The availability extent of strategic intelligence dimensions of administrative leaders at the Northern Technical University (NTU) and its formations

By

Majeed Hameed Majeed Al-Ali
Technical College of Management/Mosul Northern Technical University
Email: dr.majeed@ntu.edu.iq

Ali Mahmood Ali
Technical College of Management/Mosul Northern Technical University
Corresponding author:Email**:** ali_mahmood@ntu.edu.iq

Abstract

The current study aims at diagnosing the reality of strategic intelligence in the dimensions expressed by (foresight, systems thinking, strategic vision, partnership, and motivating employees) at the administrative leaders at the Northern Technical University and its formations, which adopted the questionnaire as the main tool for data collection. The statistical program (SPSS 25) was relied upon to analyze the data collected from a sample of (111) researchers from the administrative leaders(Dean, Associate Dean, Head of Department, and Director of the Department) in the researched field, through several descriptive and analytical statistical methods. In light of the statistical results, a set of conclusions were reached that confirms the availability of those dimensions and at high levels at the administrative leaders of the researched organization. The study also presented a set of proposals emphasizing the need to enhance the possession of these dimensions and work to adopt them by the leaders of the researched organizations to achieve their organizations' goals.

Keywords: strategic intelligence, foresight, systems thinking, the strategic vision, partnership, motivating employees.

1. Introduction

The concept of strategic intelligence appeared as one of the most important conceptual frameworks in the literature on strategic management, and in a manner that made it an entry point for managing organizations within the framework of information and analytical support aspects of the proactive decision-making process, making organizations ready to face challenges and contain unexpected surprises in the future, being a support tool for a range of strategic activities and across different stages of strategy development, administrative leaders in business organizations are keen to make the best use of their resources and multiple capabilities to seize available opportunities and avoid threats to secure a better future. Therefore, ensuring the readiness for a proactive response to the necessary changes and their implementation by competitors is the most important advantage and a prerequisite for the organization's survival. Note that this response differs and varies among business organizations due to the discrepancy in the capabilities of management and its ability to provide a calculated and sound response to the present data, as well as sound readings of the reality of the organization and its capabilities. The desired future allows for developing effective strategies for conferring distinction and uniqueness on competitors (Foresight, systems thinking, strategic vision, partnership, motivating employees). In all of this, there is reason to say that strategic intelligence contributes to conceptual development flight is to think long-term, imagine a new

future, and work for a better tomorrow in light of the rapid environmental developments that make the future vision unclear.

The first axis: methodology of the study
First, the problem of the study

The developments in the business environment led to the fact that this environment fell under the scope of influences and, in a way that, contributed to revealing the nature of the capabilities possessed by organizations and in parallel with those developments. Therefore, many organizations tend to adopt strategic intelligence in its dimensions (foresight, systems thinking, strategic vision, partnership, motivating employees). It is considered as the main entrance to interact with developments in a spirit of full confidence, surrounded by openness, and its action is crowned by value additions and in a way that secures openness towards these developments and changes with confident steps. A researcher's vision has been crystallized to study this topic, based on the raising of a set of questions that express the nature of the problem under study, which were identified by:

1-   Do the administrative leaders have the embodied dimensions of strategic intelligence at the level of the researched organizations ?
2-   What are the dimensions of strategic intelligence in the researched organizations?
3-   Which dimensions are most likely to enhance strategic intelligence in the researched organization?

secondly -Study hypothesis

This study is embodied in the main hypothesis that "the lack of expressive dimensions of strategic intelligence represented by(foresight, systems thinking, strategic vision, partnership, motivation) among the administrative leaders in the researched organization" is based on the researcher's answers to the expressed questions.

third-The study population and its sample

the study community with administrative leaders at the Northern Technical University and its formations represent(Dean, Associate Dean, Head of Department, Director of the Department), They numbered (131) researchers, and a questionnaire form was distributed to all researchers, of which (111) valid forms were retrieved for analysis, meaning that the percentage of forms valid for analysis was (84.7%) of the total distributed questionnaires. The proportion of the sample representation from the community amounted to (84.7%).

2-Materials and methods

First. The concept of strategic intelligence and its importance

A careful reading of the preceding opinions of writers and researchers generated an impression on the researcher that strategic intelligence refers to the realization of thought in various facts and events to ensure a proper reading of the information and data produced by these events, with which it is possible to come up with a realistic vision that examines the present and secures proper reading for a better future. According to this vision, strategic intelligence can be defined as mental abilities. A special characteristic of leaders and organizations is to produce accurate information that is prepared and given at the right time to the right people and leaders within the systems to ensure that they make the correct decisions (Al-Habib and Al-Sultan, 2021).

(Maccoby and Scudder,2011) describe a set of distinctive intellectual qualities of

administrative leaders that are integrated with each other to be an ability of a special nature that is employed to deal with events and variables within the framework of the leader's philosophy and personality.

(Sadalia et al., 2021) Describe it as the ability of administrative leaders to deal with the available information about the business environment and acquire the necessary knowledge for decision-making, forecasting, and planning for the future, as well as the ability to adapt in real-time to changes in the environment.

Through the researchers' review of the concepts that have been exposed, strategic intelligence can be defined as a set of distinctive mental abilities that characterize the leaders of organizations in a way that allows them to secure the necessary vision of the competitive reality and the business environment to anticipate the future and prepare for it properly, as well as deal with the necessary changes to meet the challenges and invest in opportunities according to the data provided by the business environment.

The importance of strategic intelligence is evident, according to what several writers and researchers have stated(Wagner & Belle, 2007); (Al Kharassani&Hassan,2021); (Al Nuaimi, 2008); and as follows:-

1-   Increased sustainability and competitiveness of organizations during a period of increasing uncertainty about the external environment.
2-   It serves as a radar to survey the ocean. It helps to set priorities more impartially in the context of new products and investment areas and in making difficult decisions that require a multi-criteria assessment of the feasibility and consequences of certain actions.
3-   Preparing individuals and active work groups within the organization to collaborate and harness organizational capabilities to secure an advanced competitive position, achieve current goals, and chart the path to future goals
4-   Organizations make strategic decisions by providing decision-makers with correct and accurate information on which to base their decisions.

Second. Strategic intelligence goals
(Kharshi and Falaq, 2020, 159) reviewed several goals that strategic intelligence can achieve, as follows:-

(Liebowitz, 2010) Select a summary of the most important goals that strategic intelligence can achieve, which can be reviewed according to the following:

Harness the knowledge of working individuals and stimulate their creativity to achieve and maintain a competitive advantage.

Provide informed processes for making strategic decisions that embrace innovation processes.

Based on the preceding, the researchers find the main objective of activating strategic intelligence in today's organizations lies in enabling the administrative leaders in business organizations to secure a sound and conscious reading of environmental events and data, and then build perceptions and predictions about the future and what is happening. It has potential and surprises in a way that allows it to formulate its strategy, develop its plans, and make consistent decisions.

Fourthly. Dimensions of strategic intelligence

Determining the dimensions of strategic intelligence is a sound starting point with which to embody a realistic image of strategic intelligence and then work to prepare the requirements that must be available to secure each dimension and count them as interconnected and interacting parts that complete in their interaction this process of strategic intelligence, that the researcher that in this area finds that there is a difference in the opinions of writers and researchers in indicating the explanatory dimensions of strategic intelligence, which put us in front of a trade-off function between these dimensions and then choose what was unanimously agreed upon for the majority and in line with the directions of our current study, as it will be addressed according to the following:-

1-   (foresight)

Foresight is an individual's talent by one person without another. According to the social sciences, it can appear in the two forms of foresight (intuitive and inductive). It is one of the most attractive and practical fields of study, with its use to chart a preferred future and formulate appropriate strategies to achieve pre-set goals. (Izadi et al., 2022), And defines it (Leitner et al., 2018) as a systematic process of a participatory nature to gather intelligence information on the future, in the light of which a long-term vision is built to make decisions with Taking into account risk reduction, this is an indication that foresight exercises the task of enhancing analytical knowledge about future opportunities with attention to weaknesses and the attendant risks, as well as identifying some of the main effects of decision-making.

Based on what has been presented, the researchers believe that foresight is an intellectual dimension that administrative leaders adopt to prepare predictive decisions for the future based on their vision of what events are taking place and the business environment is full of with all its social, economic and political variables, based on which strategies can be prepared that will secure the desired future for the organization.

2. (systems thinking)

The basic idea behind systems thinking is to divide the whole into sub-elements and study the interactions of the elements from understanding and evaluating situations(Yener,2022)(Tripto et al., 2016). Described it as a school of thought that focuses on the interrelationship between parts and then assembles them into a unified vision to identify patterns and interrelationships between them and how to structure those relationships in more effective and efficient ways, which is an ideal approach to understanding complex phenomena and problems through a vision of reality As a system and taking into account the complex pattern of the interrelationships between its parts as well as their interaction with the environment. (Bartolucci and Gallo, 2013)

Based on the preceding, the researchers believe that systems thinking is based mainly on the capabilities of administrative leaders to evoke a holistic view of the organizational reality as well as the environmental reality, and then identify the various elements that will affect the reality of the organization and determine the necessary mechanisms through which to deal with this reality based on understanding the overall picture and appropriately arranging its parts.

2-   (strategic vision)

The organization dreams that it seeks to achieve in the future through its conscious and real awareness of the environment in which it operates, as well as the desired boundaries that the organization wishes to reach. Thus, it forms a vivid and convincing mental image that expresses the features of the desired future and reflects the organization's thought and philosophy, which cannot achieve long-term success without it (Nasir El-Din, 2019). It is a

common image of the future that individuals seek to create at all organizational levels, as well as a room for hopes and ambitions that the organization wants to achieve over the future, taking into account its participation with all working individuals to be a starting point for motivation then reach the desired goal(Isobe et al.,2020).

Based on the preceding, the researchers believe that the strategic vision is a compass that identifies the desired ends that the organization seeks to achieve and proceeds to implement them according to those tracks and in a manner that will make it a useful reference for reading and reviewing the track and then correcting the direction in the event of a feeling of departure from it .

3-   (Partnership)

Partnership expresses the ability of business organizations to establish strategic alliances with other organizations as one of the most important concepts that have been circulated in recent years. Accordingly, it has been dealt with as a dimension of the strategic intelligence of the administrative leader, since the leader's success in making alliances and choosing the parties with which to ally will be a feature and advantage that is unique to a leader (Abuktaish&Alkshali,2020), which is the ability to develop fruitful relationships in multiple internal and external directions, including with co-workers who have complementary capabilities, as well as customers and suppliers, which enhances the strategic capabilities of the organization. Partnership often moves customers and suppliers into true partners of the organization where they exchange visions and ideas, ultimately leading to the achievement of creativity and excellence (Maccoby, 2015).

From the researchers' point of view, partnership refers to the extent of the organization's ability to enter into successful strategic alliances and exploit its energies in a manner consistent with the data of events and actual or expected changes produced by the environment based on the value system under which the organization operates and which simulates its organizational culture.

4-   (motivating employees)

(Al-Azzawi, 2012) defines it as the process of influencing behavior in terms of direction, continuity, and a strong orientation towards the goal by empowering workers, appreciating achievement, and allowing them to do something useful and participate in decision-making. The action that induces the individual to adopt an appropriate view of the satisfactory completion of the assigned work by stimulating his passions and desires to induce him to do a particular action.

In line with the views presented, the incentive can be viewed according to a holistic concept. Being an external influence directs an individual's behavior to take a specific action. Motives are defined as external causes that direct human behavior, determine its directions, satisfy his desires, and vary in intensity or weakness, comprehensively or exclusively, whether or not depending on age, gender, education, mood, social status, and the type of civilization in which the individual grew up. (Al-Nuaimi, 2021).

3. Results

Describe the level of researchers' answers about strategic intelligence and its diagnosis

To understand the issue of description and diagnosis of strategic intelligence dimensions at the level of the researched organizations, the two researchers relied on the data from the statistical analysis of the program (spss) to find out the(arithmetic mean, standard

deviation, and response rate) for each of the factors representing the study variables, which will be reviewed according to the following:

1- *Foresight:* The results of table (1) indicate that the percentage of agreement (strongly agree, agree) on its indicators(1-X5) in total amounted to (89.7%), and the percentage of neutral was (9%), disagreement (disagree, strongly disagree) equals (1.3%), and the arithmetic supports this mean value of (4.27) with a standard deviation (0.662) and with variation coefficient was (15.55%), and the response intensity was (%85.33).

Table (1). *Description of the foresight dimension and its diagnosis*

Dimensions	Indications	answer scale										Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	variation coefficient%	response intensity %
		Strongly agree		agree		neutral		disagree		Strongly disagree					
		T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%				
Foresight	X1	53	47.7	55	49.5	2	1.8	1	0.9	0	0	4.44	0.582	13.11	88.82
	X2	30	27	66	59.5	13	11.7	2	1.8	0	0	4.12	0.67	16.27	82.34
	X3	42	37.8	54	48.6	13	11.7	2	1.8	0	0	4.23	0.722	17.09	84.5
	X4	40	36	55	49.5	14	13.6	2	1.8	0	0	4.2	0.723	17.22	83.96
	X5	47	42.3	56	50.5	8	7.2	0	0	0	0	4.35	0.612	14.07	87.02
	the average	42.4	38.2	57.2	51.5	10	9	1.4	1.3	0	0	4.27	0.662	15.55	85.33
	overall index		89.7			9				1.3					

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the results of the statistical analysis program spss

2- *Systems thinking:* This dimension was measured by indicators(X6-X10). The table(2) shows a (90.4%) agreement by researchers on its total indicators and (8.6%) on the neutrality, while the percentage of disagreement (disagree, strongly disagree) was (1%), as the average value of the arithmetic mean was (4.27) with a standard deviation of (0.655) and with variation coefficient (15.55%). In comparison, the severity of the response was (85.88%).

Table (2). *Description of systems thinking dimension and its diagnosis*

Dimensions	Indications	answer scale										Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	variation coefficient %	response intensity%
		Strongly agree		agree		neutral		disagree		Strongly disagree					
		T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%				
systems thinking	X6	45	40.5	61	55	5	4.5	0	0	0	0	4.36	0.568	13.03	87.20
	X7	48	43.2	46	41.4	15th	13.5	2	1.8	0	0	4.26	0.759	17.81	85.20
	X8	38	43.2	59	53.2	14	12.6	0	0	0	0	4.22	0.652	15.46	84.40
	X9	45	40.5	54	48.6	10	9	2	1.8	0	0	4.28	0.7.2	16.41	85.60
	X10	45	40.5	61	55	4	3.6	1	0.9	0	0	4.35	0.597	13.72	87.00
	the average		39.8		50.6		8.6		1		0	4.27	0.655	15.55	85.88
	overall index		90.4			8.6				1					

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the results of the statistical analysis program spss

3_Strategic vision: Table (3) shows the data on the agreement (strongly agree, agree) with a percentage of (82.72%) of the researchers on the indicators of this dimension, which are represented by (X11-X15), while the percentage is neutral (15.48%), the percentage of disagreement (disagree, strongly disagree) (1.8%), with an arithmetic mean (4.08) and a

standard deviation (0.698) and with variation coefficient (17.13%), which indicates homogeneity in the answers of the researchers and their lack of dispersion, and a response intensity (81.66%)

Table (3). *Description of strategic vision dimension and its diagnosis*

Dimensions	Indications	Strongly agree		agree		neutral		disagree		Strongly disagree		Arithmetic mean	deviation normative	variation coefficient %	response intensity %
		T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%				
strategic vision	X11	24	21.6	60	54.1	22	19.8	5	4.5	0	0	3.93	0.771	19.63	78.56
	X12	26	23.4	70	63.1	13	11.7	2	1.8	0	0	4.08	0.648	15.88	81.62
	X13	36	32.4	60	54.1	15	13.5	0	0	0	0	4.19	0.653	15.59	83.78
	X14	35	31.5	59	53.2	16	14.4	1	0.9	0	0	4.15	0.69	16.62	83.06
	X15	31	27.9	58	52.3	20	18	2	1.8	0	0	4.06	0.729	17.94	81.26
the average		27.36		55.36		15.48		1.8		0		4.08	0.698	17.13	81.66
overall index		82.72				15.48				1.8					

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the results of the statistical analysis program spss

4_Partnership: table results (4), which represent indicators(X16-X20), showed the researcher's tendency to agree (agree, strongly agree) by (91.3%), and by (neutral) (8.3%), while the percentage of disagreement was (0.4%), supported by the arithmetic mean value of (4.38) with a standard deviation (0.657), and with variation coefficient (14.99%) in response severity (87.66%). The two indicators (X18 and X16) achieved the highest percentage of contribution to the agreement, as the approval rate reached (92.8%) and (93.7%), respectively.

Table (4). *Description of partnership dimension and its diagnosis*

Dimensions	Indications	Strongly agree		agree		neutral		disagree		Strongly disagree		Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	variation coefficient %	response intensity %
		T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%				
Partnership	X16	62	55.9	41	36.9	7	6.3	1	0.9	0	0	4.47	0.698	15.62	89.36
	X17	45	40.5	53	47.7	13	11.7	0	0	0	0	4.29	0.665	15.51	85.76
	X18	60	54.1	44	39.6	6	5.4	1	0.9	0	0	4.47	0.644	14.41	89.36
	X19	48	43.2	53	47.7	10	9	0	0	0	0	4.34	0.639	14.72	86.84
	X20	49	44.1	52	46.8	10	9	0	0	0	0	4.35	0.641	14.73	87.02
the average		47.6		43.7		8.3		0.4		0		4.38	0.657	14.99	87.66
overall index		91.3				8.3				0.4					

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the results of the statistical analysis program spss

5_Motivating employees

table(5) data reveals agreement (89.9%) of the researchers on the indicators related to this dimension represented by (X21-X25) and neutral by (8.5%), while the percentage of disagreement reached (1.6%), and the percentage of agreement on these indicators supports the value of the arithmetic mean of (4.30), and a standard deviation of (0.691), variation coefficient (16.08%), and a response intensity (86.08%).

Table (5). *Description of motivating employees dimension and its diagnosis*

Dimensions	Indications	Strongly agree T	Strongly agree %	agree T	agree %	neutral T	neutral %	disagree T	disagree %	Strongly disagree T	Strongly disagree %	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	variation coefficient %	response intensity %
motivate employees	X21	42	37.8	51	46	15th	13.5	3	2.7	0	0	4.19	0.768	18.33	83.78
	X22	49	44.1	46	41.4	12	10.8	3	2.7	1	0.9	4.25	0.825	19.4	85.04
	X23	50	45	52	46.8	9	8.1	0	0	0	0	4.37	0.631	14.44	87.38
	X24	43	38.7	59	53.2	7	6.3	2	1.8	0	0	4.29	0.665	15.5	85.76
	X25	51	45.9	56	50.5	4	3.6	0	0	0	0	4.42	0.564	12.75	88.46
the average		42.3		47.6		8.5		1.4		0.2		4.30	0.691	16.08	86.08
overall index		89.9				8.5				1.6					

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the results of the statistical analysis program spss

To ensure that the researched organizations possess the dimensions expressing strategic intelligence, represented by (foresight, systems thinking, strategic vision, partnership, and motivating employees), it is clear from the table data (6) that an agreement (88.8%) of the researchers were on those dimensions as a whole, while the percentage of researchers who were neutral (neutral) was (1%). The percentage of disagreement was (1.2%), and these percentages are supported by an arithmetic mean (4.26) and a standard deviation (0.672).

We find that the partnership dimension from the table (6) achieved the highest agreement rate of (91.4%) and a neutral percentage (of 8.2%). In comparison, the percentage of disagreement was (0.4%) with an arithmetic mean (4.38) and a standard deviation (0.657). While systems thinking achieved second place, where the percentage of agreement was (90.4%), the percentage of neutral was (8.6%), and the percentage of disagreement was (1%). The dimension of motivating employees came in the third place with an agreement rate of (89.9%) and a neutral percentage of (8.5%), while the percentage of disagreement was (1.6%). Foresight achieved fourth place with an agreement (89.7%), and the percentage of neutral was (9%), and the percentage of disagreement was (1.3%) with an arithmetic mean (4.27) and standard deviation (0.662). The strategic vision was in last place with an agreement percentage (82.72%) and a neutral percentage (15.48%), and a disagreement percentage of (1.8%). These percentages support this dimension having the lowest arithmetic mean of (4.08) and the highest standard deviation of (0.698).

Table (6). *Arranging the dimensions of strategic intelligence in the researched organizations*

T	Dimensions	agreement%	neutral %	disagreement%	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation
1	Partnership	91.4	8.2	0.4	4.38	0.657
2	systems thinking	90.4	8.6	1	4.27	0.655
3	motivate employees	89.9	8.5	1.6	4.30	0.691
4	Foresight	89.7	9	1.3	4.27	0.662
5	strategic vision	82.72	15.48	1.8	4.08	0.698
	Total dimensions strategic intelligence	88.8	1	1.2	4.26	0.672

Source: Prepared by the researchers

6. Discussion

Depending on the initial results of the analysis describing the dimensions of strategic intelligence, and its diagnosis, which proved their availability among the leaders of the researched organization to varying degrees, it is possible to reject the main hypothesis of the study and accept the alternative hypothesis that states that the availability of dimensions expressing strategic intelligence, represented by (foresight, systems thinking, strategic vision, partnership, motivation) among the administrative leaders in the researched organization " based on the researchers' answers to the expressed paragraphs.

According to the table(1), all indicators of(X1) to (X5) contributed to the agreement on the dimension of foresight with this high percentage of (89.7%), and this indicates that the leader in our organization possesses the talent of foresight and the ability to use this talent to chart a better future for his organization and formulate appropriate strategies for it.

Through the ratios shown in the table(2), it is clear that the two indicators (X6 and X10) achieved the highest percentage of agreement (strongly agree, agree) that reached (95.5%) for both indicators, with mean scores (4.36) and (4.35), respectively, and two standard deviations (0.568) and (0.597) respectively. However, the rest of the indicators(X7,X8, X9) also achieved a high contribution by agreement. Still, with a lower percentage than the indicators (X10, X6), It is inferred from the results that the leaders of research organizations, which deal with the organization as a coherent and coherent system, and they look at problems from different angles as well as adopt holistic thinking to deal with future issues, a fact that reflects reality.v

Table (3) indicates that most of the administrative leaders in the researched organizations have a long-term vision towards the future and are working to clarify its implications as a basis for the work of their organization, as well as their adoption of working on developing the organization's strategies and achieving a state of alignment between the organization's internal and external objectives.

Table (4) means that the development of internal relations and participation between the organization's members achieves the spirit of cooperation, and provides a wide space for creativity, excellence, and enrichment—of knowledge to enhance the organization's competitive position.

Table (5) results indicate that material and moral incentives can be used as an entry point to achieve the required effect as well as identify the desires and aspirations of individuals and employ them as positive stimuli for work, or work with others to secure an effective system of incentives and provide a healthy environment to improve performance.

7. Conclusions

Based on the results of the current study, several conclusions have been reached, the most prominent of which are:

1- The researchers' answers achieved a high level of agreement regarding the availability of the dimensions of strategic intelligence among the administrative leaders in the researched organizations, which reflects the researcher's impression that these leaders possess strategic intelligence that enables them to exploit the available opportunities as well as reduce the risks of potential threats.

2- The partnership dimension achieved the highest response rate compared to the other

dimensions, which tell us that the researched organizations have excelled in developing internal relations and participation among the members of the organization to achieve the spirit of cooperation and provide a wider space for creativity, excellence, and knowledge enrichment in a way that enhances the organization's competitive position.

3- The systems thinking dimension ranked second in terms of researchers' responses compared to other dimensions and an excellent percentage of all the paragraphs representing it, which explains to us that the leaders of the researched organizations deal with the organization as a coherent and harmonious system and that they look at problems from different angles, as well as adopting holistic thinking to deal with future issues.

4- Motivating employees dimension ranked the third in terms of researchers' responses to the dimensions of strategic intelligence, and this explains to us that the leaders of the researched organizations adopt material and moral incentives and use them as an entry point to achieve the required effectiveness, by identifying the desires and aspirations of individuals and in a way that enables them to employ them as positive stimuli for work, taking into account adopting the participation of others as a method to secure an effective system of incentives and provide a healthy environment to improve performance.

5- Foresight dimension achieved a high response rate, which is a good indication of the organizations that relied on this dimension and its promise as a basis for the strategic intelligence of their administrative leaders. However, the arrangement of this dimension came fourth among the other dimensions (partnership, systems thinking, motivating employees), which indicates to the researcher the need to stop before This arrangement is because foresight is a starting point for other dimensions and a pillar through which administrative leaders determine the changes that can occur in the internal and external environment and review the resulting information to determine the current and future repercussions, in light of which a sound reading of the future is secured, which qualifies it to be at the fore in the rest of the dimensions.

6- The strategic vision dimension achieved a high response rate but was the lowest compared to the other dimensions. This arrangement indicates to the researcher the debate of the relationship between the strategic vision and foresight because the strategic vision is largely based on the readings, conclusions, and expectations that the reader senses when he anticipates the future, and in a way that enables it to build and develop strategies for the organization in a way that corresponds to the requirements of future change.

References

Abuktaish, Khaled & Alkshali, Shaker Jaralla. (2020). The Effect of Strategic Intelligence on Competitive Advantage in Jordanian Extractive and Mining Companies. European Journal of Scientific Research, Vol.157, No.3, pp.258–272.

Al Kharassani, FAR, & Hassan, AM (2021). Strategic intelligence and its impact on achieving the effectiveness of the national security/Field research. Review of International Geographical Education Online, Vol. 11,No.8,PP. 2255-2265

Al-Azzawi, R. Z. A., Al-Sharea, I. H. D., & Sabri, Z. F. (2021). Strategic intelligence and its role in tax success applied research in the general authority for taxation. Academy of Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 20, No.4,PP.1-11.

Al-Habib, Ruba Abdulaziz Habib and Mai Abdul Rahman Mansour Al-Sultan. (2021). "The Impact of the Dimensions of Strategic Intelligence on the Performance of Workers - A Field Study in the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development in the Qassim

Region", The Arab Journal for Scientific Publishing (AJSP), No. (35) .

Al-Nuaimi, Fatima Hamad Muhammad. (2021). The impact of motivation on achieving job satisfaction through organizational justice - a field study on the employees of the General Directorates of Education in the Sultanate of Oman, Journal of Economic, Administrative and Legal Sciences, Volume 5, Number 6, pp. 19-30.

Bartolucci, V., & Gallo, G. (2013). Terrorism, system thinking and critical discourse analysis. Systems Research and Behavioral Science, Vol. 32,No. (1), PP. 15-27.

Isobe, T., Kunie, K., Takemura, Y., Takehara, K., Ichikawa, N., & Ikeda, M. (2020). Frontline nurse managers' visions for their units: A qualitative study. Journal of Nursing Management, Vol.28,No.(5),PP. 1053–1061.

Izadi, M., Seiti, H., & Jafarian, M. (2022). Foresight: a new approach based on the Z-number cognitive map. European Journal of Futures Research, Vol.10,No.1,PP. 1-14.

Leitner, M., Bentz, J., Lourenco, T. C., Swart, R., Allenbach, K., & Rohat, G. T. (2018). Foresight for policy & decision-makers. Work package 4-institutional strengthening. Task 4.3-promote foresight.

Liebowitz, J. (2010). Strategic intelligence, social networking, and knowledge retention. Vol.43,No.2, PP.87-89.

Maccoby, M. (2015). Strategic intelligence: Conceptual tools for leading change. Oxford University Press, USA.

Maccoby, M., & Scudder, T. (2011). Strategic intelligence: A conceptual system of leadership for change. Performance Improvement. Vol. 50 No.3, pp. 32-40.

Nasir El-Din, Yacoub Adel (2019). Strategy: Integrated Practice Approach: Strategic Thinking, Strategic Planning, Strategic Management, Middle East University Publications, Amman-Jordan, first edition.

Sadalia, I., Irawati, N., Syahfitri, I., & Erisma, N. (2021). The Impact of Strategic Intelligence on Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Organizational Development. In 3rd International Conference on Business and Management of Technology. Atlantis Press, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research, Vol. 202, pp. 252-256.

Tripto, J., Ben-Zvi Assaraf, O., Snapir, Z., & Amit, M. (2016). The 'What is a system'reflection interview as a knowledge integration activity for high school students' understanding of complex systems in human biology. International Journal of Science Education, Vol. 38,No4,PP 564-595.

Wagner, L., & Belle, J, V. (2007). "Web Mining for Strategic Intelligence: South African Experiences and a Practical Methodology". Department of Information Systems ,University of Cape Town, PP. 1-15. http://aisel.aisnet.org/icdss2007

Yener, H. (2022). A study on effects of system thinking and decision-making styles over entrepreneurship skills. Turkish Journal of Engineering, Vol. 6,No.1,PP. 26-33.