter partnership dynamics and performance trajectories. Participation imbalances and power asymmetries—often intensified under turbulent conditions—depress stakeholder engagement and learning, eroding execution quality.

Resource endowments and organizational scale/complexity are equally pivotal. A systematic review of organizational readiness for change (ORC) integrates CFIR inner-setting constructs with the Theory of Organizational Readiness, identifying structural characteristics and resource availability as core contextual levers that shape change commitment and change efficacy—the immediate engines of implementation effort. Differences by service line, team size, and professional roles illustrate how scale and complexity refract readiness and, by extension, the realized impact of strategy.

Organizational structure and alignment with strategic goals function as modifiable boundary conditions. In a Kenyan county hospital, most respondents rated structure as only fair/poor, reported limited staff involvement, and perceived weak alignment of structure with strategy; logistic regression indicated that better structural alignment markedly increased the odds of successful implementation—highlighting how internal design can amplify or dampen strategic returns under identical external conditions. Service-mix and case-mix add a final layer of contingency. PPP governance enablers and constraints vary between disease-specific programs (e.g., TB, malaria, reproductive and child health) and generalist primary care, implying that strategic control systems, stakeholder configurations, and technical oversight must be tailored to clinical portfolios to sustain performance.

Taken together, strategic practices yield stronger performance when ownership/governance arrangements codify transparent resource rules and accountability; when external regulatory demands are anticipated; when internal structures, resources, and scale-related complexities are aligned to bolster readiness; and when control and participation mechanisms are tuned to the organization's service and case mix.

Research Gaps:

Across the examined literature, several gaps constrain cumulative understanding of how strategic management practices translate into performance in healthcare. First, digital transformation evidence is largely descriptive and methodologically narrow: systematic

review data on semantic EHR interoperability synthesize only 14 implementation cases, with single-database search limitations and heterogeneous settings, leaving scarce, systematic, real-world evaluations of clinical and operational benefits and little guidance on which semantic features (models, terminologies, ontologies) best scale across contexts. Second, performance measurement systems remain fragmented, with adaptation challenges from private-sector tools (e.g., BSC) and a lack of methodological standardization in primary care; reviews call for validated, context-sensitive PMS suited to diverse regional and technological conditions and for longitudinal assessment of effectiveness.

Third, clinical governance implementation shows wide, role-specific variability (e.g., stronger public/patient involvement vs. weaker risk management, audit, and staff management), yet the field lacks causal identification of which governance levers improve patient outcomes and under what organizational conditions. Fourth, audit and feedback infrastructures are theorized as strategic enablers, but empirical work is often conceptual or scenario-based; stronger primary data designs are needed to test whether auditor competency, e-audit adoption, and leadership support produce durable gains in compliance, safety, and throughput.

Finally, cross-cutting mechanisms and contingencies remain under-specified: few studies integrate workforce capability and culture with interoperability and governance into mediated and moderated models that explain heterogeneous effects by resources, scale, and service/case-mix. Reported gaps include insufficient support for data interpretation skills among staff and uneven structural alignment of organizations with strategy—both plausible dampeners of strategic returns that warrant rigorous testing. Collectively, the field needs multi-site, longitudinal, and context-attentive designs that connect strategic practices to validated, multidimensional outcomes through clearly specified digital, audit, and human-capital pathways.

Methodology

Study Design:

Cross-sectional, multi-site quantitative study using a structured self-administered questionnaire. The design tests hypothesized direct, mediating, and moderating relationships between strategic management practices, enabling infrastructures, and multidimensional organizational performance in healthcare institutions.

Study Approach:

A positivist, explanatory approach employing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM). The model specifies (i) direct paths from strategic practices to performance; (ii) mediation by enabling infrastructures (digitalization/interoperability, audit-feedback, knowledge management, workforce capability, culture); and (iii) moderation by ownership/governance and organizational scale.

Population and sample size:

Target population: Administrators, clinical leaders, and middle managers employed in public, private, and mixed-ownership hospitals and large primary-care networks across the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA).

Sampling frame: Ministry of Health facilities, other governmental providers, and accredited private hospitals across all regions. Stratified proportional sampling by ownership (public/private/mixed), level of care (tertiary/secondary/primary), and region.

Sample size: Minimum $N \geq 400$ completed responses to ensure stable CFA/SEM estimation, subgroup comparisons (e.g., public vs. private), and ≥ 10 –15 observations per estimated parameter. Anticipate an initial invite of ~1,200–1,600 staff (assuming 25–35% response) with follow-ups to reduce nonresponse bias.

Data collection tools:

Five-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). English and Arabic versions developed via forward–back translation and expert review; piloted ($n=30$ –50) for clarity and timing.

- **Section A: Demographics/organizational profile:** Role, clinical specialty/department, years in current role, total experience, managerial span,

education, region, facility type/ownership, bed size, accreditation status, EHR adoption (basic/advanced/none).

- **Section B: Domain-1—Strategic management practices (formulation, implementation, evaluation):** Items on environmental scanning, priority-setting, target cascades, cross-functional deployment, progress reviews, and corrective action ($\approx 12\text{--}15$ items).
- **Section C: Domain-2—Enabling infrastructures:** Subscales: (i) digital transformation/EHR interoperability & analytics; (ii) internal/external audit and feedback; (iii) knowledge management and data use; (iv) workforce capability-building (training, coaching, leadership); (v) culture (psychological safety, learning orientation) ($\approx 16\text{--}20$ items).
- **Section D: Domain-3—Organizational performance:** Perceived performance on: clinical quality/safety (e.g., adherence to protocols, incident learning), operational efficiency/throughput (e.g., turnaround times, bed flow), patient experience, workforce outcomes (engagement, retention intent), and financial sustainability (cost control, revenue cycle) ($\approx 12\text{--}16$ items). Where feasible, items invite entry of last-quarter KPI values to strengthen criterion validity.

Data analysis:

Data screened for missingness (Little's MCAR), outliers, and assumptions. Missing data is handled via full information maximum likelihood. Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω ($\geq .70$), composite reliability ($CR \geq .70$), average variance extracted ($AVE \geq .50$), HTMT ($< .85$). CFA with fit criteria ($CFI/TLI \geq .90$, $RMSEA \leq .08$, $SRMR \leq .08$). SEM to estimate direct effects; mediation tested via bias-corrected bootstrapping (5,000 resamples); moderation by ownership/scale via interaction terms and multi-group SEM. Common method bias checks (Harman single-factor, CFA one-factor, unmeasured latent method factor), multicollinearity ($VIF < 5$), and sensitivity analyses excluding extreme respondents.

Ethical considerations:

Approval from an accredited KSA Institutional Review Board. Organizational permissions from participating facilities. Informed consent embedded at survey start; participation voluntary, with right to withdraw. Anonymity preserved; no personally identifiable patient data collected. Data encrypted, stored on secure servers, and reported only in aggregate. Study adheres to the Declaration of Helsinki and relevant KSA regulations.

Study limitations:

Cross-sectional self-report design limits causal inference and may introduce common method variance. Organizational self-selection and nonresponse may affect generalizability. Perceptual performance measures, where objective KPIs are unavailable, may attenuate effect estimates. Heterogeneity across service lines and case-mix could yield unobserved confounding despite stratification and controls.

References:

- Al Aina, R., & Atan, T. (2020). The impact of implementing talent management practices on sustainable organizational performance. *Sustainability*, 12(20), 8372.
- Al-Amin, M., Sullivan, E., & Szalay, N. E. (2024). An Exploratory Study of Dynamic Capabilities and Performance Improvement in Hospitals. *Journal of healthcare management / American College of Healthcare Executives*, 69(5), 335–349. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JHM-D-23-00144>
- ALHARBI, A. A. H., Halawani, A. H. A., Dahwah, E. A. M., Asiri, N. H., Turkistani, A. A., Alsharif, M. O., ... & Almarhabi, S. S. Integrated Health Management: Achieving Excellence Through Coordination and Collaboration.
- Alsaedi AR, Haddad ME, Alshelaly SE, Alsadei MM, Alharbi AJ, Alkhurais AA, Almajnoni FR, Alneami NA. Assessing Clinical Governance Awareness and Implementation Among Healthcare Professionals in Madinah, Saudi Arabia: A Cross-Sectional Study. *J Multidiscip Healthc.* 2025;18:2349-2360 <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S515427>
- Andrieiev, I., Trehub, D., Khatsko, K., Sokolovska, I., & Ganzhiy, I. (2024). Strategic management in healthcare: the impact of strategic decisions on achieving organizational goals and improving the quality of healthcare services. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 6.
- Awais, M., Ali, A., Khattak, M. S., Arfeen, M. I., Chaudhary, M. A. I., & Syed, A. (2023). Strategic Flexibility and Organizational Performance: Mediating Role of Innovation. *Sage Open*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181432>
- Bradacs, A. I., Voita-Mekeres, F., Daina, L. G., & Mekeres, G. (2025). Exploring the Impact of Workplace Satisfaction, Leadership, and Career Development on Employee Retention in Hospitals. *Cureus*, 17(3), e81493. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.81493>
- Caci, L., Nyantakyi, E., Blum, K., Sonpar, A., Schultes, M. T., Albers, B., & Clack, L. (2025). Organizational readiness for change: A systematic review of the healthcare literature. *Implementation research and practice*, 6, 26334895251334536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26334895251334536>
- de Melo Santos, C. J., Barbosa, A. S., & Sant'Anna, Â. M. O. (2025). Performance measurement systems in primary health care: a systematic literature review. *BMC health services research*, 25(1), 353. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12412-6>
- Dove, G., Craig, A., Harris-Roxas, B., & Kelly-Hanku, A. (2025). Governance of Public-Private Partnerships for Primary Healthcare in Low- and Lower-Middle-Income Countries, 2000-2023: A Systematic Review. *International journal of health policy and management*, 14, 8442. <https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.8442>
- Guzmán-Leguel, Y. M., & Rodríguez-Lara, S. Q. (2025). Assessment of Patients' Quality of Care in Healthcare Systems: A Comprehensive Narrative Literature

- Hu, S., Liu, S., Li, X., Zhao, J., Chen, J., Chen, W., & Hu, J. (2025). Organizational evidence-based practice culture, implementation leadership, and nurses: A bidirectional mediation model. *International nursing review*, 72(2), e13054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.13054>
- Huebner, C., & Flessa, S. (2022). Strategic Management in Healthcare: A Call for Long-Term and Systems-Thinking in an Uncertain System. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(14), 8617. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19148617>
- Huf W, Mohns M, Almeta E, Lister R, Buchta C, Demyanets S, Buchberger W and Ettl B (2024) Benchmarking medical laboratory performance on a global scale. *Front. Public Health*. 12:1363957. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2024.1363957
- Junaid, M., Zhang, Q., Cao, M., & Luqman, A. (2023). Nexus between technology enabled supply chain dynamic capabilities, integration, resilience, and sustainable performance: An empirical examination of healthcare organizations. *Technological forecasting and social change*, 196, 122828.
- Kosiol, J., Fraser, L., Fitzgerald, A., & Radford, K. (2023). Resource-based view: A new strategic perspective for public health service managers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management*, 18(1), 8-19.
- McDonnell, T., Cosgrove, G., Hogan, E., Martin, J., McNicholas, T., O'Dowd, M., ... & McAuliffe, E. (2023). Methods to derive composite indicators used for quality and safety measurement and monitoring in healthcare: a scoping review protocol. *BMJ open*, 13(7), e071382.
- Nezamdoost, F., Najar, A. V., Zarqi, M., Jamali, J., Tabatabaei, S. S., & Hooshmand, E. (2025). Development and validation of a patient experience assessment questionnaire for evaluating hospital care in Iran. *BMC health services research*, 25(1), 62. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12208-8>
- Nnia, M. I., Ugbam, O. C., Emmanuel, A. K., & Benedict, I. O. (2023). Examining How Strategic Management Practices Impact Organisational Performance: The case of Nigerian teaching hospitals. *European Journal of Business Economics and Accountancy*, 11(3), 1-17.
- Odhiambo, E., & Njuguna, R. (2021). Strategic management practices and performance of health non-governmental organizations in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *Journal of Strategic Management*, 6(1), 1-16.
- Oludele, A. E. (2021). Impact of strategic planning on organizational performance of health care services in Nigeria. *Science Journal of Business and Management*, 9(3), 209-214.
- Palojoki, S., Lehtonen, L., & Vuokko, R. (2024). Semantic interoperability of electronic health records: Systematic review of alternative approaches for enhancing patient information availability. *JMIR medical informatics*, 12(1), e53535.

- Prenestini, A., Calciolari, S., & Rota, A. (2024). Keep-or-drop multidimensional control systems in professional organisations: evidence on the use of the balanced scorecard in healthcare. *Journal of health organization and management*, 38(9), 157–174. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-09-2023-0287>
- Rotea, C. C., Ploscaru, A. N., Bocean, C. G., Vărzaru, A. A., Mangra, M. G., & Mangra, G. I. (2023). The Link between HRM Practices and Performance in Healthcare: The Mediating Role of the Organizational Change Process. *Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland)*, 11(9), 1236. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11091236>
- Spanos, S., Leask, E., Patel, R., Datyner, M., Loh, E., & Braithwaite, J. (2024). Healthcare leaders navigating complexity: a scoping review of key trends in future roles and competencies. *BMC medical education*, 24(1), 720. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05689-4>
- Srimulyani, V. A., & Hermanto, Y. B. (2022). Organizational culture as a mediator of credible leadership influence on work engagement: empirical studies in private hospitals in East Java, Indonesia. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), 1-11.
- Wongsin, U., Pannoi, T., Prutipinyo, C., Maruf, M. A., Pongpatrachai, D., Quansri, O., & Sattayasomboon, Y. (2025). Strategic planning and organizational performance in public health sector: a scoping review. *BMC health services research*, 25(1), 1017. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-13206-6>
- Zhang, X., & Saltman, R. (2022). Impact of Electronic Health Record Interoperability on Telehealth Service Outcomes. *JMIR medical informatics*, 10(1), e31837. <https://doi.org/10.2196/31837>
- Zuchowski, M., Göller, A., & Henzler, D. (2023). Is medical leadership associated with better hospital management? Evidence from a structural analysis of hospitals in Germany. *British Journal of Healthcare Management*, 29(2), 1-9.