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ABSTRACT

The general objective of this study was to analyze the strategy execution processes among internet service providers in Kenya. The study was guided by the following specific objectives: to determine the influence of the workforce on strategy execution at Access Kenya, to examine the influence of organization’s operations on strategy execution at Access Kenya and to assess the influence of the strategic process at Access Kenya on strategy execution.

The target population constituted Access Kenya employees in Nairobi, from which a sample size of 100 respondents were identified through stratified sampling. Primary data was collected from the respondents using a questionnaire. The data collected before it is cleaned, coded and edited for completeness and accuracy before being analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) to obtain descriptive statistics. Data presentation was in the form of frequency tables, mean, charts, and graphs.

The study revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between a competent workforce and influences on strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta of 0.675 with the t-value at 3.001 which was significant. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by a competent workforce. It was also revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between workforce communication and strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 0.751 of with the t-value at 5.93 which was significant. Also it was revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between an empowered workforce influence strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 0.624 of with the t-value at 5.103 which was significant.

The study further revealed that Access Kenya operations dictates the strategy execution process. Additionally the administrative system facilitates strategy execution. In the same regard leadership in Access Kenya has ensured that leaders show equal attention to all functional-level concerns. There is also communication flow in Access Kenya between top management and Access Kenya has maintained the flexibility to adapt goals based on environmental changes. Finally the study established that service quality in Access Kenya has influenced the strategy execution process, as well performance measurement has been streamlined to keep the execution process intact.
Finally the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between strategic process and strategy execution. R squared value of 0.471 shows that only 47.1% of strategy execution is explained by strategic process. The remaining 53.9 % is explained by other factors put in place by the Access Kenya in order to enhance their strategy execution.

The study recommends to the management of Access Kenya to always consider employees as being one of the most important contributors to the strategic process and in this regard therefore there is need to always involve such employees in the entire strategic process. Additionally Access Kenya needs committed employees in order for the organization be able to successfully execute their set strategies. This is because committed employees at Access Kenya are more likely to give your customers better service, since they will always be willing to take the time to solve difficult problems, their work is of higher quality, and they are more likely to stay with Access Kenya.

The study also recommends that Access Kenya needs to constantly make adjustments to its organizational structure and align it with the changes in the competitive environment of Internet Service Providers. This is because in case of a delay in this realignment Access Kenya may end up exhibiting poor results which in the end can place it at a serious competitive disadvantage. Additionally the study recommends that act of adjusting organizational structure for Access Kenya with respect to a perfect strategy will do a great deal in helping to ensure successful strategy implementation in the organization.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The discipline of getting things done is the key thing that differentiates firms that succeed from those that just muddle through or fail (Bossidy and Charan, 2009). In the modern day business environment strategies that once worked well no longer work. It means therefore that organization managers need to conceive the path forward despite the turbulence in the business environments that has been necessitated by the dynamic economies across the world. In most organizations, strategic managers have a lot of idea this is seen in the way they are able to come up with a number of potential strategies, some of them would make their organizations competitive and profitable. Majority of ideas are very great in paper, but before they are executed they are not likely to make any type of substantive difference when it comes to profitability.

Strategy execution is considered to be that which drives the organization along a conceived path so as to allow organizations to seize and fully exploit the opportunities manifesting in the market place. Chetty (2010) argues that the ability to execute strategy is considered to be more than even the quality of the strategy itself. It means therefore that well formulated strategies, can only put the organization on a competitive map but only solid execution can keep it there. In their survey it was revealed that three out of five of companies rated weak strategy execution in their specific organizations. According to Martin (2010) one can see the real value of the strategy through its execution. In the same vain he argues the ability for an organization to execute a strategy is more essential than even the strategy itself. This is simply because if a strategy, however good if the strategy is not well executed then its quality is meaningless to the organization.

According to Chetty (2010) there are six factors that need to be considered for a firm to successfully execute its strategy. These include: obtaining top executive commitment, generating engagement at all levels, communicating a clear tangible strategy, cascading accountabilities, selecting the best people to drive key initiatives, and the ability to monitor and tract progress. This therefore means that all six dimensions need to be managed comprehensibly to be able to align them with the firm’s strategic choices. Qi
(2005) further proposes seven factors that are considered to be key for successful strategy execution. These include: adequate feedback systems, sufficient resources, good leadership and direction skills, motivation for all involved staff, communication and coordination, an appropriate company structure, an appropriate company culture.

According to Pateman (2008) converting a strategy into results usually requires the coordination of people, operations as well as the strategy. But as the economic, political and business environments change, the ways in which they are carried out also changes. Leadership, and specifically strategic leadership, is considered to be one of the key elements for effective strategy execution. It means therefore that lack of leadership, by the top management of the organization can be a major constraint to effective strategy execution. This is because it is the sole mandate of the executive to see how well to manage these three aspects so as to successfully execute the strategies. Successful managers understand the essence of a sound business strategy and therefore they have to invest significant time, as well as money notwithstanding the effort in the development of strategies. This however is not a guarantee to improved performance in such organizations. If strategies are not implemented properly, then it follows that there will be implications that come as a result of this. In regards to financial implications for instance the organizations are likely to lose on profits as well as on competitive advantage. In a research by the corporate strategy board, it was found that almost 37 percent of the potential value of a strategy is lost during execution (Management Today, 2009).

Globally there are a number of studies that have revealed how most companies have strategies, although far fewer achieve them. One such good example is that study by Bigler (2011) which revealed that 90 percent of formulated strategies of firms in the USA and Europe are not implemented on time and do not achieve the intended results. Additionally that although strategy formulation is glamorous, unfortunately its implementation often gets a short drift. Similarly a study by Charan and Colvin, suggested that 70 percent of 10 chief executive officers who fail do so not because of bad strategy, but because of bad execution. According to this study 70 percent of CEOs are dismissed because of the failure to execute strategies.
Another study was conducted by Kaplan and Norton (2008) who sought to examine problems in organizations when it comes to strategy execution in the United States. Their findings revealed that less than 10 percent of employees understood their company’s strategy. Other research studies have also revealed that less than 5 percent of the employees typically understand their organization’s strategy.

Downes (2011) also conducted a study that revealed that there are two categories of strategy execution obstacles, which face most companies. He therefore stated that internal company problems as well as external problems which are generated by outside forces in the industry, in which the particular company lies. Both internal and external issues are indeed affected by the extent to which companies are as far as the activities regarding the successful launch of strategic initiatives are concerned.

Daft (2010) on his part argued that indeed the biggest challenge that faces strategy execution today is the changing world that wants a paradigm of leadership to evolve to a new mindset that relies on human skills, integrity and teamwork. Quite apart from the benefit and moral value of a benevolent approach to treating colleagues as human beings and respecting human dignity in all its forms, research and observations show that well motivated employees are more productive and creative. While management and leadership are similar, there are some significant differences. Therefore a fast changing and increasingly complex business environment requires visionary leadership, and leaders who are willing to learn, experiment and influence organizational change.

A study conducted by Nickols (2010) revealed that strategy is execution there are four cases of strategy execution: flawed strategy and flawed execution, sound strategy and flawed execution, flawed strategy and sound execution, and sound strategy and sound execution. In the same line of thought he further avows that any organization has a pretty good chance for success, only when the strategy and the execution are sound barring aside environmental and competitive influences. He further contends that executing the wrong strategy is one of the major problems leading to unsuccessful execution of strategies.

In the African context a study by Makerere University (2010) was able to show that for ICT to be used as a vehicle and a winning strategy in assuring successful integration of
ICT in enterprises, the challenge that faces the institution is the execution of the strategy. Similarly a study on the perceived importance of strategy implementation in South African organizations, established that strategy implementation is more important than strategy formulation in South African organizations and that the ability to implement a strategy in an organization is more important than the ability to formulate a strategy in an organization. Also Africa is very limited.

In Kenya a study by Awino (2011), on selected strategy variables influencing performance in large manufacturing firms revealed that strategy competency model provides an environment where core competencies, strategy and strategy implementation process, core capabilities can be linked effectively within the value chain to enhance corporate performance. The joint effect of core competencies, core capabilities, strategy and implementation has influenced firms’ performance by creating synergy in most of the large manufacturing organizations surveyed in the private sector in Kenya.

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite the significance of strategy execution, it has not attracted a wide research attention. Raps (2010) articulates the lack of academic consideration in the area of strategy execution, this is emphasized by Otley (2013) who argues that majority of the literature is dominated by a focus on long term planning and the strategic content, rather than the actual execution of strategies. Similarly, Powers (2008) acknowledged that managers are trained to formulate good strategies however they are not trained to execute them. This has therefore led to a situation where organizations have the necessary strategy formulating capabilities but lack the implementation capability.

There have been studies nevertheless on strategy execution, although there have been no studies comparing similarities and differences of strategy execution among internet service providers in Kenya. In the same regard few studies have focused on strategy implementation and relationships among different strategy levels (Okumus, 1988; Otley, 2003; Slater and Olson, 2001). These studies have sought to examine the strategy implementation processes however no specific research has sought to examine the link between, the three aspects of strategy execution, which are the operations, people and the strategy itself. This study therefore seeks to narrow the gaps mentioned. Generally it will address the gap by examining how the link between, the strategy and the people as well as the strategic process work together to enhance successful strategy execution. The purpose
of this study is therefore to analyze the strategy execution processes among internet service providers in Kenya.

1.3 General Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study was to analyze the strategy execution processes among internet service providers in Kenya.

1.4 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives were:

1.4.1 To determine the influence of the workforce on strategy execution at Access Kenya
1.4.2 To examine the influence of organization’s operations on strategy execution Access Kenya
1.4.3 To assess the influence of the strategic process on strategy execution Access Kenya

1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 Access Kenya

The study will also make a contribution towards the attitude of Access Kenya managers in their involvement in the process of strategy execution. Stakeholders as well will benefit from the study in that they will become aware of the factors which influence strategy execution and will utilize the knowledge to set standards.

1.5.2 Researchers and Academicians

The findings and recommendations of this study are important as they will contribute to theory in strategy execution. Scholars interested in studies in strategy execution can also use the findings of this study.

1.5.3 Policy Makers

The findings of this study will also be useful to policy-makers, and internet service providers especially those operating in Nairobi. One of the policy-makers includes the Kenya Government. The government can utilize this study to identify the status of internet service providers in Kenya. The government can then make and implement
policies towards creating an environment that will aid to organizations be successful in strategy execution.

1.5.4 Other Governments

Other governments would want to understand the reasons behind the robust growth and good financial results in the country. As the East African integration pushes onwards it would be useful for other member states to know the challenges faced in strategy execution in Kenya so that they can prepare their industry to well carry out businesses in Kenya.

1.6 Scope of the Study

Strategy execution is not limited to internet service providers. However, the study was restrictive in scope covering only Access Kenya. The study was done in organizations with established management structures. The respondents for the study were strategic managers or senior managers. The scope of this study was also limited to the execution of an existing strategy. This means that this study does not go into more detail on the formation of the strategy to be executed. Strategy execution in turn can be studied from different viewpoints. The two basic viewpoints are: seeing strategy implementation as a straightforward operationalization of a previously formulated strategy and focusing on the interpersonal and behavioral aspects related to strategy execution. This study acknowledged and integrated elements from both of the two views. The study was limited to the organization of the study which is Access Kenya and was carried out between January 2015 and April 2015.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Leadership

This includes the actions that create the basic motivation for the actors to act according to the strategy. This includes the “soft” actions necessary so the actor knows what he is supposed to do, is able, and is motivated to do it (Hungler and Wheelen, 2007).

1.7.2 Organization Structure

This consists of lines of authority, reporting and coordination, as well as real and perceived career paths and decision-making authority (Hrebiniax, 2005).
1.7.3 **Strategic Management**

It is the art and science of formulating, implementing and evaluating cross-functional decisions that enable an organization to achieve its objectives (David, 2009).

1.7.4 **Strategy Execution**

It is the act of implementing the strategic change in the organization that is necessary to implement the strategic intentions (Lambert, 2009).

1.8 **Chapter Summary**

This chapter provides a background of the problem followed by the statement of the problem, research objectives are significance of the study and the definition of terms. Chapter two will provide literature review organized in terms of the research objectives. In chapter three, research design, methodology, as well as the data type and the data collection instruments are explained. Chapter four will provide the study findings in terms of descriptive and logic regression results based on the study objectives. Chapter five will provide the summary as well as conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, literature is reviewed based on research objectives. To start with, reviewed relevant literature relating to the influence of people on strategy execution; followed by the influence of operations on strategy execution; and finally the influence of the strategy itself on strategy execution.

2.2 The influence of Workforce on Strategy Execution

People are considered to be one of the most important components to an organization when it comes to the process of strategy execution. In simple terms, people or rather employees in an organization play an essential role in executing the strategy. As such any organization which is serious about executing its strategy has to make sure that the people element of their execution system is given proper attention. Flood et al (2010) argues that people are at the very core of the organization success this especially so in labour intensive organizations. As such this kind of organizations can be deemed un-existent without people. Further, Raps (2005) further articulates that human resources are indeed very essential and thus valuable intangible asset to an organization.

The problem however is that many organizations tend to ignore the people factor especially when conducting strategy implementation. In fact it has been established that managers in the lower cadre of the organization are considered as the last people to even know about the company strategy. This therefore is the reason why Michlitsch (2010) argues that there is the absence of the human factor as one of the major reasons why strategy execution efforts fail. This he avows as resulting from the lack of understanding from managers that employees play a major role in strategy success. In this regard therefore the absence of people on board for any strategic initiative will definitely result into strategy failure.

In most organizations the people involved in strategy execution are mainly the top management, middle management, lower management. This therefore sidelines the other lower cadre employees in the organization. It means that for a strategy to be effectively
executed, at least the people involved should be of very high quality. At this juncture the quality of the executors is accredited to skills, attitudes, capabilities, experiences and other characteristics of people required by a specific task or position. According to Viseras, Baines, and Sweeney (2005) there are about 36 key success factors when it comes to strategy execution. These however can be categorized into three: people, organization and systems in the manufacturing environment. Their intriguing findings show clearly that success of strategy execution largely depends on the human or people side of the organization and less on organization and systems related factors. The current study acknowledges the relevance of these three categories and therefore incorporates them as variables in the study.

McKnight (2005) has argued that the human resources department is normally absent when it comes to strategy formulation and implementation this is because most organizations consider the human resource function as being a non-business and therefore non-important department. He further put forward an argument that the human resource function need to be designed in such a way that makes it not only part of the whole organization anatomy but also as a strategic business partner. This will enable it to take part in both strategy formulation and implementation (McKnight, 2005). This assertion has also been echoed by Flood et al. (2000) who has confirmed this need and who further suggests that employs should not only be engaged in formulating the strategy but should also be involved in executing it.

2.2.1 Employee competency

Employee competency is another essential component of the human resource function. According to Bossidy and Charan, (2012) in most organizations, managers simply overlook the employee competence factor given that they are too busy thinking so much about the other underpinning factors for instance how to increase earnings and thus company growth, dealing with environment dynamics among other issues. This therefore means that little attention is given to employee competency.

Competency can be defined as the standard or quality of the outcome of the person’s performance. This is according to Rutherford (2010) where he asserts standard as being the minimum acceptable level of performance. According to Bossidy and Charan, (2012)
competency is simply more than just knowledge and skills. This is because it involves the ability to meet complex demands, by drawing on and mobilizing psychosocial resources, including skills and attitudes, in a particular context. (OECD, 2004). If an organization has to be successful, it has to ensure that it has the right people for the job. This is mainly a result of their judgments, experiences, as well as, since these aspects go a long way in driving the organization’s performance (Bossidy and Charan, 2012). Without competencies, either on the top or in the bottom of the organizational structure, even the best strategy with the best environmental factors will have limited chances of success.

According to Michlitsch (2010) if an organization lack the type of employees with the requisite skills and competency then they are likely not to properly execute a company strategy, they have no room for success but will rather fail to do so. In this regard therefore maintaining competencies within organization do have a significant role in successful strategy execution. As such, organizations need to bring on board through hiring and maintaining only qualified and competent people. Organizations also need to develop competencies for current employees through development programs such as training and development so as to endeavor to bring success to the organization. The lack of competencies is not solely attributable to lower level managers or employees. This is because even chief executive officers may not be appropriate to execute a new strategy (Wheelen and Hunger, 2010). According to the authors, the career cycle of such executives has an inverted or negative relationship between their tenure and organizational financial performance. The current studies agree with the findings of these studies; however these studies seem not to identify the specific skills and capabilities that are required to execute strategy. Further a lot of focus is only on higher management skills such as leadership and the specific leadership skills that are necessary to align people and culture to execute strategy.

Hrebiniak (2005) has stated categorically that organizations with developed capabilities or competencies which are consistent with a chosen strategy would perform as compared to those organizations that are yet to achieve this fit between strategy and capabilities. Further Harrington (2006) finds that a higher level in total organizational involvement during strategy execution had positive effects on the level of implementation success, firm profits and overall firm success. Wheelen and Hunger (2005) have also confirmed this by stating that the required competencies of executives or chief executive officers
depend on the desired strategic direction of the firm and that competencies must match the chosen strategy. There might be a need for an aggressive type of CEO if the firm is going for a concentration strategy as an example (Bossidy and Charan 2002).

### 2.2.2 Strategy Communication

Another essential element of people that has an impact to strategy execution is their awareness of the strategy. It is indeed very hard to execute strategy when the strategy itself is not well understood. This means that communicating the strategy to employees is likely to affect strategy execution (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000). Beer and Eisenstat further argued that if a strategy is well-conceived and communicated to the organization it will be well executed. The knowledge of the strategy as well as the understanding of it are two different concepts. As such, for a strategy to be successfully executed these two concepts have to be integrated.

Kaplan and Norton (2008) carried out a study on strategy execution problems in organizations in the United States and was able to establish that in the great majority of surveyed companies; not more than 10 percent of employees understood their company’s strategy. Other research studies have also revealed that less than 5 percent of the employees typically understand their organization’s strategy. Similarly, Hrebiniak (2005) has stated that in many organizations he studied, employees most often were not aware of their company’s strategy. It was clear from his study of how all employees cannot understand the strategy and their roles in it, successful strategy execution is highly unlikely (Kaplan and Norton, 2008).

Raps (2005) further put forward an argument which established that indeed one of the reasons why strategy execution fails to succeed is because of challenging and complex problems. This is also as a result of the vagueness of the assignment of responsibilities. Michlitsch (2010) further made an argument that the need for people to know clearly what they are supposed to do if the company wants to succeed. In addition, employees have to be given clear guidance to enable them successfully executing the strategy. Wheelen and Hunger (2005) on his side believes that when a organization lacks direction, then it follows that people will do their work according to their personal view of what
tasks should be done, how, and in what order. This therefore compromises the priorities of the organization.

### 2.2.3 Employee Commitment

Stringer (2006) is of the opinion that employee commitment is simply not just a personality trait but it also means a quality which can be strategically influenced. As such most employees are likely not to be involved in their daily jobs this is because they care about it and it is for this reason that they are likely to have a desire to accomplish their assigned tasks in the perfect way. Organizations therefore require committed employees in order for them to be able to successfully execute their set strategies. Stringer (2006), revealed that if employees are very much committed to the organization chances are that they will to give your customers better service, they are willing to take the time to solve difficult problems, their work is of higher quality, and they are more likely to stay with the organization.

Ryan and Ryan (2007), conducted a study that showed how employees have talents and abilities are only being utilized to a 48% degree. In this regard therefore leaders have the responsibility of unleashing the remaining 52% by achieving buy-in to employees. Leaders need to also allow their employees to have the knowhow on what they stand to benefit from embracing the vision (Dimatteo, 2006). Many leaders also had an assumption that their employees are onboard with company's objectives. However, Ryan and Ryan (2007) argued that this cannot be assumed, and by only communicating the strategy to them, employees cannot be assumed to support the strategy and utilize their best capabilities to execute them.

This is the reason why Sterling (2003) attributes the failure of some strategies to lack of sufficient buy-in among those who execute them. He established a strong relationship between buy-in and employees' support of the organization's strategic plan. These findings are also outlined by Hrebiniak (2005) who established inability to generate buy-in as an obstacle to strategy execution. The difference between successful and unsuccessful strategy execution is the way management motivates and educates its people to act on a business strategy. This therefore highlights the strong relationship between buy-in and motivation.
2.2.4 Employee Empowerment

Hellriegel and Slocum, (2004) have argued that employee empowerment is simply but giving employees the authority, skills, as well as the self-control to enable them to effectively carry out their tasks. Further, Pearce and Robinson (2007) defined empowerment as being that act of allowing an individual or team the right and flexibility to make informed decisions while at the same time initiating action. According to Brymer (1991) empowerment is considered to be that process of decentralizing decision making in an organization, in a manner that allows managers to give more autonomy to their lower level and front line employees. In the same regard, Lincoln, Travers, Ackers & Wilkinson (2002) described empowerment as being the use of certain techniques in order to be able to bring transformation to those people without power so as to bring them into equitable position. In this regard, therefore it is very clear that the concept of empowerment is the practice of giving employees the authority to be able to make decisions that will go a long way in enhancing the processes as perceived by the employee without referring to superiors. This also means that employees who are competent are likely to be aware of the strategy and their role in it thus such employees cannot participate in its execution without being empowered to do so.

A study by Mahoney and McMillan (1994) made a revelation of how workers who are directly involved in the process of strategy execution know best how to improve it. Since Kenyan organizations have high power distance, as identified by Hofstede (2003), it is evident that Kenyan organizations in general do not apply empowerment principles. And since existing literature has shown a link between empowerment and successful strategy execution, it can be proposed that employee empowerment is one of the factors impacting successful strategy execution in Kenyan organizations. As such the lack of employee empowerment in Kenyan organizations is seen as a major barrier to strategy execution.

2.2.5 Influence of management on Strategy Execution

Top managers can demonstrate their support directly by conveying to middle managers that an initiative is an organizational priority, allocating implementation policies and practices such as human resources and funding to facilitate innovation implementation, and convincing middle managers that innovation implementation is possible using available implementation policies and practices. Middle managers may maximize the influence of top managers' support on their commitment by communicating with top
managers about what kind of support would be most effective in increasing their commitment to innovation implementation (Raps, 2010).

The middle level managers are in a position to know the availability and depth of capabilities in an organisation and thus can help in synchronizing strategic plans with reality. Their interaction with the customers gives them an idea of the market requirements enabling them to adapt capabilities to service these needs. This is enabled by their ability to translate customer needs to requirement of product characteristics, in the process creating knowledge. By their very position as a linking pin between top management and operational level, they act to supply feedback to the top management which facilitates adjustments in the strategic plans. Capability based competition forces managerial knowledge to be placed at the centre of strategic planning which brings to fore the role of middle level managers by virtue of their centrality in the organisational information network and their ability to promote organisational learning. The effective execution and integration of all these roles is what results in superior firm performance (Floyd and Woolridge 2012).

Management can also influence strategy execution through resource mobilization. Resources that resist imitations, such as culture and reputation, are intangibles, and the result of complex interactions. They become crucial to explaining present competitive advantage. Regardless of the limitations in measuring resources, some empirical studies have statistically tested the original postulates of RBV, confirming the importance of resource sharing among business, and especially the association of intangible resources with performance (Herrmann, 2010)

2.3 The influence of Operations on Strategy Execution

Kotler (2010) defines the term operations as that process of making physical products. In the context of a service industry such as a hotel the operations team includes the waiters and waitresses, doormen, somelier among others while marketing promising various service levels, Kotler explains the importance of these two departments working well together. Ray et al. (2006) argues that when looking at the link between strategy implementation and operations, the adoption of effectiveness of business processes as a
dependent variable may be more appropriate than adopting overall firm performance as a dependent variable as such the results are consistent with resource-based. This can well be achieved based solely on the strategic business processes. This link therefore according to Stalk, Evans, Schulman (2012) is therefore the building blocks of a corporate strategy which is not seen as products and markets but business processes.

2.3.1 Operationalizing the Organizational Structure
An organization structure is an important component of the process of strategy execution (Heide et.al, 2012). This is because studies have shown how an effective organizational structure influences the strategy execution process while at the same time it can be an implementation barrier. According to Drazin and Howard (2009) effective strategy execution will result from a proper strategy-structure alignment (Noble, 2009). They therefore point out that indeed organizations are likely to make adjustments to their organizational structure by aligning them with the changes in the competitive environment. It follows therefore that firms that take long in making this realignment are likely to end up having poor results which can place them at a serious competitive disadvantage. Schaap (2010) further made a suggestion that the act of adjusting organizational structure with respect to a perfect strategy can greatly help to ensure successful strategy implementation.

2.3.2 Administrative Systems
According to Govindarajan (2009) there are few studies that have focused on the design of differentiated administrative systems which are key in facilitating the execution of a variety of business strategies which are pursued by diversified corporations. He argues that there exist three key administrative mechanisms through which firms are likely to make use of in order to cope with uncertainty among them we have: design of organizational structure, design of control systems and selection of managers. On the basis of these distinctions, various constellations were put up. Bivariate results did not provide support for the interaction between the business strategy, decentralization, and effectiveness. When budget evaluative style, decentralization, and locus of control were aligned appropriately to meet the requirements of the business strategy, superior performance occurred. This was therefore a clear indication of how the two aspects influence each other. Govindarajan and Fisher (1990) also have a belief that leadership
characteristics, structural variables, as well as control systems contribute differentially to the effectiveness of a strategy.

2.3.3 Leadership

Kyarimpaa (2009) advises that ineffective leadership is a challenge to the successful strategy execution. This is especially in developing nations where majority of the organizations lack effective leadership (Harrington, 2006). Effectively, in such organizations emphasis is placed on shorter-term frames, strong focus on command, control and predictability, with little emphasis being placed on employee empowerment and motivation. Mintzberg (2010), recognizes that management and leadership are two different things which are both required for better strategy execution. He emphasizes that people are tired of managers who are not leaders and vice versa. Contemporary management thinking suggests that managers do things right, while leaders do the right things. He contended that managers combine human and other resources to achieve goals, while leaders solve problems creatively.

A strong sense of purpose is normally the discretion of true leadership as such it plays an important role in harnessing the creative energies of all the people in the business Schultz et al. (2013). An exceptional leadership is a key ingredient to making strategic change effective and lasting (Daft, 2005). According to Daft one of the enormous challenge facing leaders today is the changing business environment which demands a paradigm of leadership to evolve to a new mindset that relies on human skills, integrity and teamwork. Schultz, et al. (2013) further state that the advantage and moral value of a benevolent approach to treating other employees especially the lower echelons as human beings and respecting human dignity in all its forms, research and observations show that well motivated employees are more productive and creative.

Megglinson, et al. (2006), state that there exists a difference between management and leadership According to them leading is an essential part of managing, but not the whole of it. As such it is the innate ability of one person to influence others to strive to attain goals or objectives. Management, while requiring the use of leadership, also includes the other functions of planning, organizing, staffing and controlling (Megglinson, Byrd and Megginson, 2006). Instead of just sitting back or rather simply reacting to the changes in the business environment, it is essential for strategic leaders to examine past events and take action so as to anticipate what these might mean for the future.
Harrison (2013) indicates that senior executive management have a significant impact on the strategies and performance of their organizations. This is also the case for excellent leadership which also has an enormous positive influence. The influence of leadership can take both positive and negative dimensions. It follows therefore that poor leadership can have a powerful negative influence and create dissonance amongst employees (Worley and Doolen, 2006).

According to White (2004) the responsibility of formulating and implementing the strategy lies largely on leaders of an organization. Leaders are the ones who decide what must be done, and then actually figure out how it is going to be done. (Meyer, Botha 2010) reiterates the aspect of leaders having a skill set that allows them to analyze the opportunities and the threats that may exist, both currently and going forward, and thereafter having the ability to analyze the resources and abilities that an organization possesses to deal with those opportunities and threats (Harrison and St John, 2004).

2.3.4 Internal Management Performance

According to Armstrong (2006) performance contracts have been used in many organizations in order to increase of operational autonomy have also induced some developments in the strategy execution of organizations. Several organizations are introducing types of internal devolution of management capacities or internal contracting. For instance, Armstrong (2010) made it clear that companies have created business units which are responsible for the development of commercial activities. These according to Armstrong has enabled business units manage their products in a comprehensive way and are responsible for the different functions of marketing, public relations, strategic planning, financial management, human resources and logistics. There are developments towards devolution of operational autonomy to local regional offices (Chetty, 2010). Key elements in this process are differentiation, subsidiary and communication networks. The current study seeks to analyse how the internal organization management, can facilitate successful strategy execution.

2.3.5 Financial Management Performance

Lack of proper financial management is considered as a key challenge to strategy implementation. The use of performance-based targets has induced an increased cost consciousness. Organizations have to develop cost-accounting systems and provide yearly financial statements (Slater & Olson, 2011). The information provided improves the
company’s capacity to control the organizations’ financial practices. With performance management the outlook on better budget estimates, based on an increased knowledge of real costs, is realistic. In some cases, transfers are corrected on the basis of achieved performance results such that a failure to meet performance targets results in a decrease of financial transfer to company. On the other hand, there is a positive financial return to the company in case performance results exceed set targets (Nickols, 2010). These positive corrections are dependent, however, on developments of the overall budgetary position of the company are therefore limited.

These remarks attenuate the real impact of the budget as an incentive. There is also a need to enhance the performance orientation of the different financial management instruments (budgets, accounts and audits) and the coherency and consistency of these instruments. More coherence and consistency would mean that budget; accounts and audits are based on the same output and cost categories. Most organizations with contracts develop accrual and cost accounting but fail to use the resulting cost information in their budget estimates. Compliance audits remain more important than performance audits (Chimhanzi, 2010).

2.4 The influence of the Choice of strategy on Strategy Execution

Strategy lies at the heart of general management (Porter, 1996) and characterizes the company by its vision (Collins and Porras, 1996). According to Porter (2006), today’s business suffer incompleteness in terms of unique purpose of a strategy. Rather, Porter (2006) prefers to refer to strategy as an action plan and guideline. In the same regard, Mintzberg (1987) confers with the perspectives of strategy and further defines strategy as a plan as “some sort of consciously intended course of action, a guideline to deal with a situation” (p.11). The only difference however is that, he acknowledges that the meaning of strategy comes into being immediately the strategy is in the collective mind of a company. Strategy is indeed a prerequisite of a shared perspective which helps the company to function most effectively. As such, having a formal strategy formulation is suggested to be the main determinant for organizational consistency (Dumpelmann, 2009; Spreitzer, 1995).

Bossidy and Charan (2009) are of the idea that a clear and formal strategy formulation can without doubt take away such shortcomings to facilitate a successful execution of a business’ strategy. In the same manner, a clear and formal strategy gives room for the execution of tools which strengthen the position of employees within the organization and
also makes the employees part of the execution process. It means therefore that it is imperative for employees to act in accordance with the strategy and thus pick up signals from the market or their work domain and add to the strategy in favor of the corporate organization (Martin, 2010).

Qi (2005), argues that it is important for organizations to have excellent strategies as essential as the strategy execution itself. This is because companies have long known that in order they ought to develop a good strategy first before developing an appropriate realignment of structure, systems operations, leadership and people. According to Carroll (2000), it has been established that most organizations benefit a lot from having a formal strategy in three ways. First of all, is the better use of time and effort, secondly is elimination of the unnecessary errors to be made and identifies problems that may arise beforehand, lastly, is the aspect of improved communication between the avoidance employee and the person creating the organizational goals.

Carroll (2000) brings forward the study of Gillen et al. (1984), in which is concluded that “a quality system incorporating difficult, relevant, and participative goals, along with frequent feedback, is most likely to be related to higher performance”. Similarly, Bamberger (1994) suggests that the formal strategy formulation, or strategic plan, can reinforce the company values with attempts to create an identical vision amongst the employees (Dumpelmann, 2009). On the other hand however, a strategic plan needs not be too strict in terms of what actions need to be taken and how to undertake these actions. This is because such plans restrict innovativeness in organizations. Further Boonsta and De Caluwé (2006) believe that strategies need to bring along change that is necessary for a company to survive.

2.4.1 Strategy Flexibility

Strategy flexibility is essential for organizations as it helps such organizations to cope with uncertainty. This is according to Mintzberg (1978) who argues that strategy flexibility enhances the chances of successful strategy execution. This ideally is the case in the event that such organizations have anticipated changes or when they had to change their strategy to respond to competitors’ actions and behavior. Ultimately, it is important that changes in strategy are communicated to the employees.
As Kaplan and Norton clearly noted, there is a persistent failure to balance the tension between strategy and execution. This is really disappointing, bearing in mind the fact that the better matching of actions to strategy was the original reason Kaplan and Norton popularized balanced scorecards in the 1990s. With more than 60 percent of large and medium-sized organizations in North America having adopted scorecard-type frameworks, we might have expected better. Most organizations go a long way to write, making or closely missing their numbers each quarter but have never put in mind the concept of examining how to modify their strategy to generate better growth opportunities or how to break the pattern of short term financial shortfalls (Martin, 2010).

According to Rutan (1999), all strategy implementation aspects during the planning phase are fundamental for execution. This is mainly because at this stage there is no time to do that. As such it is critical for every member of the strategy development team to understand and agree upon the details of the plan. Qi (2005) reiterates the need for management to make the commitment to stay focused on the agreed upon plans and therefore only make significant changes to the strategic plan after making careful consideration on the overall implications and consequences of such change. Brenes, et al., (2007) further admits that organizations need to maintain a balance between ongoing business activities and working on new strategic initiatives. This is so because the challenges to strategy execution often results from companies dwelling on new strategy development and in the process forget their main line of business that underlie within previously formulated business strategies.

2.4.2 Strategy Clarity
Nickols (2010) argues that strategy clarity is key to the process of strategy execution. According to him there are four cases of strategy execution: flawed strategy and flawed execution, sound strategy and flawed execution, flawed strategy and sound execution, and sound strategy and sound execution. In the same line of thought he further avows that any organization has a pretty good chance for success, only when the strategy and the execution are sound barring aside environmental and competitive influences. Zagotta and Robinso (2002), further contends that executing the wrong strategy is one of the major problems leading to unsuccessful execution of strategies. The current study therefore acknowledges and concurs with these sentiments and shall seek to establish the impact of having a wrong strategy on the process of strategy execution in Access Kenya.
According to Fourie (2009) it is evident how some strategies such as cost strategies often seek to minimize the costs incurred by the organizations. This therefore goes a long way in ensuring that the strategies are effectively executed. The execution process as this minimizes the essential role of employees through limiting their discretionary behavior. Similarly a product breadth strategy emphasizes the importance of employees as the goal is to produce a consistent, but wide variety of products at a low cost. Thus, the orientation is more toward manufacturing efficiency resulting in a more tightly coupled production process.

2.4.3 Strategic Purpose

According to Parise and Cross (2007), the first step in strategy execution is to be sure that the members of the organization understand the business strategy so as to have a clear view of what the organization needs to deliver upon. This will include purpose, market positioning, key strategic initiatives and priorities, required tradeoffs and integrations, performance standards and deliverables, timing and sequencing. Hrebiniak and Joyce (2005) further admit that this may sound obvious, but many companies fail to do a good job of strategy development and implementation, let alone communication. This is mainly because majority of executives misunderstand strategy and confuse the strategic and operating agendas.

Moreover, human resource plans and activities frequently stay firmly rooted in operations and fail to serve or advance the strategic requirements of the business. Candidly, this will need to change if long-term competitive advantage is to be realized and sustained; companies will need to develop, acquire or contract the requisite competencies to plug these gaps. Similarly Powers (2008) believes that a firm and foundational understanding of business strategy allows an organizational strategist to explore the organizational implications of the strategy and to determine, develop and lead those organizational initiatives necessary to build an organization that is capable of delivering the strategy.

Parise and Cross (2007), believes that most organizations are not well aware of the difference between strategy and strategic threads, which are mere elements of strategies. As such without a strategy, time and other resources are easily wasted on piecemeal, disparate activities; mid-level managers will fill the void with their own, often parochial,
interpretations of what the business should be doing; and the result will be a potpourri of disjointed, feeble initiatives, this therefore comes in the way of the strategy execution process and thus negatively influence the strategy execution process. Day (1999) further stresses that an effective strategy must be straightforward in both intent and direction. Similarly Kotler (2000) suggests that while goals are what every business unit wants to achieve, strategy is the game plan for getting there, and each business must tailor a strategy to achieve its goals. As such a goof strategy will not make the execution process successful. It can furthermore be argued that bearing in mind the modern dynamic business environment, static strategy cannot create value in the long term this is because the changes in the environment will render the strategy obsolete eventually. As such the execution process will not be successful. Ansoff and McDonnell (1990) further suggest that in an environment where challenges develop too rapidly to be anticipated, management needs to be flexible and thus provide rapid response.

2.4.4 Strategy Feasibility

Strategy feasibility is key to strategy implementation. There is need determine, how a firm is to compete so that it can obtain advantages that are sustainable over a length period of time. That means focusing on two fundamental questions. How should the strategy be feasible so as to be able to create competitive advantages in the market place? For example, managers need to determine if the company should position itself as the low-cost producer, or develop products and services that are unique which will enable the company to charge premium prices or some combination of both. Managers must also ask how to make such advantages sustainable, instead of highly temporarily in the market place (Raps, 2010).

2.4.5 Strategy Acceptability (PESTLE)

PEST analysis stands for "Political, Economic, Social-cultural, and Technological analysis" and describes a framework of macro-environmental factors used in the environmental scanning component of strategic management. It is a part of the external analysis when conducting a strategic analysis or doing market research, and gives an overview of the different macro environmental factors that the company has to take into consideration. It is a useful strategic tool for understanding market growth or decline, business position, potential and direction for operations. However, strategy could be
further defined as the means to achieve the ends, (objective). The strategy should be acceptable to the society. In reality, this can only be true to some extend because the present system of operation give no future effectiveness or efficiency. (Adebisi 2006)

2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents a comprehensive review of available literature relating to the influence of people, operations and the strategy itself on strategy execution. This will enable an informed and more focused study of the strategy execution processes in internet service providers. Chapter three covers the research design and methodology which highlights the design and methodological issues that will be adopted.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology that was employed in this particular study with respect to the three research objectives of the study. The study first presented the research design that was employed in the study, followed by the population and sampling procedures. The chapter also presented the data collection methods as well as the research procedures followed and finally the data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design

Bryman (2008) defines a research design as being that framework which can be used by researchers in generating evidence which is suited both to a certain set of criteria and to the research question in which the researcher is interested. This particular study adopted a descriptive survey design. A descriptive design is that particular research design that makes use of numerical information in order to collect, organize and summarize data. In this study descriptive statistics was used to quantify data. The study also made use of inferential statistics in form of regression tables in order to test relationships between variables under study.

3.3 Population and Sampling

3.3.1. Population

A population is described to be that total collection of elements from which a research can be able to make inferences from (Cooper and Schindler, 2000). This study focused on a total population 100 respondents who were employees of Access Kenya Group limited, the organization of study. The research was mainly concerned with gathering input from middle and top management concerning strategy execution.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

Sampling design is considered to be that process of selecting the target population and selection of the sample (Cooper and Schindler, 2000). The target population in this research was determined by the organization of study in this case: Access Kenya Group
Ltd employees. All the Team Leaders, Head of Sections and top management as well as employees of the organization were involved in the study.

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Bryman (2008), describes a sampling frame as that listing of all units in the population from which the sample can be selected. In this particular study, the sampling frame was obtained from the Access Kenya human resource. The sampling frame was made up employees from all the departments in the organization from the information provided by human resource. The various business units involved in the study were Sales, Marketing and Communications, Customer services, Credit Control, Client Relation Management, CRM, Human Resources, Finance, Administration and Network operations.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

According to Cooper and Schindler (2000), a sampling technique can be described to be a method used to determine the main elements in the representative sample. The sampling technique that was employed in this particular study was stratified random sampling because of the population was heterogeneous. Despite the fact that there were various sections in Access Kenya Group Ltd this did not in any way affect the composition of the sample as the type of responsibility and work role an employee is involved in does not change the factors contributing to strategy execution.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

A sample is described as that particular segment of the population was selected for investigation (Bryman, 2008). The sample size for the study involved in this study was 100 respondents a 58% representation of the target population. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2009), a population of 30% is representative enough. This study therefore opted to select 100 percent of the target population.
Table 3.1 Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management (Formulators)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Level Management Level</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit control</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though many of the scales were adopted or modified from previous researchers, it was necessary to assess the reliability of the research instrument. Cronbach Alpha was therefore used to test reliability of the instrument and the cut off point of 0.7 was considered as seen in table 3.2. The data collection instrument was subjected to an examination by a panel of experts who were asked to review the instrument to ascertain its validity.

Table 3.2: Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Strategy</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to test for normality, Shapiro-Wilk tests were carried out as seen in table 3.3, below. It was established that the test was not significant an indication that the data had a normal distribution. The confirmatory factor analysis in table 3.3 (b), show than none of the variables had to be dropped and were therefore used in the study. The study used 3 main variables so we had 3 components (workforce, operations, strategy). Because the principal components analysis was conducted on the correlation matrix, the variables are standardized, which means that the each variable has a variance of 1, and the total variance is equal to the number of variables used in the analysis, in this case, 3. The Total column contains the eigenvalues. The first component accounted for the most variance (and hence
have the highest eigenvalue), and the next component accounted for as much of the left over variance as it can, and so on. The % of Variance represents contains the percent of variance accounted for by each principal component. While the Cumulative % showed the cumulative percentage of variance accounted for by the current and all preceding principal components. In this case For example, the third row shows a value of 100. This means that the first three components together account for 100% of the total variance. The number of rows reproduced on the right side of the table (b) were determined by the number of principal components whose eigenvalues are 1 or greater as seen in table 3.3 (c).

**Table 3.3: Normality Test**

(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Normality</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov²</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

b) Confirmatory factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrix a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.
3.4 Data Collection Methods

According to Cooper and Schindler (2000), data collection is described as that process that involves the gathering of facts which are presented to the researcher from the environment of the study. Primary data for the research was collected through use of questionnaires that comprise of both closed and open ended questions that sought to measure strategy execution in Access Kenya. In this study respondents were required to respond to questions which were developed from the three research objectives which provides substantial data for analysis to derive conclusions.

The questionnaire were crafted in simple language that was clear especially revolving around the various strategic issues which were evaluated.

3.5 Research Procedures

This is considered to be that process that was followed in the course of carrying the research project (Bryman and Bell, 2003). The first step was the preparation of the research proposal which was followed by the determination of the sample as well as estimation of the budget of costs that were incurred in the cost of the study. The data instrument for data collection were questionnaires were developed and a pilot exercise conducted to evaluate its effectiveness. The evaluation of the pilot exercise was to give leeway to data collection from the field followed by analysis and interpretation. The final step was drawing of conclusions and making of recommendations coupled with presentation of the findings for implementation to the company.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

According to Cooper and Schindler (2000), the process of data analysis was comprised of reducing accumulated data to a size that was manageable, notwithstanding developing summaries, as well as looking for patterns and applying statistical techniques. The data was analyzed using SPSS Statistics in terms of frequency tables, correlations and presented in form of tables and figures to elicit the findings in light of the three research objectives. The analyzed was presented in tables and figures.
3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter analyzed the methodology that was used to conduct the research. The research involves descriptive study through a cross sectional case of the organization of study. The population of focus was all employees of Access Kenya Group Ltd involved in the core business of the company. Data collection was conducted through the use of questionnaires and analyzed through the determination of percentages, mean, and presentation through graphs and charts. Chapter four presents the study findings and interpretation.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and findings of the study on the research questions with regards to the data collected from the respondents with respect to Access Kenya. The initial section covers the background information with respect to the respondents; consequently the second section covers findings on if the workforce at Access Kenya influences strategy execution. The third section presents findings if the operations influences strategy execution and the final section assesses if the strategic process influences strategy execution. A total of 110 questionnaires were issued out of which 100 questionnaires were retuned.

4.2 Reliability and Validity

A pilot study was conducted to find out if the respondents could answer the questions without difficulty. Respondents in the pretest were drawn from three departments. They were asked to evaluate the questions for relevance, comprehension, meaning and clarity. The research instrument was modified on the basis of the pilot test before administering it to the study respondents.

4.3 Background Information

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents

Table 4.1 presents a summary of the gender of the respondents with regards to the responses given by the respondents. As presented in the table, it is evident that majority of the respondents were male while the minorities were female. The table shows that 72 percent were male while the remaining 28 percent were female.

Table 4.1 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Study Level

Table 4.2 indicates that 54% of the respondents from Access Kenya have undergraduate qualifications, as their highest education level. 28% reported that they had attained a post-graduate degree as their highest level of education while 12% have doctorate qualifications. Those who reported as having attained a diploma or any other qualifications as their highest education level made up 8% of the respondents.

Table 4.2: Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Age Range

The study sought to find out the age distribution of the employees at AcessKenya Table 4.3 provides a summary of the age of the respondents as a result of the responses given by the respondents. As clearly seen in the table, the majority (46 percent) of the respondents were between the ages of 35-50 years. They were closely followed by those with the age ranging between 19-34 years and were indeed 14 percent of the respondents. Finally 14 percent of the respondents were above 50 years old.

Table 4.3: Age of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4 Duration of Employment

The results of the study shows that majority of the respondents have been in Access Kenya for more than ten (10) years. Specifically, 48 percent of the respondents have been in the organization between 5-10 years, while 38 percent of the respondents have been in the organization less than five (5), years. Similarly, 10 percent of the respondents have been in the organization between 11-15 years while 4 percent between 16 and twenty years. None of the respondents has been in the organization more than 20 years.

![Figure 4.1: Duration of Employment](image)

4.4 The influence of the Workforce on Strategy Execution

The first objective of the study was to establish if the workforce at Access Kenya influences strategy execution. The following subsection presents a summary of the findings in this regard.

4.4.1 Competent Workforce

The study sought to establish how a competent workforce influences strategy execution. Respondents were asked if there is a lack of competent people at all levels as well as how lack of competent people affects strategy execution. As seen in the model summary table 46 (a), below the R square value is 44.5 which indicates that indeed a competent workforce accounts for 44.5 percent of strategy execution at Access Kenya, while the remaining percentage is accounted for by other variables not included in the model. The ANOVA table (b) value for F-static was 27.814 and p value of 0.00 shows that the model is significant. Finally As seen in table 4.4 (c), there is a positive significant relationship between a competent workforce influences strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a
beta of 0.675 with the t-value at 3.001 which was significant. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by a competent workforce.

Table 4.4: Relationship between a Competent Workforce and Strategy Execution

\[ \text{Model Summary} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.581(^a)</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>5.90703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Competent Workforce

\[ \text{ANOVA}^a \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>836.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>836.031</td>
<td>23.960</td>
<td>0.000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1639.969</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34.893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2476.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategy execution
b. Predictors: (Constant), Competent Workforce

c. | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>37.651</td>
<td>6.980</td>
<td>6.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategy execution

4.4.2 Workforce Communication

The study further sought to establish how communication among the workforce influences strategy execution at Access Kenya. The model summary in table 4.5 (a) shows that workforce communication contributes 58.5 percent of strategy execution, the remaining percent is contributed by other variables not included in the model. The ANOVA table (b) value for F-static was 66.34 and p value of 0.00 shows that the model is significant. Finally As seen in table 4.5 (c), there is a positive significant relationship between workforce communication and strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta
0.751 of with the t-value at 5.93 which was significant. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by workforce communication.

Table 4.5: Relationship between Workforce Communication and Strategy Execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.668 (a)</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>3.9985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Predictors: (Constant), Workforce Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1494.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1494.033</td>
<td>66.34</td>
<td>0.000 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>981.967</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2476.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution

(c) Predictors: (Constant), Workforce Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>40.316</td>
<td>4.537</td>
<td>8.885</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Workforce Communication</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution

4.4.3 Empowered Workforce

Finally the study sought to examine how an empowered workforce influence strategy execution. The model summary in table 4.6 (a) shows that an empowered workforce contributes 53.7 percent of strategy execution, the remaining percent is contributed by other variables not included in the model. The ANOVA table (b) value for F-static was 39.284 and p value of 0.00 shows that the model is significant. Finally As seen in table 4.6 (c), there is a positive significant relationship between an empowered workforce influence strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 0.624 of with the t-value at...
5.103 which was significant. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by an empowered workforce.

Table 4.6: Empowered Workforce and Strategy Execution

a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Predictors: (Constant), Empowered Workforce

b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution
\textsuperscript{b} Predictors: (Constant), Empowered Workforce

c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution

The regression results are further affirmed by the descriptive results shown in table 4.7 where majority of the respondents were in agreement that in Access Kenya Lack of competent people affects strategy execution, people are encouraged to provide inputs in decision making, there is communication flow between top management and employees, strategy is seen to be highly sensitive information, employees, especially at lower level, understand the company’s strategy, employees understand why the company is going this direction, employees understand their roles in the company strategy and how their daily job contributes to it, employees can they link their daily jobs to overall strategic
objectives, there are clear guidelines to execute the strategy to ensure unified methods of work, all employees know exactly how to work upon the strategy, employees in are empowered to make their own decisions and finally employee empowerment impacts strategy execution.

Table 4.7: Workforce and Strategy execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of competent people affects strategy execution</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are encouraged to provide inputs in decision making</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is communication flow between top management and employees</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy is seen to be highly sensitive information</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees, especially at lower level, understand the company’s strategy</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees understand why the company is going this direction</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees understand their roles in the company strategy and how their daily job contributes to it</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees can they link their daily jobs to overall strategic objectives</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear guidelines to execute the strategy to ensure unified methods of work</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All employees know exactly how to work upon the strategy</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in are empowered to make their own decisions</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee empowerment impacts strategy execution</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Operations and Strategy Execution

The study further sought to examine if the organization’s operation influences strategy execution. The following subsection presents a summary of the findings with regard to how operations at Access Kenya influences the execution of the organization strategy. As seen in table 4.10, it is evident that majority of the respondents agree Access Kenya operations dictates the strategy execution process. Additionally the administrative system facilitates strategy execution. In the same regard leadership in Access Kenya has ensured that leaders show equal attention to all functional-level concerns. There is also communication flow in Access Kenya organization between top management and Access Kenya has maintained the flexibility to adapt goals based on environmental changes. Finally the study established that service quality in Access Kenya has influenced the strategy execution process, as well performance measurement has been streamlined to keep the execution process intact.

Table 4.8: Operations and Strategy execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya’s structure dictates the strategy execution process</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya’s Administrative system facilitates strategy execution</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All leaders at Access Kenya show equal attention to all functional-level concerns</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is communication flow between top management and employees at Access Kenya</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya has maintained the flexibility to adapt goals based on environmental changes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality has influenced the strategy execution process</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement has been streamlined to keep the execution process intact</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The model summary in table 4.9 (a) shows that operations contributes 62.1 percent of strategy execution, the remaining percent is contributed by other variables not included in the model. The ANOVA table (b) value for F-static was 49.22 and p value of 0.00 shows that the model is significant. Finally As seen in table 4.9 (c), there is a positive significant relationship between operations and strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 1.549 of with the t-value at 6.876 which was significant. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by effective operations.

**Table 4.9: Operations and Strategy Execution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>Std. Error of the Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.621a</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>4.33342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Predictors: (Constant), Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVAa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1241.725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1241.725</td>
<td>49.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1234.275</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2476.000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Predictors: (Constant), Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficientsa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>4.126</td>
<td>7.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.6578</td>
<td>5128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.6 Strategic Process and Strategy Execution**

Finally the study sought to assess if the strategic process influences strategy execution. The following subsection presents a summary of findings with regards to how the strategic process affects strategy execution at Access Kenya. The R value in Table 4.10 (a) was 0.513 indicating that there is a positive relationship between strategic process and
strategy execution. R squared value of 0.471 shows that only 47.1% of strategy execution is explained by strategic process. The remaining 53.9 % is explained by other factors put in place by the Access Kenya in order to enhance their strategy execution.

As shown in Table 4.10 (b) the model was significant with F= 0.00. This is an indication that firm strategic process alone cannot steer Access Kenya to effective strategy execution. As depicted in Table 4.10 (c) strategic process had a beta value of 0.562 and a t value of 8.3495 and p value of 0.00. In terms of the significance of the predictor variables, the individual variables whose t-values are significant (p= <0.05) are considered.

Table 4.10: Regression results for strategic Process and strategy execution

a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Process

b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVAa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution
b. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic process

c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficientsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategy Execution
Table 4.11: Strategic Process and Strategy execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Uncertain %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya encourages coordination &amp; integration of activities among employees from different departments.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya strategic intent &amp; direction is clear to all employees.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya’s goals and objective are clear to all employees.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya’s vision provides an oversight to employees’ actions.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya’s mission is performance oriented</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya's strategy and objectives are suitable given important changes in the external environment.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Kenya strategy is compatible with the mission of the organization.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Chapter Summary

In this chapter the researcher provides the findings with respect to the information given out by the respondents. The first section provides the study findings based on the respondent’s background. This was followed by the findings on employee and strategy implementation. The section that follows presents the study findings on organization structure and finally the strategic process and strategy implementation. The next chapter provides the conclusion, summary as well as the discussions and the recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary and discussions on the findings of the research as well as interpretations and relevance to established literature. It looks at the implications of the findings to the existing body of knowledge in the field of strategic management. First it summarizes the findings starting with objectives of the study. The discussion section is presented in three sections, covering the findings on competitive strategies, organizational competencies and firm performance. Thereafter, the conclusion recommendations and limitations of the study are presented ending with suggestions for future research.

5.2 Summary

The general objective of this study was to analyze the strategy execution processes among internet service providers in Kenya. The study was guided by the following specific objectives: to determine the influence of the workforce on strategy execution at Access Kenya, to examine the influence of organization’s operations on strategy execution at Access Kenya and to assess the influence of the strategic process at Access Kenya on strategy execution.

The target population constituted Access Kenya employees in Nairobi, from which a sample size of 100 respondents were identified through stratified sampling. Primary data was collected from the respondents using a questionnaire. The data collected before it is cleaned, coded and edited for completeness and accuracy before being analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) to obtain descriptive statistics. Data presentation was in the form of frequency tables, mean, charts, and graphs.

The study revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between a competent workforce influences strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta of 0.675 with the t-value at 3.001 which was significant. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by a competent workforce. It was also revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between workforce communication and strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 0.751 of with the t-value at 5.93 which was
significant. Also it was revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between an empowered workforce influence strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 0.624 of with the t-value at 5.103 which was significant.

The study further revealed that Access Kenya operations dictates the strategy execution process. Additionally the administrative system facilitates strategy execution. In the same regard leadership in Access Kenya has ensured that leaders show equal attention to all functional-level concerns. There is also communication flow in Access Kenya between top management and Access Kenya has maintained the flexibility to adapt goals based on environmental changes. Finally the study established that service quality in Access Kenya has influenced the strategy execution process, as well performance measurement has been streamlined to keep the execution process intact.

Finally the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between strategic process and strategy execution. R squared value of 0.471 shows that only 47.1% of strategy execution is explained by strategic process. The remaining 53.9 % is explained by other factors put in place by the Access Kenya in order to enhance their strategy execution.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Influence of the Workforce on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

The study revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between a competent workforce influences strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta of 0.675 with the t-value at 3.001 which was significant. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by a competent workforce. It was also revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between workforce communication and strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 0.751 of with the t-value at 5.93 which was significant. Also it was revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between an empowered workforce influence strategy execution at Access Kenya, with a beta 0.624 of with the t-value at 5.103 which was significant.

This findings affirm that indeed employee competency is another essential component of the human resource function. According to Bossidy and Charan, (2012) in most organizations, managers simply overlook the employee competence factor given that they are too busy thinking so much about the other underpinning factors for instance how to
increase earnings and thus company growth, dealing with environment dynamics among other issues. This therefore means that little attention is given to employee competency.

Additionally the findings agree with Michlitsch (2010) who argues that if an organization lack the type of employees with the requisite skills and competency then they are likely not to properly execute a company strategy, they have no room for success but will rather fail to do so. In this regard therefore maintaining competencies within organization do have a significant role in successful strategy execution. As such, organizations need to bring on board through hiring and maintaining only qualified and competent people. Organizations also need to develop competencies for current employees through development programs such as training and development so as to endeavor to bring success to the organization. The lack of competencies is not solely attributable to lower level managers or employees. This is because even chief executive officers may not be appropriate to execute a new strategy (Wheelen and Hunger, 2010).

Finally the findings align with Raps (2005) who put forward an argument which established that indeed one of the reasons why strategy execution fails to succeed is because of challenging and complex problems. This is also as a result of the vagueness of the assignment of responsibilities. Michlitsch (2010) further made an argument that the need for people to know clearly what they are supposed to do if the company wants to succeed. In addition, employees have to be given clear guidance to enable them successfully executing the strategy. Wheelen and Hunger (2005) on his side believes that when a organization lacks direction, then it follows that people will do their work according to their personal view of what tasks should be done, how, and in what order. This therefore compromises the priorities of the organization.

5.3.2 Influence of the Operations on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

The study further revealed that Access Kenya operations dictates the strategy execution process. Additionally the administrative system facilitates strategy execution. In the same regard leadership in Access Kenya has ensured that leaders show equal attention to all functional-level concerns. There is also communication flow in Access Kenya between top management and Access Kenya has maintained the flexibility to adapt goals based on environmental changes. Finally the study established that service quality in Access Kenya
has influenced the strategy execution process, as well performance measurement has been streamlined to keep the execution process intact.

The findings agree with Drazin and Howard (2009) who argued that effective strategy execution will result from a proper strategy-structure alignment (Noble, 2009). They therefore point out that indeed organizations are likely to make adjustments to their organizational structure by aligning them with the changes in the competitive environment. It follows therefore that firms that take long in making this realignment are likely to end up having poor results which can place them at a serious competitive disadvantage. Schaap (2010) further made a suggestion that the act of adjusting organizational structure with respect to a perfect strategy can greatly help to ensure successful strategy implementation.

The findings also agree with Kyarimpa (2009) who argued that ineffective leadership can be a serious threat to the successful strategy execution. This is especially in the context of developing nations where majority of the organizations lack effective leadership (Harrington, 2006). Effectively, in such organizations emphasis is placed on shorter-term frames, strong focus on command, control and predictability, with little emphasis being placed on employee empowerment and motivation. Mintzberg (2010), also argues that there is a clear distinction between management and leadership however both required for better strategy execution. He emphasizes that people are tired of managers who are not leaders and vice versa. Contemporary management thinking suggests that managers do things right, while leaders do the right things. He contended that managers combine human and other resources to achieve goals, while leaders solve problems creatively.

Finally the findings are in line with Armstrong (2010) who made it clear that companies have created business units which are responsible for the development of commercial activities. These according to Armstrong has enabled business units manage their products in a comprehensive way and are responsible for the different functions of marketing, public relations, strategic planning, financial management, human resources and logistics. There are developments towards devolution of operational autonomy to local regional offices (Chetty, 2010). Key elements in this process are differentiation, subsidiary and communication networks. The current study seeks to analyze how the internal organization management, can facilitate successful strategy execution.
5.3.3 Influence of the Strategic Process on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

Finally the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between strategic process and strategy execution. R squared value of 0.471 shows that only 47.1% of strategy execution is explained by strategic process. The remaining 53.9% is explained by other factors put in place by the Access Kenya in order to enhance their strategy execution.

The findings are in line with Bossidy and Charan (2009) who are of the idea that a clear and formal strategy formulation can without doubt take away such shortcomings to facilitate a successful execution of a business’ strategy. In the same manner, a clear and formal strategy gives room for the execution of tools which strengthen the position of employees within the organization and also makes the employees part of the execution process. It means therefore that it is imperative for employees to act in accordance with the strategy and thus pick up signals from the market or their work domain and add to the strategy in favor of the corporate organization (Martin, 2010).

The findings also agree with Nickols (2010) who argues that strategy clarity is key to the process of strategy execution. According to him there are four cases of strategy execution: flawed strategy and flawed execution, sound strategy and flawed execution, flawed strategy and sound execution, and sound strategy and sound execution. In the same line of thought he further avows that any organization has a pretty good chance for success, only when the strategy and the execution are sound barring aside environmental and competitive influences. Zagotta and Robinson (2002), further contends that executing the wrong strategy is one of the major problems leading to unsuccessful execution of strategies. The current study therefore acknowledges and concurs with these sentiments and shall seek to establish the impact of having a wrong strategy on the process of strategy execution in Access Kenya.

Finally the findings agree with Fourie (2009) who argues that some strategies such as cost strategies often seek to minimize the costs incurred by the organizations. This therefore goes a long way in ensuring that the strategies are effectively executed. the execution process as this minimizes the essential role of employees through limiting their discretionary behavior. Similarly a product breadth strategy emphasizes the importance of employees as the goal is to produce a consistent, but wide variety of products at a low cost. Thus, the orientation is more toward manufacturing efficiency resulting in a more tightly coupled production process.
5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Influence of the Workforce on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

The study concludes that there is a positive significant relationship between a competent workforce influences strategy execution at Access Kenya. This implies that indeed strategy execution at Access Kenya is largely influenced by a competent workforce. It was also concluded that there is a positive significant relationship between workforce communication and strategy execution at Access Kenya. Finally it can be concluded that there is a positive significant relationship between an empowered workforce influence strategy execution at Access Kenya.

5.4.2 Influence of the Operations on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

The study further concludes that Access Kenya operations dictates the strategy execution process. Additionally the administrative system facilitates strategy execution. In the same regard leadership in Access Kenya has ensured that leaders show equal attention to all functional-level concerns. There is also communication flow in Access Kenya between top management and Access Kenya has maintained the flexibility to adapt goals based on environmental changes. Finally the study established that service quality in Access Kenya has influenced the strategy execution process, as well performance measurement has been streamlined to keep the execution process intact.

5.4.3 Influence of the Strategic Process on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

Finally the study concludes that there is a positive relationship between strategic process and strategy execution. The study also concludes that Access Kenya encourages coordination & integration of activities among employees from different departments. Access Kenya strategic intent & direction is clear to all employees. Access Kenya’s goals and objective are clear to all employees. Access Kenya’s vision provides an oversight to employees’ actions. Access Kenya’s mission is performance oriented Access Kenya's strategy and objectives are suitable given important changes in the external environment and finally Access Kenya strategy is compatible with the mission of the organization.
5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Influence of the Workforce on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

The study recommends to the management of Access Kenya to always consider employees as being one of the most important contributors to the strategic process and in this regard therefore there is need to always involve such employees in the entire strategic process. Additionally Access Kenya needs committed employees in order for the organization be able to successfully execute their set strategies. This is because committed employees at Access Kenya are more likely to give your customers better service, since they will always be willing to take the time to solve difficult problems, their work is of higher quality, and they are more likely to stay with Access Kenya.

5.5.1.2 Influence of the Operations on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

The study recommends that Access Kenya needs to constantly make adjustments to its organizational structure and align it with the changes in the competitive environment of internet service provision. This is because in case of a delay in this realignment Access Kenya may end up exhibiting poor results which in the end can place it at a serious competitive disadvantage. Additionally the study recommends that act of adjusting organizational structure for Access Kenya with respect to a perfect strategy will do a great deal in helping to ensure successful strategy implementation in the organization.

5.5.1.3 Influence of the Strategic Process on Strategy Execution at Access Kenya

The present study acknowledges that indeed it is important for Access Kenya to develop a good strategy since this will boost its chances of outshining competitors in the internet service provision. The study therefore recommends managers at Access Kenya need to use sufficient time and effort, to develop a good strategy. Secondly there is need to eliminate unnecessary errors in the organization strategy and remove problems that may arise beforehand. Lastly, the study calls for improved communication between the avoidance employee and the person creating the organizational goals.
5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

This study successfully examined the concept of strategy execution and also went ahead to present a rich prospect for other areas to be researched in future. As such the study recommends for similar study across heterogeneous industries and not just the internet service provision.

Secondly the study recommends that similar studies in this area should focus on other factors affecting strategy execution and not just the three factors examined in this particular study.
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Appendix I: Questionnaire

PART I: General Information

Kindly answer all the questions either by ticking in the boxes or writing in the spaces provided. Note that the evaluation will be considered incomplete if you do not answer all the questions.

1. Gender:
   Male  ☐  Female  ☐

2. Study level
   College  ☐  Undergraduate  ☐  Masters Degree  ☐

3. What is your age range?
   19-34 years  ☐  35-50 years  ☐  above 50 years  ☐

4. Duration of employment at Access Kenya
   Less than 1 year  ☐  2 - 5 years  ☐  More than 5 years  ☐
**SECTION B: INFLUENCE OF WORKFORCE ON STRATEGY EXECUTION**

a) Using a scale of 1 – 5 tick the appropriate answer from the alternatives provided for each of the questions. **Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Uncertain 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) There is a lack of competent people at all levels (CEOs, Middle managers, Lower-level employees) in your company</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Lack of competent people affects your strategy implementation</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) People are encouraged to provide inputs in decision making in your organization</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) There is communication flow in your organization between top management and employees and amongst the employees themselves</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Your company considers strategy to be highly sensitive information / top secret / confidential information that should not be disclosed</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Employees, especially at lower level, understand the company’s strategy</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Employees understand why the company is going this direction</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Employees understand their roles in the company strategy and how their daily job contributes to it</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Employees can they link their daily jobs to overall strategic objectives</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) There are clear guidelines to implement the strategy to ensure unified methods of work</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii) All employees know exactly how to work upon the strategy</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii) Employees in your organization are empowered to make their own decisions</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv) In your organization, employee empowerment impacts strategy implementation</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) **Management influence on Strategy Execution**

Using a scale of 1 – 5 tick the appropriate answer from the alternatives provided for each of the questions. *Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Uncertain 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree*

| i) Resource deployment by management is key to strategy execution | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| ii) Responsibility allocation by the management enhances strategy execution process | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| iii) Knowledge communication by management helps employees to properly execute the organizational strategy | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| iv) The willingness of managers to take risks during the implementation process enhances strategy execution | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| v) The problem solving style by management enhances strategy execution | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| vi) The internal locus of control on the part of the managers contribute to implementation effectiveness | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
c) **SECTION C: INFLUENCE OF OPERATIONS ON STRATEGY EXECUTION**

Using a scale of 1 – 5 tick the appropriate answer from the alternatives provided for each of the questions. **Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Uncertain 4 Agree 5. Strongly Agree**

| i) The organizational structure dictates the strategy execution process in your organization | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| ii) The administrative system in your organization facilitates strategy execution | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| iii) Leadership in your company has ensured that leaders show equal attention to all functional-level concerns | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| iv) There is communication flow like in your organization between top management and employees and amongst the employees themselves | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| v) Your company has maintained the flexibility to adapt goals based on environmental changes | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| vi) The product/service quality in your organization has influenced the strategy execution process | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| vii) Performance measurement has been streamlined to keep the execution process intact | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
| viii) Your organization conceptualizes continuous innovativeness as a tool in strategy execution | (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) |
**SECTION D: INFLUENCE OF STRATEGY ON STRATEGY EXECUTION**

| (i) | Your company encourages coordination & integration of activities among employees from different departments. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |
| (ii) | The firm’s strategic intent & direction is clear to all employees. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |
| (iii) | The firm’s goals and objective are clear to all employees. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |
| (iv) | The firm’s vision provides an oversight to employees’ actions. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |
| (v) | The company’s mission is performance oriented. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |
| (vi) | The company’s strategy and objectives are suitable given important changes in the external environment. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |
| (vii) | The organization strategy is compatible with the mission of the organization. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |
| (viii) | The company's strategy continues to serve the public in the same product or service, market, and production sectors as defined in its business definition, or in very similar sectors. | (i) (2) (3) (4) (5) |

**Thank you very much for your participation!**
Appendix (ii): List of Strategy Implementation Obstacles

1. Took more time than originally allocated
2. Major problems surfaced which had not been identified earlier.
3. Co-ordination was not sufficiently effective
4. Competing activities distracted attention from implementing this decision
5. Capabilities of employees involved were insufficient
6. Training and instruction given to lower level employees were inadequate
7. Uncontrollable factors in the external environment had an adverse impact on implementation
8. Leadership and direction provided by departmental managers were inadequate
9. Key implementation tasks and activities were not sufficiently defined
10. Information systems used to monitor implementation were inadequate
11. Advocates and supporters of the strategic decision left the organization during implementation.
12. Overall goals were not sufficiently well understood by employees
13. Changes in responsibilities of key employees were not clearly defined
14. Key formulators of the strategic decision did not play an active role in implementation
15. Problems requiring top management involvement were not communicated early enough.
16. Deviation from original plan objectives
17. People are not measured or rewarded for executing the plan
18. Lack of feelings of "ownership" of a strategy or execution plans among key employees
19. Lack of understanding of the role of organizational structure and design in the execution process

20. Insufficient financial resources to execute the strategy.

### Appendix II: Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cost (Kenyan Shillings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal Development</strong> (Printing and Stationary)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistant fee</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary and printing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Expenses</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationary</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Expenses</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix III: Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame (2014/2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Review</td>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding and submission</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>