



Article

The Role and Impact of Organizational Success on Enhancing Sustainable Performance: An Analytical Study at Sumer University

Mohammed Adul Hasan Khalif Al Saeidi¹, Athmar Mohammed Abed Al Rikabi²

1. Department of public Administration, College of Administration and Economics, Sumer University
 2. Department of public Administration, College of Administration and Economics, Sumer University
- * Correspondence: moham77777med@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aimed to identify the role and impact of organizational success on enhancing sustainable performance at Sumer University. It also aimed to determine the extent to which organizational success contributes to supporting sustainable performance by identifying the availability of the study variables (organizational success and sustainable performance) at Sumer University, measuring the impact of organizational success on sustainable performance, and identifying the statistically significant relationship between organizational success and sustainable performance. The study included the independent variable, organizational success with its dimensions (organizational readiness, employee selection, retention, and growth), and the dependent variable, sustainable performance with its dimensions (economic, social, and environmental). The study sample consisted of 70 employees, to whom a questionnaire was distributed. Statistical software, including SPSS version 28, was used to process the data collected from the study area. Among the most important conclusions of the study: The results showed a relationship and impact of organizational success on sustainable performance at Sumer University. The university was able to reduce unnecessary activities by using organizational success strategies, which leads to improved and sustained performance.

Citation: Al Saeidi, M. A. H. K, & Al Rikabi, A. M. A. The Role and Impact of Organizational Success on Enhancing Sustainable Performance: An Analytical Study at Sumer University. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2026, 9(1), 576-585.

Received: 03rd Oct 2025
Revised: 18th Nov 2025
Accepted: 24th Dec 2025
Published: 21th Jan 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Keywords: Organizational success, sustainable performance, Sumer University.

1. Introduction

Organizational success is a multidimensional concept. It can be defined both quantitatively and qualitatively, in terms of planned objectives, duties, and activities, through the interactive integration of all parts of the system. The organizational dimension of success is often manifested in organizational, environmental, and human factors, achieved through the management function. The core of the production factor is the individual, and therefore, management must integrate the efforts of individuals with other resources to achieve the organization's goals. Educational organizations generally aim to succeed in their operations to remain competitive with other organizations and to continuously improve. A key factor in the success of these organizations is their excellence and distinction from other organizations in their performance. In the current climate of intense competition among organizations to achieve organizational success, and given the emerging challenges of sustainable performance, negative social impacts (such as unsuitable working conditions), and the imbalance between economic growth and environmental protection, achieving economic growth often requires intensive resource utilization. This necessitates the search for new alternatives and solutions, especially in

environments lacking a culture of organizational success and sustainable performance practices. To achieve sustainable performance, attention must be paid to the economic, social, and environmental dimensions. The research problem can be expressed in the following questions: What is the nature and level of attention given to the study variables (organizational success and sustainable performance) at Sumer University? What is the relationship between organizational success and sustainable performance at Sumer University? And what is the impact of organizational success on sustainable performance in the study environment? With escalating economic instability and environmental and social risks globally, organizations have begun striving to offer high-quality products and services with a positive environmental impact. Organizations are now obligated to consider environmental and social dimensions, in addition to financial ones, to demonstrate sustainable performance. Sustainable performance aims to achieve societal well-being without harming natural resources, which are the common property of current and future generations. Sustainable performance is measured through multiple indicators encompassing economic, social, and environmental aspects.

Theoretical Foundations of Organizational Success and Sustainable Performance

First: Organizational Success: Organizational success is a multidimensional concept that can be defined in two ways: quantitatively and qualitatively. This is determined by the planned objectives, duties, and activities, through the interactive integration of all parts of the system. Organizational success refers to the measure that demonstrates an organization's ability to utilize its available resources and its capacity to achieve balance in its operating environment in the long term, in a way that enables it to achieve its goals. Kose et al. argue that organizational success depends on its ability to manage effectively [1]. Aga. D. A. Noorderhaven. N., & Vallejo, B. enabling it to acquire updated knowledge and experience, develop new ideas, successfully analyze experiences and skills, and leverage its competitive history within the same sector [2]. While (Vayyavur) believes that the concept of organizational success refers to the existence of an effective strategy for planning the organization's resources in order to gain a competitive advantage, and that organizational factors either facilitate or hinder successful resource planning, organizational success as the achievement of the organization's goals in several aspects, such as financial performance, internal processes, learning, and growth. Vayyavur emphasize that an organization can achieve survival and continuity if it recognizes the fundamental success factors, which are usually determined in light of its capabilities and internal environmental conditions such as organizational culture, social capital, job performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, leadership style, and other internal factors, as well as external conditions. argues that organizational success can be determined by an organization's internal resources, including tangible and intangible assets, as well as its implicit capabilities such as the accumulated knowledge, experience, and skills of its employees [3]. Ravangard et al. on the other hand, defines it as an organization's ability to achieve its vision, mission, and goals in order to reach superior performance [4]. Whitney however, emphasize that organizational success refers to an organization's ability to achieve its objectives by possessing highly skilled and integrated human resources [5], [6]. This is facilitated by the ability to exchange ideas during work, united by a common goal and shared objectives, thus enabling the organization to achieve excellence [7]. Donsophon et al. define organizational success as "the ability of an organization to achieve its goals in terms of vision, mission, strategic planning, internal processes, continuous development, effective leadership, review and benchmarking mechanisms, and evaluation, in order to continue to maintain its competitive advantage, and thus survive and grow." [8]

Dimensions of Organizational Success: When measuring organizational success, it is important that success indicators be simple, dynamic, and flexible, and that they be timely and aligned with the organization's strategy, vision, and goals [9]. Measuring and evaluating organizational success in general and relative terms is possible, despite the existence of different types of success, such as economic, technological, and administrative/organizational success. One of the most important indicators of organizational success is growth, which means the organization's ability to achieve its

long-term organizational goals through expansion, innovation, survival, and continuity [10].

1. Organizational Readiness: Organizational readiness encompasses the attitudes, beliefs, and intentions of the organization's members. It indicates the extent to which members are psychologically and behaviorally prepared to implement change. Organizational readiness is closely linked to the decision-making process and means that company management is prepared to allocate financial, human, and technological resources.[11]

2. Selecting the Right Employees: An organization's success depends on having the right people in the right jobs at the right time. Employees are an essential part of the production cycle; they are the core of every organization, and organizations cannot exist without them. Therefore, organizations do not take human resources for granted. Any organization must focus on selecting the right employee for the right job because of the valuable impact this has on the organization's goals [12]. An organization's success is linked to the process of selecting the right employees to ensure the highest levels of performance, which requires that each job possess specific competencies to perform at the highest level [13].

3. Survival: Organizations strive to survive and continue operating in an environment characterized by rapid change, increasing uncertainty, and growing complexity. To ensure survival and success, organizations must respond to the current and future environment. Organizational survival is a primary objective, and to achieve this, organizations must identify internal and external threats that hinder their continued existence [14].

4. Growth: Growth refers to an organization's ability to achieve its long-term goals through expansion, renewal, diversification, and integration strategies. Organizations continuously renew, develop, and change, which propels them from one stage to another. When reviewing the organizational life cycle, the first stage begins with the organization's emergence and birth. In this stage, the organization struggles for survival. It then transitions to the maturity stage, where it strives for growth and combats stagnation and inertia [15].

Second: The concept of sustainable performance. The idea of sustainable performance was first introduced in 1972 at the United Nations Conference in Stockholm on the environment, addressing the waste and depletion of resources, environmental pollution, and chemical emissions from factories and plants that threaten the ecosystem [16]. The concept of sustainable performance was presented in 1980 through the book "Strategy for Conserving the World," initially relating to sustainable approaches for maintaining the long-term production of forests and fisheries. The concept of sustainability then evolved to encompass all types of human development and activities [17]. Sustainable performance is defined as performance that meets the needs of stakeholders without compromising the ability to meet their future needs [18].

The concept of sustainable performance can be defined by considering the definitions of several researchers. defined it as the way in which an organization adds value to its shareholders in particular, and to society in general, enhancing positive aspects and eliminating negative ones related to economic, environmental, and social issues [19]. defined it as the organization's ability to meet the needs and expectations of customers and other stakeholders in the long term. Nor-aishah et al. views it as the methods used in the organization's activities to create value in the short and long term, taking into account economic, environmental, and social aspects [20]. Cunningham defined it as the integration of the economic, environmental, and social aspects of the organization in a way that does not negatively impact the environment and society [21]. It achieves long-term economic benefits. Nhamo et al. defines it as performance that harmonizes the social, environmental, and economic aspects of the organization [22]. Sarker et al. define it as one of the key indicators used by organizations to determine their level of success, assisting senior management in making critical and strategic decisions in the external environment [23]. Sustainable performance has also been defined as performance that generates profits for the organization while preserving the external environment and addressing social issues by achieving the goals of all stakeholders to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage [24].

Dimensions of Sustainable Performance: The sustainable performance variable is measured through several dimensions: environmental, social, and economic. These dimensions have been used by many researchers and are considered among the most logical. They are:

1. The Economic Dimension: The economic dimension is a cornerstone of sustainable performance and is equivalent to business performance, which is measured through productivity, cost reduction, revenue, profits, cash flow, and business growth. This dimension focuses on increasing the well-being of individuals through their access to products and services related to health, housing, education, and transportation. Economic sustainability helps in measuring the sustainable performance of the organization [25].

2. The Social Dimension: This involves maintaining a balance between economic efficiency and labor productivity for individuals and society through the use of renewable and non-renewable natural resources to promote social development arising from organizational performance. The social dimension is defined as the effective interpretation of the organization's mission in practice, in line with accepted social values. The social aspect relates to making the social mission a reality. The organization has a reality, and an important element in the social dimension is the 'safety management systems' and 'occupational health' and the 'safe organization' program [26].

3. The environmental dimension: is the organization's commitment to preserving and protecting the natural environment and providing environmentally safe goods and services [27]. The environmental aspect works to protect natural resources, provide environmentally friendly services and products, and work to reduce the use of resources harmful to the environment by raising environmental awareness. This dimension focuses on environmental protection and safety through the optimal use of natural resources and harnessing them for the benefit of humanity.

2. Materials and Methods

The current study applied a quantitative, descriptive-analytical, research design to illustrate the role and effect of organizational success on maintaining sustainable performance at Sumer University. A simple random sample of 70 respondents was selected from the research population (academic and administrative employees working for it) to ensure adequate representation and the reduction of selection bias. AbstractsData were collected using a structured questionnaire that was designed based on thorough literature review process and study conceptual framework. The first section was designed to measure Organizational Success with its four dimensions of organizational readiness, selection, retention, and growth of the appropriate employees and the second section was designed to examine Sustainable Performance across its three dimensions of economic, social and environmental streams. In order to accurately describe respondents perception, five point Likert scale where participants respond to items with five levels of agreement from strong disagreement to strong agreement was utilized. Backtracking full-panel deployment, the instrument was evaluated for content validity through review by subject-matter experts, as well as reliability via acceptable Cronbach's alpha coefficients. The data were collected, coded, and analyzed using SPSS version 28 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Descriptive statistics were used to characterize the sample and level of the study variables and inferential statistics (Pearson correlation and simple linear regression analysis) were used to test the research hypotheses with respect to strength and direction of relationships/effects among the variables. Using this methodical approach allowed a thorough exploration of how the dimensions of organizational success translate to sustainable performance in the university context.

3. Results and Discussion

Study Hypotheses: Several study hypotheses, both main and sub-hypotheses, were formulated to achieve the research objectives. These hypotheses are as follows:

Main Hypothesis 1: There is a statistically significant relationship between organizational success and its dimensions (organizational readiness, employee selection, retention, and growth) and sustainable performance across all its dimensions.

The following sub-hypotheses stem from this main hypothesis:

Sub-hypothesis 1: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of (organizational readiness) and sustainable performance across all its dimensions.

Sub-hypothesis 2: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of (employee selection) and sustainable performance across all its dimensions.

Sub-hypothesis3:There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of (retention) and sustainable performance across all its dimensions.

Sub-hypothesis4: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of (growth) and sustainable performance across all its dimensions.

The second main hypothesis: states that there is a statistically significant and meaningful relationship between organizational success and sustainable performance at Sumer University. This main hypothesis includes the following sub-hypotheses:

Sub-hypothesis1: There is a statistically significant and meaningful relationship between the organizational readiness dimension and sustainable performance.

Sub-hypothesis2: There is a statistically significant and meaningful relationship between the appropriate employee selection dimension and sustainable performance.

Sub-hypothesis3: There is a statistically significant and meaningful relationship between the retention dimension and sustainable performance.

Sub-hypothesis4: There is a statistically significant and meaningful relationship between the growth dimension and sustainable performance.

Analyzing the results and testing the hypotheses: In order to analyze the nature of the relationships between these variables, Pearson Correlation was calculated to examine the existence of the relationship. The research population was represented by Sumer University, and the research sample was represented by a group of employees. The questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of employees working at Sumer University, as the sample consisted of (70) male and female employees at the university. After collecting the data, the variables were evaluated taking into account the objectives and hypotheses. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 28. The nature of the data was examined through the SPSS program, then parametric statistical techniques were applied, and the t-value, Pearson correlation coefficient, and regression were calculated in order to interpret this data to measure organizational success, sustainable performance, and to confirm the research hypotheses.

Testing the Correlation Between Organizational Success and Sustainable Performance

Testing the First Main Hypothesis and its Sub-Hypotheses: This involves determining the type and strength of the relationship between the independent variable (organizational success) and the dependent variable (sustainable performance) using the correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient ranges between (+1, -1). A positive value indicates a direct relationship between the two variables, while a negative value indicates an inverse relationship. The closer the coefficient is to one, the stronger the relationship. Table (1) shows the results of the first main hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses:

Table 1. Person Correlation Coefficients for Examining the Relationship Between Organizational Success and Sustainable Performance n=70

Hypothesis	Variables		Simple correlation coefficient (Person)	Level of significance (2-tailed)	The strength and direction of the relationship
	Independent	Approved			
Sub 1	organizational readiness	Sustainable performance	0.565 **	(0.001)	positive mean

2	Choosing the right employee	Sustainable performance	0.754 **	(0.002)	positive mean
3	Staying	Sustainable performance	0.543 **	(0.001)	positive mean
4	Growth	Sustainable performance	0.766 **	(0.001)	positive mean
First President	Organizational success	Sustainable performance	0.717 **	(0.001)	strong exponential

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the responses in the questionnaire and the SPSS V.28 program.

We note from Table (1) that the simple linear correlation coefficient reached (0.717**). This result indicates a strong and statistically significant positive relationship with a confidence level of (99%) between the two variables of organizational success and sustainable performance. This means that the greater the attention given to organizational success, the greater the attention given to sustainable performance, and vice versa. This proves the validity of the first main hypothesis, which stated that (there is a statistically significant and meaningful relationship between organizational success and its dimensions (organizational readiness, selection of the right employee, retention, growth) and sustainable performance with its dimensions combined). From the main hypothesis, the following sub-hypotheses emerged:

a. The first sub-hypothesis, which states that there is a statistically significant correlation between the dimension of organizational readiness and sustainable performance (in its various dimensions) in the organization under study, shows a moderately strong and statistically significant positive relationship with a confidence level of 99% between organizational readiness and sustainable performance. The simple linear correlation coefficient is 0.565**, meaning that increased attention to organizational readiness leads to increased attention to sustainable performance, and vice versa. This confirms the first sub-hypothesis.

b. The second sub-hypothesis, which states that there is a statistically significant correlation between the dimension of selecting the right employee and sustainable performance in the organization under study, shows a strong and statistically significant positive relationship with a confidence level of 99% between selecting the right employee and sustainable performance. The simple linear correlation coefficient is 0.756**, meaning that increased attention to selecting the right employee leads to increased attention to sustainable performance, and vice versa. This confirms the second sub-hypothesis.

c. The third sub-hypothesis, which states that there is a statistically significant correlation between the survival dimension and sustainable performance in the organization under study, shows a moderately strong and statistically significant positive relationship with a confidence level of (99%) between survival and sustainable performance. The simple linear correlation coefficient is (0.543**), meaning that as the focus on survival increases, the focus on sustainable performance also increases, and vice versa. This confirms the third sub-hypothesis.

d. The fourth sub-hypothesis, which states that there is a statistically significant correlation between the growth dimension and sustainable performance in the organization under study, shows a strong and statistically significant positive relationship with a confidence level of (99%) between growth and sustainable performance. The simple linear correlation coefficient is (0.764**), meaning that as the focus on growth increases, the

focus on sustainable performance also increases, and vice versa. This confirms the fourth sub-hypothesis.

Testing the second main hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses

Testing the second main hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses requires determining the strength of the independent variable's influence on the dependent variable. This is done by applying some statistical methods, namely the regression (effect) coefficient (β) and the coefficient of determination (R^2), which explains the percentage of the independent variable's influence on the dependent variable. The calculated (F) value is then compared with its tabulated value to indicate whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Table (2) shows the results of the second main hypothesis and the sub-hypotheses derived from it.

Table 2. Results of the impact of organizational success and its dimensions on sustainable performance n=70

The independent variable and its dimensions	dependent variable	Coefficient of determination R^2	Regression coefficient (effect) β	fixed limit α	Calculated value	Calculated F value	Level of significance P
organizational readiness	Sustainable performance Y	0.525	0.617	1.070	**	**	0.000
					10.585	112.00	
Choosing the right employee		0.543	0.687	1.026	**	**	0.000
					13.328	177.62	
Staying		0.527	0.570	1.486	**	**	0.000
					9.750	95.06	
Growth		0.661	0.713	0.931	**	**	0.000
					20.246	409.89	
Organization al success		0.687	0.892	0.397	**	**	0.000
					20.495	420.045	

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the responses in the questionnaire and the SPSS V.28 program.

Table (2) indicates that the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) for organizational success was (0.687), indicating that its contribution was (68.7%) to sustainable performance. The remaining percentage (31.3%) is attributed to other unknown factors that did not appear in the model. Any increase of one unit in the value of the organizational success variable leads to an increase in the focus on sustainable performance, represented by the regression coefficient (β) of (0.892). The calculated (t) value (20.495) was greater than the critical value of (2.326) at a significance level of (0.01). The calculated (F) value (420.04) is greater than the critical value of (6.63) at a significance level of (0.01) with a confidence level of (99%). Based on these results, the second main hypothesis is accepted, which states that (there is a statistically significant and meaningful effect between organizational success and sustainable performance at Sumer University). (2) The results of the sub-hypotheses stemming from the second main hypothesis can be stated and interpreted:

a. The effect of the organizational readiness dimension on sustainable performance. The results show the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) of (0.526), which indicates the contribution of the organizational readiness dimension of (52.6%) to sustainable performance. The remaining percentage (47.4%) is due to other unknown factors that did not appear in the model. Any increase in the value of the organizational readiness dimension by one unit leads to an increase in interest in sustainable

performance, which was represented by the regression coefficient (β) of (0.617). The calculated value of (t) (10.585) was greater than the tabulated value of (2.326) at a significance level of (0.01). The calculated value of (F) (112.00) indicates that it is greater than the tabulated value of (6.63) at a significance level of (0.01) with a confidence level of (99%). Based on these results, the first sub-hypothesis is accepted, which stated that (there is a statistically significant and meaningful effect of the organizational readiness dimension on sustainable performance).

b. The effect of the appropriate employee selection dimension on sustainable performance: The results show the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) of (0.543), which indicates the contribution of the appropriate employee selection dimension of (54%) to sustainable performance. The remaining percentage (46%) is due to other unknown factors that did not appear in the model. Any increase in the value of the appropriate employee selection dimension by one unit leads to an increase in interest in sustainable performance, which was represented by the regression coefficient (β) of (0.687). The calculated value of (t) (13.328) was greater than the tabulated value of (2.326) at a significance level of (0.01). The calculated value of (F) (177.62) indicates that it is greater than the tabulated value of (6.63) at a significance level of (0.01) with a confidence level of (99%). Based on these results, the second sub-hypothesis is accepted, which stated that (there is a statistically significant and meaningful effect of the appropriate employee selection dimension on sustainable performance in the organization under study).

c. The Impact of the Survival Dimension on Sustainable Performance: The results show a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.527, indicating that the survival dimension contributes 52.7% to sustainable performance. The remaining 47.3% is attributed to other unknown factors not reflected in the model. Any one-unit increase in the survival dimension leads to increased interest in sustainable performance, as indicated by a regression coefficient (β) of 0.570. The calculated t-value (9.750) was greater than the critical value of 2.326 at a significance level of 0.01. Similarly, the calculated F-value (95.06) was greater than the critical value of 6.63 at a significance level of 0.01, with a 99% confidence level. Based on these results, the third sub-hypothesis is accepted, stating that the survival dimension has a statistically significant impact on sustainable performance in the organization under study.

d. The effect of the growth dimension on sustainable performance: The results show the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) of (0.661), which indicates the contribution of the growth dimension of (66.1%) to sustainable performance. The remaining percentage (33.9%) is due to other unknown factors that did not appear in the model. Any increase in the value of the growth dimension by one unit leads to an increase in interest in sustainable performance, which was represented by the regression coefficient (β) of (0.713). The calculated value of (t) (20.246) was greater than the tabulated value of (2.326) at a significance level of (0.01). The calculated value of (F) (409.89) indicates that it is greater than the tabulated value of (6.63) at a significance level of (0.01) with a confidence level of (99%). Based on these results, the fourth sub-hypothesis is accepted, which stated that (there is a statistically significant effect between the subordinate assistance dimension and job embedding in the organization under study).

4. Conclusion

The statistical analysis revealed a relationship and impact of organizational success on sustainable performance at Sumer University. The dimensions of organizational success influence sustainable performance, indicating that Sumer University prioritizes organizational success and leverages it to enhance sustainable performance. This is demonstrated by the university's focus on organizational readiness, selecting suitable personnel, and fostering survival and growth. Furthermore, the university has successfully

reduced unnecessary activities by employing organizational success strategies, leading to improved and sustained performance.

The university has demonstrated a strong commitment to sustainable performance and was among the most active in implementing performance indicators. However, the application of sustainable performance indicators was not uniform, revealing significant differences between organizational success and sustainable performance. Therefore, greater attention must be paid to both organizational success and sustainable performance at the university to ensure its continued development and keep pace with changes in education and development.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Kose, I. Dasdemir, E. S. Yurdakul, and H. Yildirim, "Factors affecting administrative and organizational success in Turkey's forestry," *Appl. Ecol. Environ. Res.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 8713–8735, 2019, doi: 10.15666/aeer/1704_87138735.
- [2] D. A. Aga, N. Noorderhaven, and B. Vallejo, "Transformational leadership and project success: The mediating role of team-building," *Int. J. Project Manage.*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 806–818, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.02.012.
- [3] R. Vayyavur, "ERP implementation challenges and critical organizational success factors," *Int. J. Current Eng. Technol.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 2147–2161, 2015, doi: 10.14741/2277-4106.
- [4] R. Ravangard, S. Karimi, P. Farhadi, Z. Sajjadnia, and N. Shokrpour, "The effects of transformational leadership and mediating factors on organizational success using structural equation modeling," *Health Care Manage.*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 58–71, 2016, doi: 10.1097/HCM.0000000000000090.
- [5] D. Whitney, "Appreciative inquiry: Creating spiritual resonance in the workplace," *J. Manage. Spirituality Relig.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 73–88, 2010, doi: 10.1080/14766080903497656.
- [6] M. Kaliannan and S. N. Adjovu, "Effective employee engagement and organizational success: A case study," *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 172, pp. 161–168, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.350.
- [7] A. C. Maltz, A. J. Shenhar, and R. R. Reilly, "Beyond the balanced scorecard: Refining the search for organizational success measures," *Long Range Planning*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 187–204, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0024-6301(02)00165-6.
- [8] K. Donsophon, P. Jhundra-Indra, and S. Raksong, "Managerial professionalism strategy and firm success: An empirical investigation of hotel businesses in Thailand," *AU-GSB e-J.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 141–160, 2016.
- [9] Z. Akal, *Performance Measurement and Control in Business: Multiple Performance Indicators*. Ankara, Turkey: National Productivity Center, 2005.
- [10] S. Duang-Ek-Anong, "Organizational success factors in the implementation of big data analytics for customer relationship management," *Int. J. Simulation – Systems, Sci. Technol.*, vol. 20, no. 5, 2019.
- [11] O. O. Oluwaseun, "Employee training and development as a model for organizational success," *Int. J. Eng. Technol. Manage. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 181–189, 2018.
- [12] A. Golec and E. Kahya, "A fuzzy model for competency-based employee evaluation and selection," *Comput. Ind. Eng.*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 143–161, 2007.
- [13] O. O. Adewale, A. J. Abolaji, and O. J. Kolade, "Succession planning and organizational survival: An empirical study of Nigerian private tertiary institutions," *Serbian J. Manage.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 231–246, 2011.
- [14] L. McKeown, *Predictable Success: Getting Your Organization on the Growth Track—and Keeping It There*. Austin, TX, USA: Greenleaf Book Group, 2010.
- [15] P. Bansal and M. R. Des Jardine, "Business sustainability: It is about time," *Strategic Organization*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 70–78, 2014.
- [16] K. Hamani, "Developing a corporate sustainability performance evaluation model of the USE construction contractors," Ph.D. dissertation, School of Energy, Geoscience, Infrastructure and Society, 2019.
- [17] N. Nofryanti, R. Sembel, Y. Augustine, and R. J. Arsajah, "Sustainability performance and development goals," *Int. J. Sustainable Develop. World Policy*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2021.
- [18] T. R. Miller, B. A. Minter, and L. C. Malan, "The new conservation debate: The view from practical ethics," *Biol. Conserv.*, vol. 144, no. 3, pp. 948–957, 2011.
- [19] N. Lace, "The open innovation model of coaching interaction in organizations for sustainable performance within the life cycle," *Sustainability*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 1–17, 2018.
- [20] N. A. Hassan, N. H. Ahmad, and R. Thurasamy, "Entrepreneurial leadership and sustainable performance of manufacturing SMEs in Malaysia: The contingent role of entrepreneurial bricolage," pp. 1–21, 2020.
- [21] E. Cunningham, "Artificial intelligence-based decision-making algorithms, sustainable organizational performance, and automated production systems," *J. Self-Governance Manage. Econ.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 31–41, 2021.

-
- [22] G. Nhamo, K. Dube, and M. Togo, "Sustainable development goals for society," in *Sustainable Development Goals Series*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature, 2021, pp. 1–19.
- [23] M. R. Sarker, S. M. Ali, S. K. Paul, and Z. H. Munim, "Measuring sustainability performance using an integrated model," *Measurement*, vol. 184, pp. 1–13, 2021.
- [24] P. K. Dey, C. Malesios, D. De, S. Chowdhury, and F. B. Abdelaziz, "The impact of lean management practices and sustainability-oriented innovation on SME sustainability performance: Evidence from the UK," pp. 1–45, 2020.
- [25] P. G. Boucon, "Identifying environmental sustainability strategies in West Michigan manufacturing," Ph.D. dissertation, Baker College, Flint, MI, USA, 2015.
- [26] A. A. Adamu, C. Y. Wan, and A. H. Gorondutse, "Ethical sensitivity and sustainable performance of SMEs: Empirical evidence from Nigeria," *Int. J. Res. Innov. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 8, pp. 78–82, 2020.
- [27] L. A. Al-Hakim, T. H. Thabit, and H. A. Al-Nasrawi, "The complementary relationship between organizational architecture and organizational agility: An empirical study in mobile carriers of Erbil–Iraq," *Int. J. Social Sci. Educ. Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 19–28, 2017.