ASSESSING NON-MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEE’S PERCEPTIONS OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION IMPEDIMENTS: THE CASE OF INTERNET ACCESS PROVIDERS OF ZIMBABWE.

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEGREE.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

UNIVERSITY OF ZIMBABWE

INITIAL MLAMBO

APRIL 2015

SUPERVISOR: DR. D. MADZIKANDA
DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to all Internet Access Providers managers and employees who provided assistance in the fulfilment of the study. I hope the results of this study will contribute towards effective strategy management within your organisations.
DECLARATION

*Student’s Declaration* - I, INITIAL MLAMBO, do hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own investigation and research, except to the extent indicated in the acknowledgements, references, and by comments included in the body of the report, and that this dissertation is therefore my original work and has not been presented in part or in full for any other degree in any other University.

Signature .................................................. Date .........................

**NAME: INITIAL MLAMBO**

**STUDENT NUMBER: R027522Y**

*Supervisor Declaration* – I, Dr D Madzikanda, confirm that the work reported in this dissertation was carried out by the candidate under my supervision as the University supervisor. This dissertation has been submitted for review with my approval as University Supervisor.

Signature .................................................. Date .........................

**NAME: DR. D. MADZIKANDA**

Graduate School of Management

University of Zimbabwe
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first acknowledge my supervisor, Dr D. Madzikanda for the direction he provided in this dissertation. His dedication, commitment and assistance was extremely enriching and supportive.

I would like to thank my family, especially my wife Catherine Mlambo and children, for they endured my prolonged absence from their lives because of my pursuit of the MBA degree.
Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles on organisation performance. Research on literature review indicated scarce or paucity studies on perceptions of employees on strategy implementation obstacles and their influence on organisation performance, hence, the need for this study to fill that gap.

Employees within the Internet Access Providers companies of Zimbabwe participated in the study and 133 responses were received from the questionnaire that was distributed. Questionnaires were distributed through multiple channels that includes electronic emails, electronic survey and physical copies.

The results showed that employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles positively influences organisation performance. A significant relationship was found between perceptions of communication, performance management and organisation variables as predicting organisation performance. Prevalent indications from the results showed that resources and environment were perceived negatively and were not statistically significant in determining organisational performance among the Internet Access Providers indiscriminately impeding organisation performance. In addition, leadership and strategy formulation were not statistically significant in predicting organisational performance. The results on leadership and resources were unique as they contradicted most previous research. The key conclusion is that positive employee perceptions positively influence organisation performance.

The study recommended effective management of: strategy implementation barriers, employee perceptions and strategy implementation drivers. Management should ensure employees perceive strategy implementation positively in order to drive organisational performance.
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CHAPTER 1

1 Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

The current business environment is highly competitive and volatile. Companies are implementing change as part of mainstream management. They are developing and implementing new strategies daily to remain competitive (Grant, 2009). A survey conducted by Economist revealed that fifty seven percent of firms were unsuccessful at executing strategic initiatives in 2004 (Allio, 2005). The white paper of Strategy Implementation of Chinese Corporations research found that eighty three percent of surveyed firms failed to implement their strategy smoothly and only seventeen percent felt that they had a consistent strategy implementation process (Li et al., 2008). Glatstein (2008) reported that nine out of ten strategies fail. A Fortune magazine study revealed that seven out of ten CEOs who fail, do so not because of bad strategy, but because of bad execution (Glatstein, 2008). The management consultant group Marakon Associates and the Economist Intelligence Unit surveyed one hundred and ninety seven (197) companies in 2008. The respondents indicated that sixty eight percent of the firms achieved expected results of their strategic plans. The reasons for this hiatus between expectation and actual performance was attributed to strategy execution failure.

Several researchers (Getz and Lee, 2011; Okumus, 1999; El-Ansary, 2006; Carvalho et al., 2013; Calfee, 2006; Barbosa and Romero, 2012; Coalitions et al., 2005; Darmin et al., 2013; Hamid and Zaribaf, 2008) investigated the reasons why there is such poor record of strategy implementation and they proposed implementation models to assist management. However, most researchers concentrated on top management, middle management, resources, processes and organisation structure without investigating the influence of non-managerial employees on strategy execution (Herzig and Jimmerson, 2006; Savaneviciene and Stankeviciute, 2011; Sharpe, 1981; Management and Haven, 2013). This study realised the need for effective strategy implementation. It will focus on non-managerial employees who are involved in the execution of daily activities required to achieve the strategy and boost organisational performance.
Internet Access Providers are not excluded in the companies that had poor execution of strategies. Some Internet Access Providers have formalised their strategy processes whilst others are lagging behind. Internet Access Providers have tried many strategies without accomplishing performance objectives. Several strategic shifts undertaken resulted in worst performance. Blame game is rampant between management and non-managerial employees. All Internet Access Providers have properly defined strategy documents, however, execution of these strategies is inundated by myriad of problems. Management intransigently posit economic challenges as premise to strategy implementation failures. Diabolically, there is lack of non-managerial participation in strategy formulation and consultation on problems bedevilling these organisations. Consequently, the study seeks to understand employees’ perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation and their subsequent impact on organisation performance.

1.2 Background of Internet Access Providers

The Internet Access Providers industry has ten registered operators namely: Africom (Pvt) Ltd, Aquiva Wireless (Pvt) Ltd, Aptics (Pvt) Ltd, BlueSat Access, Dandemutande, Liquid Telecoms, Pecus Enterprise (Pvt) Ltd, Powertel, Telecontract (Pvt) Ltd and Valley Technologies. Internet Access Providers licenses were issued in 2009 to eighteen companies but eight companies failed to raise fundssufficient to acquire the issued licenses. These eight companies experienced still birth under the vagrancies of the economy. Liquid Telecomsis the major player within this sector, Powertel follows and Africom stand at number three in terms of workforce and capitalisation.

Internet Access Providers provide a conglomerate of services ranging from fibre optics, VSAT, WiMax, Internet, Voice and Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP), Virtual Private Networks (VPNs) and Local Area Network (LAN) services. They deliver any Information Communications Technology service required by government, private companies and home users. There is high competition amongst the Internet Access Providers players. Competition is also tense from Mobile Network Operators who offer voice and internet over GSM networks. Consequently, without strong financial muscle, most Internet Access Providers struggle to get recognition and realise value from their licenses. Since license issuance, only Powertel recorded profits in 2013 whilst the rest reeled in unprecedented financial losses.
1.3 Environmental Analysis

1.3.1 Background
According to the Finance Minister, Zimbabwe’s ICT sector was projected to grow at 6.8% for the year 2015. In 2009, the ICT sector grew by 3.1% following scraping of duty on ICT products. In 2010, it grew by 3.6%. The ICT sector is undergoing unpredictable and intensive changes globally and locally. Technology is fast changing daily and companies have to decide between innovation and closure. In Zimbabwe alone, the past three years experienced exponential growth in products and services offered by ICT operators. Econet launched more than ten products in three years which was breath taking. Their blockbuster Ecocash product shook related industries like banks and retailers. Telecel and NetOne followed suit by breaking their product launch cycles. The industry experienced product innovations, market innovations and technological innovations that mapped Zimbabwe as one of the fastest growing ICT sector in Africa. Small players like Internet Access Providers, were forced to utilise internal capabilities to survive. Survival in the jungle depended on ability to strategise effectively and implement strategy successfully. The political environment influences much of the decisions in this sector. The period of Government of National Unity were conflagrated by reporting challenges for Internet Access Providers. Two ministries (Ministry of Transport and Communication and Ministry of ICT) were vying for their allegiance. This posed policy challenges and regulation formulation stood still. However, fast growth of mobile, data and internet users dominated social trends. Zimbabwe recorded the highest growth of mobile subscribers resulting in local companies being recognised at international level for launching innovative products.

1.3.2 Political and Legal Analysis
The Internet Access Providers in Zimbabwe are politically affected by government influence and interventions on the industry. Government laws put restrictions on their operations through tariff regulation and business model implementation. The political arena is very critical to the sustenance of the Internet Access Providers sector. Political instability during the previous year’s negatively affected investments into the sector. The government enforces political decisions for the betterment of the consumers thereby hampering operations. Currently, government will poignantly implement Long Run Incremental Costing Model consequential to revenue defoliation ensuing from reduced consumer prices. The Long Run
Incremental Costing Model is a government initiative which determines prices of ICT services based on market potential and required investment to support that market. It endeavours to create a common pricing model for both Mobile Network Operators and Internet Access Providers following convergence of voice and data services. Levelling the play field will render Internet Access Providers uncompetitive. Also, government decisions favours parastatal operators in the sector like TelOne and Powertel at the detriment of other players. However, there is currently low influences of political nature on the sector.

The Internet Access Providers are regulated by POTRAZ which is a government department. POTRAZ regulates through statutes, regulation and Telecommunications Acts. Deregulation of telecommunications industry in 2001 promulgated a new sector called Internet Access Providers. The Internet Access Providers holds converged licenses to operate both voice and internet services. Government heavily regulate them on tax payments, tariffs and licensing. Currently, the government unitarily increased their license fees from two million to five million per ten years. Most Internet Access Providers are struggling to raise this amount to renew their licences. They failed to pay off their debts accrued on statutory payments and licenses for the past four years. Consequently, one of the operator’s (Valley Technologies) had its license withdrawn because of inability to raise funding for the license.

1.3.3 Economic Analysis
The Internet Access Providers sector is heavily influenced by both macro and micro economic factors. In the Zimbabwean context the following factors have been dominant.

1.3.3.1 Economic Climate
The economy is uncertain and unpredictable. Unemployment is very high in Zimbabwe causing great strain on the industry. Disposable incomes are reducing due to economic depression and deflation. Subscriptions and revenues are plummeting due to falling customer demand, disposable incomes and competition. The liquidity crunch is worsening daily further decapitating economic stability. As a result, Internet Access Providers struggle to raise capital and fund operations and only those with deep pockets survive.

1.3.3.2 Interest Rates
Interest rates are critical as they fundamentally influence investment decisions. The prevailing punitive interest rates on borrowings negatively affect the appetite to borrow by
local Internet Access Providers. Banks are charging an average of twenty percent per annum on loans far above the average five percent at international level. Consequently, Internet Access Providers struggle to improve their operations through borrowings and overdrafts. They survive on hand to mouth which greatly vestiges their growth potential.

1.3.3.3 Exchange Controls and Rates
Exchange controls and unrealistic rates from 2004 to 2008 overly forestall continued survival of the Internet Access Providers. The fixed exchange rates resulted in Internet Access Providers accessing foreign currency at exorbitant rates. Consequently, equipment importation was expensive and little investment accrued in the sector. This is evidenced by the fact that Internet Access Providers licenses were issued in 2004 but there were no operational operators till 2011. It was difficult to invest during that period.

1.3.3.4 Currency
Currency has been pivotal to the success of the sector and its ability to attract investors. Cash shortages badly affected morale during 2007-2009 period. Business operations were constrained. The introduction of multi-currency improved business transactions as confidence was instilled in the sector.

1.3.3.5 Power supply
Internet Access Providers are heavy consumers of electricity. They require electricity to manage data centres, points of presence, base stations and network. Perennial erratic shortages of electricity culminated in high operational costs. Secondary sources of power in form of generators, Uninterrupted Power Suppliers and solar power was installed as redundancy. Consequently, increases in both variable and fixed costs reduced profit margins. Service experience became a nightmare and some Internet Access Providers lost customers and business.

1.3.4 Social Analysis
Social issues are also impacting on the Internet Access Providers sector. Changes in customer taste and demographic composition are pressurising Internet Access Providers to be more effective and efficient. The mobile penetration rate is now more than ninety percent (90%) whilst internet penetration rate is highest in the region. Customers now demand internet twenty four hours. There is considerable growth in demand for internet across all demographics.
1.3.5 Technological Analysis
The impact of technological factors on Internet Access Providers is without any doubt due to the nature of the telecommunications industry. Specifically, emergence of alternative means of communication and innovation globally affects how Internet Access Providers operate. There is considerable emergence of destructive technologies forcing companies to change business models. Internet Access Providers are rolling out open source systems capable of killing TelOne and GSM business models. Billing solutions have evolved from being singular and modular to converged systems capable of billing anything from mobile payments, short messaging services, video, chat and deep packet inspection. Product life cycles have been reduced from six to twelve (6-12) months to one to eight (1-8) weeks including testing. However, inadequate funding incapacitated new technology adoption by Internet Access Providers. Internet Access Providers capitulated to Mobile Network Operators who unleashed destructive technologies for voice and data services. Mobile Network Operators launched mobile data services which destroyed Internet Access Providers mainstream revenues. Consequently, failure to embrace new technologies tantalized Internet Access Providers due to poor service delivery and customer experience.

1.3.6 Environmental
Internet Access Providers are subjected to environmental obligations in the society. In order to supply fibre services, trenches are dug which destroys the environment. Consequently, Environmental Management Association monitors Internet Access Providers activities on the environment. They are also obliged to comply with Safety, Health and Environmental practises across their organisations.

1.4 INTERNET ACCESS PROVIDERS CASE STUDY
1.4.1 Strategy Planning
According to Kreipl and Pinedo (2004), strategy planning is composed of setting management goals and defining measures for their achievement. On the basis of the goals of the super-ordinated level, plans of a current level are formed (Ivanov, 2010). Planning is also considered as an adaptive process that encapsulates the planning and control decisions to be interrelated at all the decision-making levels (Ivanov, 2010).
Internet Access Providers in Zimbabwe employ diverse tools for strategy planning. Aquiver and Liquid Telecoms use the TOGAF model which is more reminiscent of Telecommunications companies. The TOGAF model details methodologies for supporting development of enterprise architecture. The enterprise’s supporting architecture depends on the organisation’s vision and its capabilities. Powertel uses Resource Based Management strategy development and tracking tool. All Internet Access Providers undergo strategy planning sessions at the end of every year. Powertel employs Strategy consultants who assist in developing yearly strategic goals. Africom adopts complex strategy development tools ranging from PESTEL, Porters Fife Forces, MckenseySeven S Model, STOP Methodology at every level of the organisation. All employs in Africom are required to develop strategic initiatives which are monitored by executive management.

1.4.2 Strategy Formulation
Rational planning and logical incrementalism are the two main models of strategy formulation in the management literature (Elbanna, 2006). Where neither of these approaches is present, organizations are likely to lack clearly discernible processes, thereby exhibiting ‘strategy absence’ (Inkpen, 1995). Karami (2007) averred that strategy formulation includes developing a business mission, deciding both short term and long term objectives, and prioritizing strategies to pursue. Strategy formulation is concerned with resource allocation, decisions about diversifications, entry into international markets, merging with suppliers or sale agencies, and participation in joint ventures. Strategy commits an organization to specific products, markets and technologies over an extended period of time.

Most Internet Access Providers strategy formulation follows a hierarchical order. The Vision, Mission statement and Values of the Company are first identified, articulated and communicated to all the staff members. The Vision, Mission and Values is regularly checked by Executive management. The Chief Executive Officer’s, Managing Directors and Executive management are responsible for communicating the Vision, Mission, and Values to staff members. Top Management in these organisations directs strategy formulation exercises. They formulate the super-ordinate Vision of the company. The super-ordinate goals are the Key Success Factors from which different departments’ base their own Key Success Factors. The process of strategy formulation is mainly top down for Aquiver, Aptics, Liquid and Powertel whilst Africom adopts both multi-directional strategy formulation.
1.4.3 **Strategy Implementation**

According to Karami (2007), implementation is the third stage of strategy implementation. Implementation is critical because it impacts successful and effective strategy execution. This stage included task organisation, recruitment and hiring and performance management to ensure alignment of individuals. Africom developed the best strategies for the past three years. It pioneered convergence of data and voice in 2010. It was the first company to implement Voice Over Internet Protocol switch in Zimbabwe and Africa using a switch in Zimbabwe. Africom championed Closed User Group Value Added Services among Zimbabwean Telecommunications and Internet Access Providers companies. However, it never reaped from its strategy ingenuity due to poor implementation. Africom’s chronic deficiency was unstructured way of strategy implementation.

Aptics and Aquiver seemingly suffered similar fate as Africom. They championed adoption of Voice Over Internet Protocol and Borderless communication. However, inadequate financing crippled their strategy implementation. Furthermore, management lacked proper implementation tools to manage and track strategic initiatives. The Resource Based Management tool was adopted by Powertel in 2013 and positive results were achieved in 2013 and 2014 financial periods.

Waweru (2011) revealed that the predictors of strategy implementation include the firm’s capacity to overcome resistance to change, having incentives based on meeting strictly quantitative targets, adopting a win-lose competitive posture, its effectiveness in strategy implementation, and the environmental rate of change. Internet Access Provider’s strategy formulation produced outstanding strategic decisions and plans, but execution diverted from the main course for Aquiver, Aptics, Africom and Valley Technologies. This has been promulgated by a lack of defined implementation process that ensures success. All Internet Access Providers adopted performance management, balanced score card as tools for strategy implementation, but problems in strategy implementation procured. These includes failing to meet deadlines, doing activities away from strategic focus, non-alignment of staff and departments.
1.4.4 **Strategy Review and Performance**

Internet Access Providers review their strategies every quarter. Powertel uses resource based performance management system that was developed by the government for state enterprises. All Powertel employees have a performance contract that is liked to organisations strategic goals. Africom uses the Balanced Score Card for strategy reviews. Individuals are reviewed on a monthly and quarterly basis. Africom introduced another tool called SPR (Strategy Performance Reward) which linked Strategy to Performance and Reward.

Aquiver, Valley Technologies and Aptics are devoid of effective strategy review tools. These organisations experienced poor strategy implementation resulting from lack of successful strategy review, lack of resources and high staff turnover. Inadequate rewarding system suffocated efforts for successful strategy implementation and review. Valley Technologies abandoned performance management following labour unrest after failing to reward employees from an improperly implemented performance management system.

1.5 **Statement of the problem**

In today's difficult market, Internet Access Providers faces the most daunting set of challenges than before. The traditional Internet Service business has matured and no longer provides an engine for revenue growth, yet the much-hyped data market and Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) has not matured sufficiently to deliver continued growth. Mounting debt and unfriendly capital markets have limited the ability of Internet Access Providers to invest in new infrastructure. Intense competition from Mobile Network Operators, Over the Top Operators resulted in downward spiralling of revenues. Internet Access Providers has to take practical steps to weather this storm and effectively access new market opportunities.

Strategy implementation is crucial for the survival of Internet Access Providers who are faced with existential threats from Mobile Network Operators and Over the Top services Operators. Zimbabwean Internet Access Providers understand the importance of strategy from planning, formulation, implementation to review. However, there is inadequate attention to the
variables that affect strategy implementation. Internet Access Provider’s management develop world class strategic objectives and initiatives which are rarely implemented.

Furthermore, no consideration and emphasis is placed on the effects of non-managerial employee’s perceptions or opinions of strategy implementation obstacles. Internet Access Provider’s management mostly adopt top down approach to strategy implementation without understanding how non-managerial employee’s perceptions of implementation problems can impact strategy success. Non managerial employees are non-existent in the strategy process. These employees are exposed to the brutality of implementation challenges which greatly influence their morale, motivation, attitudes and consequently their overall perception of the strategy. Resultantly, Internet Access Providers are not clear of how perceptions of non-managerial employees on strategy implementation obstacles can influence the success of their strategies. Management wrongly react to non-managerial employees issues with ineffective solutions that further decapitates successfully strategy implementation.

1.6 Research Objectives

The main aim of the study is to understand how employee’s perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation process influence organisation performance.

The area of study will be focussed on, but not limited to, the obstacles of strategy implementation or execution of business strategy, particularly as applicable to the Internet Access Providers industry.

Specifically the research will have the following sub objectives:

1) To identify the main obstacles of strategy implementation in Internet Access Providers industry
2) To determine the main strategic implementation drivers of organisational performance within Internet Access Providers
3) To develop a conceptual framework/tool of strategy implementation that incorporate employee perceptions
4) To investigate how employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles affects organisational performance
5) To provide managerial and policy recommendations on strategy implementation and organisation performance

1.7 Research Questions
The main research question in this study will be to find out how employees’ perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles influence organisational performance. Does employee perceptions of strategy obstacles influence organisation performance? Below are the sub research questions:

1) What are the main obstacles to strategy implementation for Internet Access Providers?
2) What are the main drivers of strategy implementation for Internet Access Providers?
3) Is there a conceptual framework that incorporates employee perceptions in strategy implementation?
4) Does employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles influence organisation performance?
5) How is strategy currently being implemented by Internet Access Providers and what are the main impediments?

1.8 Research Hypothesis
The following hypothesis will be tested in the study:

Employees’ perceptions (opinions) of strategy implementation obstacles influence organisational performance

1.9 Justification of the Study
The study will elucidate obstacles to strategy implementation as perceived by non-managerial staff. It will reveal how employee perceptions can affect strategy execution and therefore strategy attainment and organisational performance. Management can utilise the results to develop strategies for successful strategy implementation. The study emancipate non-managerial staff to divulge critical success factors to strategy execution. It aims to provide a structured model of strategy implementation that can improve company performance, competitiveness and staff morale. This study will recommend a strategy implementation
framework that is suitable for Internet Access Providers which can easily be integrated into their business processes and environment. Employees’ perceptions about strategy obstacles will help management and board members to have hands on appreciation of occurrences at the lowest level in the organisation.

The study will develop a strategy implementation model that incorporates employee perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles. The tool will be ground breaking and valuable to the academic field and strategy profession. Previous strategy implementation studies focused on top management without considering the perceptions of non-managerial staff. This study will close this gap by considering how employee perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles are critical to strategy implementation and organisation performance.

Furthermore, the study seek to improve strategy implementation among Internet Access Providers and other related industries. Management will understand the existing strategy implementation obstacles and drivers. The study will recommend methodologies to neutralise strategy implementation obstacles and exploit strategy implementation drivers. Consequently, utilising key findings in this study will help strategy implementation.

are critical to be part of strategy implementation because they are the executors of the strategy. They can unlock strategy and therefore their perceptions should be considered. Non-managerial employees has been rendered less important in strategy execution, but the researcher seeks to establish the benefits of managing non-managerial staff’s perceptions on the overall strategic process and organisation performance.

1.10 Scope of Study

The scope of this study will be confined to non-managerial employees of Internet Access Providers. The perceptions of employees on obstacles to strategy implementation being experienced within Internet Access Providers can be generalised for other organisations within Internet Access Providers in Zimbabwe. All Internet Access Providers’ non-managerial employees within Zimbabwe only will be considered in the study. Five organisations within Internet Access Providers will partake in the study.
Non managerial employees are considered important because of the research gap and problem that has been highlighted in previous sections. All employees despite their work period will be eligible to participate in the study. This is because, the study need to investigate perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles within Internet Access Providers and how these perceptions influences organisational performance.

1.11 Organisation of the study
The research is empirical in nature. It will include a theoretical study encompassing literature review of strategy implementation obstacles and conceptual models of strategy implementation. The information under review will critically analyse employee perceptions and how they affect organisational performance. Chapter 2 is a literature review for the study whilst Chapter 3 is about Research methodology which justifies the research philosophy and methods selected. Chapter 4 is about data analysis where the data collected is critically investigated and presented. Finally, Chapter 5 is on the research findings and recommendations.

1.12 Summary
This chapter has introduced the research to be undertaken. It started by background of the study and the environmental analysis of the Internet Access Providers industry. Internet Access Providers Case study was explained deeply to provide an understanding of how strategy is being implemented among the Internet Access Providers. Employee perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation should be considered in strategy management. Management should consider non-managerial employees at every stage of the strategy management process. In order to achieve organisational and individual performance objectives, perceptions of non-managerial employees on obstacles to strategy implementation should be considered.
CHAPTER 2

2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews and analyses literature from previous research studies related to the study. The research aims to establish how non-managerial perceptions on obstacles to strategy implementation influence organisation performance, consequently, the chapter gives a brief explanation of the strategy management process as articulated by authoritative authors and researchers. Emphasis of strategy formulation particularly the different approaches, processes and how formulation influences employee perceptions and therefore organisational performance will be explained. The chapter will explore and probe strategy implementation, dicing on roles of different actors and their influence to strategy implementation. Obstacles to strategy implementation are critically reviewed to build a strong base for the study. These obstacles are applied on the study as main variables through which employee perceptions are measured against, hence, their scrutiny should be overemphasised. Employee perceptions and behaviour cements the chapter with review on influences to strategy achievement and organisation performance. Finally, the Chapter is cemented by a proposed conceptual model based on reviewed literature of existing strategy implementation models.

2.2 The Design School

There are several ways of classifying, studying and reviewing strategic management. Mintzberg (1998) classified strategic management into ten schools which can be categorised into two main groups. The Prescriptive school encompasses Design, Planning and Positioning School whereas the Descriptive school has the other seven schools being: Entrepreneurial, Cognitive, Learning, Political, Cultural and Environmental School.

The literature review will be based on the principles of the Design School. The Design School proposes a “non – complex model which perceives the process of strategic formation
as a design process to reach a satisfactory balance between internal distinctive competence and external threat and opportunity” (Sarbah and Otu-nyarko, 2014, p.1). Strategy formation should be a conscious, informal and controlled process of thought(Mintzberg, 1990).

The prescriptive view of strategy formulation under the Design School concentrates more on how strategy should be formulated than how it is. Consequently, it propounds processes to be followed during strategy formulation up to implementation. The School proposed SWOT model to identify fit between internal capabilities and external opportunities and threats in the marketplace. The SWOT analysis is a critical tool required to further formalise into a more systematic approach where strategy formulation consists of developing, formalizing and implementing an explicit plan (Mintzberg ,1998;Sarbah and Otu-nyarko, 2014). This study will utilise Strategy Management Process as a classical school derived from Mintzberg as it considers how strategy should be formulated as outlined in following sections of this Chapter.

2.3 Strategy Management Process

The main purpose of the study is to understand how non-managerial employee’s perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation process influences organisation performance. However, in order to understand the subject of strategy implementation, it is of utmost importance to review strategy management process models.Kazmi (2008, p.7)cited Alexander saying, “The key reason why implementation fails is that practicing executives, managers and supervisors do not have practical models to guide their actions during implementation”. Consequently, the study will use the model by Wheelen and Hunger (2012) and consider how every stage of the strategy management process can either mediate, moderate or inhibit strategy achievement and organisation performance. The assessment of strategy management processes becomes crucial for practitioners and researchers alike in order to conduct and evaluate different formulation processes(Acur and Englyst, 2006).

Wheelen and Hunger (2012) posited that strategy management process is divided into four stages namely: environmental scanning, strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation. Figure 2.1 is a representation of the strategy management process.
The following section will analyse and explain the different stages of the strategy management processes as articulated from previous literature.

### 2.4 Strategy Planning and Environmental Scanning

Kreipl and Pinedo (2004) gave an explication that planning is composed of setting management goals and defining measures for their achievement. Environment Scanning incorporates external and internal scanning (Wheelen and Hunger, 2012). Shapiro (2012) exhorted that, a strategic planning process is not something that can happen in an *ad hoc* way, at a regular planning meeting or during a staff meeting. It requires careful planning to set it up so that the process is thorough and comprehensive. Andrews *et al.*, (2009) espoused that rational planning is characterized by analytical, formal and logical processes through which organizations scan the internal and external environment, and develop policy options which differ from the status quo. The options that are generated by this process are evaluated prior to the setting of organizational targets, which are then regularly reviewed and monitored (Mintzberg, 1998; Shapiro, 2012).

### 2.5 Strategy Formulation

Two central facets of strategic management are the ways in which strategy is formed, referred to as strategy formulation, and the substance of those decisions, or strategy content (Andrews *et al.*, 2009). Elbanna and Child (2007), revealed that rational planning and logical incrementalism are the two main models of strategy formulation in the management literature (Blahová and Knápková, 2011). Andrews *et al.* (2009) concurred with Inkpen (1995) that where neither rational planning nor logical incrementalism is present, organizations are likely to lack clearly discernible processes, thereby exhibiting strategy absence.

In contrast, a new generation of researchers Baert *et al.* (2013) criticised conventional strategy formulation processes. Arguably, strategy formulation should start by looking at the problem...
than the solution. Problem formulation is the core and determines what problem is solved and ultimately the quality of the solution in strategy formulation (Baer et al., 2013). The proposal is unique in that it integrates theories of individual and group behaviour with theories of strategic decision making (Baer et al., 2013).

Gavetti and Rivkin (2008) consider both deliberate and emergent views as incomplete. They miss other important ways to search for a strategy, approaches that lie between deliberation and emergence (Blahová and Knápková, 2011). Gavetti and Rivkin (2008) supported analogical reasoning which enabled forward thinking organisations to employ analogies with great care and precede competitors.

Depperu and Gnan (2006) contrasted all literature by assuming the outer context as more critical in strategy formulation than inner context. They propounded that, the relationships that occur between the competitive environments of the firm for each of its Strategic Business Areas, the strategic needs that arise because of the specific characteristics of the competitive environment, influences the way strategy is formulated.

2.6 Employee Perceptions of strategy formulation
Andrews et al. (2009, p.4) postulated that, “strategy formulation is a political process where actors within organizations may have conflicting views on the most appropriate ways to meet organizational goals. How these are reconciled is reflected in the strategy making process”. Political conflicts may be over resource allocation, policy goals or organizational power, inside or outside the organization (Elbanna and Child, 2007). Johansson and Winroth (2010) asserted that management needs to consciously allow employees to participate in decision making and bottom up implementation. Nutt (1986) was able to show that implementation styles based on cooperation rather than edicts, thus transferring some decision authority to relevant employees proved to produce nearly doubled success rates as compared to edict style. Verlag and Studies (2010) and Kaplan and Norton (2005) argued that if employees are not involved in strategy formulation and are unaware of the strategy they cannot help implement it effectively. Klöning (2010) indicated that if employees are not able to understand how a given strategy will influence their own as well as the company’s future performance, they perceive this strategy as questionable and thus are not inclined to follow its course. Some employees simply lack the willingness for implementing new strategic plans.
since they are rooted in former routines of doing business. This lack of commitment mostly results in avoidance, thereby compromising strategy achievement.

Neilson et al. (2008) said that even companies that are good at implementation had their employees perceiving strategy formulation taking too long and translation of strategic decisions into operational decision as sluggish. This study seeks to understand what will be the effect of such perceptions on implementation and organisation performance. Failure to adopt an idea or innovation can arise from an in-group bias among employees within an organizational subunit that leads the subunit’s members to undervalue systematically ideas associated with members of the organization outside their subunit (Management and Haven, 2013). Kloninger (2010) analysed employee self-interests as a major impact on strategy formulation. As Guth and MacMillan (1986) pointed out, every employee will analyse the perceived consequences of given strategies and strategic changes. They act accordingly by promoting strategies which are favourable to their goals and impedes those disadvantageous to their individual goals. Differences in the goals of middle-level managers and employees can lead to major differences in their perceptions of the desirability of the strategy being selected.

2.7 Strategy Implementation

The process of strategy implementation cannot be divorced from strategy formulation. Cocks (2010) research emphasised the need for balancing strategy formulation with strategy execution. Organisational success requires constant review and connection between strategy formulation and execution with each component feeding and growing off the other in an organic way. Strategy formulation and strategy implementation should thus be considered as two sides of the same coin (Wheelen and Hunger, 2012; Barbosa and Romero, 2012; Hrebiniak, 2006).

Wheelen and Hunger (2012) propounded that strategy implementation is the sum total of the activities and choices required for the execution of a strategic plan. Hrebiniak (2006) supported the argument by viewing implementation as administration and organisation of work activities. According to Bossidy and Charan (2011) implementation is a specific set of behaviours and techniques that companies must master to have competitive advantage (Junior and Zatti, 2013). According to Neilson et al. (2008) strategy execution is the result of
hundreds of decisions made every day by employees acting in accordance with the information they have and their own interests (Junior and Zatti, 2013).

2.8 Strategy Implementation Actors

2.8.1 Role of Top Management

Sorooshian and Dodangeh (2013) explained that top managers are critical for strategy implementation because of the power they wield in the organisation (Wheelen and Hunger, 2012). Sorooshian et al. (2010) revealed that successful strategy realization is identified by coherence of decisions and actions of all employee resources at all levels of the organisation and not simply by people who described the strategy. Top management makes decisions that affects structure, direction, operations, performance, resource allocations and even human resources (Helfat et al., 2006). Acur and Englyst (2006) overemphasised top management’s importance in strategy implementation by considering their role as that of overseer or gatekeeper, reconciling the proposals of various organisational subunits into an overall plan for the organisation. Top management influence strategy formulation process through their experience and interests in the organisation.

According to Savaneviciene and Stankeviciute (2011, p.412),“top management and line managers are key actors in the process of bringing strategic directions to the practical environment as they define where to go”. Camelo et al. (2010) acknowledged that top management’s beliefs and interpretations guide strategic actions of organisations. Savaneviciene and Stankeviciute (2011) stated that leader’s focus is crucial to initiate and provide direction to the organizational change process (Camelo et al., 2010). Cole, Harris, and Bernerth (2006) alluded that change results in uncertainty. It is prerogative of top management to offer clear rationale for transformation and inculcate acceptance from other employees of organization (Moore et al., 2010). Therefore, actions of top management help create enduring organisational change to employees (Cole et al., 2006; Savaneviciene and Stankeviciute, 2011). Moreover, new strategies demands commitment from top management through support and risk taking attitude. Encouragement to overcome implementation problems and attitude towards risk by top management can either moderate or mediate effect of communication on organisation performance (Rodriguez, Perez and Gutierrez, 2008).
2.8.2 Role of Middle Management

Hales (2007) stated that, line managers often perform their duties under situations of considerable ambiguity. They have limited authority and influence on decisions to determine effectiveness yet they are accountable for operational effectiveness. McCarthy, Darcy, and Grady (2010) supported that by viewing line managers as agencies between strategic and operational activities. Line managers should harness commitment and co-operation through inspiring, encouraging, and enabling and facilitating change of (the organization’s) employees (Manville et al., 2012). Similar expressions were shared by Savaneviciene and Stankeviciute (2011) that line managers are responsible for the actual practise of strategy prescribed by top management. McGurk (2009) criticised middle managers as political obstacles to change. Middle managers play a critical role of interpreting and framing strategic objectives for front-line staff (Rouleau and Balogun, 2011) because they bridge the hiatus between top management and front-line staff (Mayer and Smith, 2007). Furthermore, Aranda and Arellano (2010) concluded that organisational performance does not depend not only on the quality of the strategy but primarily on its successful implementation. This successful implementation, in turn, depends on the degree of similarity among managers’ strategic priorities. Consensus (similarity or common understanding) among managers’ priorities were found to be key drivers for successful strategy implementation. Skilled managers are able to use their knowledge of their organizational context and their colleagues/subordinates/seniors to influence those around them to adopt their point of view (Rouleau and Balogun, 2011).

2.8.3 Role of Employees

Low level employees are equally critical in successful strategy implementation and mechanisms are required to direct all employees towards same strategy implementation (Sorooshian et al., 2010). Employee commitment results in psychological attachment to the organisation which enables them to expend discretionary effort towards achieving organizational results (Macky and Boxall, 2007). Savaneviciene and Stankeviciute (2011) stated that employees on the shop-floor and front line understand directions of strategy in different circumstances and can feed line managers with transparent descriptions of the strategy. Cocks (2010) emphasised that staff should be involved in strategy planning process to be enthusiastic about implementation. Emergent ideas and tactics through intuition and suggestions from people who are in touch with actual tasks can change the fortunes of a company (Giner et al., 2010). Common understanding of strategy by staff is arguably one of
the key determinants of successful strategy implementation (Aranda and Arellano, 2010). Strategy is formulated at the top, but it must be executed at the bottom. If employees do not understand the strategy or are not motivated to achieve it, the enterprise’s strategy is bound to fail (Kaplan and Norton, 2010).

2.9 Obstacles to strategy Implementation

It is ultimately critical to review obstacles to strategy implementation to aide understanding of these factors. Strategy implementation has been viewed as the most critical component of strategy success if the strategy is good. Darmin, Sumarwan, Daryanto, and Kirbrandoko (2013) illuminated that a company’s ability to implement its strategy successfully is a result of its ability to overcome obstacles leading to poor strategy implementation. Researchers used different perspectives to identify obstacles to strategy implementation. Alexander (1985) pinpointed twenty-two hindrances to strategy implementation. Alexander (1991) observed ten obstacles to strategy implementation. Al-Ghamdi, 1998 researched twenty implementation obstacles whilst Shah's (2005) research revealed twenty-one obstacles to strategy achievement. Kalali et al. (2011) postulated sixteen problems related to the failure of implementation of strategic decisions. These researches lacked structured approach and they only listed problems. They were not built within the specific framework of the strategic management process (Darmin et al., 2013). Therefore, Hrebinjak (2006) highlighted the importance of a structured approach to strategy implementation. Consequentially, he proposed that a good strategy should come first to ensure successful implementation.

Darmin et al. (2013) research considered the influence of strategy implementation problems on strategy implementation success and firm performance. Their survey on sixty Indonesian firms revealed seven new major factors as influencing strategy implementation being: (1) problems related to corporate scorecard, (2) key performance indicators, (3) information technology, (4) competence, (5) performance appraisal, (6) strategy management office and (7) financial support.

2.10 Categorisation of Obstacles

Darmin et al. (2013) grouped obstacles of strategy implementation into two categories being those factors which are related to steps in strategy implementation followed with problems
which are related to organizational supporting factors to implement strategy. In contrast, Ivančić (2013) grouped obstacles into internal and external impediments. Internal factors have a direct impact on strategy implementation while external factors usually have a moderating or mediating effect on strategy performance. Other researchers suggested two general dimensions in strategy implementation obstacles: the structural view (firm structure and control mechanisms) and the interpersonal process view (strategic consensus, behaviours, organizational climate, communication and interaction processes) (Noble, 1999). Another dimension is dichotomising obstacles into: soft factors (people oriented factors: communications, consensus and commitment), hard factors (institutional factors: organizational structure and administrative system) and mixed factors (strategy formulation, Strategic Business Unit relationship among different hierarchical levels and strategy etc.) (Li et al., 2008). Earlier work by Simkin (2002) proposed seven components of managerial barriers, human resource barriers, cultural barriers, conceptual barriers, structural barriers, strategic barriers, operational barriers as categories of strategy implementation obstacles. Rahimnia, Polychronakis, and Sharp (2009) concluded that the main impeders of strategy implementation can be grouped into five main areas: planning consequences, organisational, individual, managerial and environmental.

2.11 Critical Analysis of Obstacles

2.11.1 Strategy Formulation
Strategy formulation involves setting company vision, mission and values of the organisation. The vision is translated into a strategy with goals and objectives to be achieved (Cocks, 2010). The inability to create a clear direction in mission, vision and strategy statement and socialize it to all employees impedes strategy implementation (Darmin et al., 2013; Aaltonen and Ilävälko, 2002). Kaplan and Norton (2010) explained that lack of vision was one of the main barriers to strategy implementation. Only twenty to forty percent of the companies have strategic targets set in their strategies, less than ten percent of employees understand the strategy. Findings by Cole et al. (2006) showed that a three-way interaction between vision clarity, vision appropriateness, and vision execution was found to predict managers’ job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and role ambiguity which later influenced strategy implementation success.
Top management monopolise strategy formulation and expect their subordinates to implement those formulated strategies. Failure to involve implementers at the formulation stage is a major problem that cannot be ignored. The implementers do not own the strategic plan, and therefore they shun it (Dandira, 2011). Participative strategic formulation increases employee commitment to the organisation and strategy implementation. Furthermore, increased personnel commitment enables more rapid strategy implementation and improves both the strategy-environment fit and, consequently, company performance (Kohtamäki et al., 2012). Guth and MacMillan (1986) explained challenges experienced in top down strategy formulation approach between top management, middle management and low level employees (Kloninger, 2010). Low or even non-existing commitment of employees can occur if predicted strategy outcome does not agree with that of employees. This could lead to passive rejection or even active sabotage of strategic plans. If the perceived degree of goal alignment and attainment is low, the individual's commitment to the strategy will be low, so the amount of effort an employee would be willing to put forward to implement the strategy will be low (Guth and MacMillan, 1986).

We develop the following hypothesis on strategy formulation:

H1-0: Employee perceptions of strategy formulation positively influences organisational performance

2.11.2 Performance Management

Performance management is critical for successful strategy implementation. Performance management includes setting up corporate and departmental score cards and performance indicators (Kaplan and Norton, 2010). Personal scorecard cascades from departmental scorecard and it serves as a management process to ascertain that the strategy is everyone’s responsibility. Moreover, another problem affecting poor strategy implementation relates to the lack of clear key performance indicators for each person or positions to support achievement of corporate strategy (Simons, 2000; Kaplan and Norton, 2010). Darmin et al. (2013) revealed absence of performance appraisal based on Key Performance Indicator Appraisal and individual performance not tied to compensation as barrier to successful strategy implementation. One of the reasons why companies often fail to translate strategy into action has to do with the performance measurement system, because they fail to collect the right information to monitor progress towards their strategic goals (Jusoh and Parnell, 2008).
Associated with performance management is lack of control and monitoring systems. Teeratansirikool, Siengthai, Badir, and Charoenngam (2013) affirmed that firms formulate strategy to attain its long-term goals using control systems to measure progress toward goals and make necessary adjustments. Kazmi (2008) alluded strategy implementation failure to setting down of unclear measures of effectiveness linked to performance management. If no routine and integrative system exists in the company to control, monitor and review the implementation and achievement of business targets, then the strategy implementation becomes ineffective (Darmin et al., 2013; Kaplan and Norton, 2010). After all has been done, compensation is perceived as the most important element hindering strategy implementation (Aaltonen and Ikävalko, 2002).

Umashev and Willett (2008) highlighted that perceptual evidence from employees indicated that performance management systems failed because of (a) a cascading problem existed; (b) the cascading of indicators rather than goals and (c) an inflexible top-down approach was adopted to the implementation. Also, perceived differences in performance management especially to the use of performance management tools resulted in difficulties to monitor and track strategy implementation. Most low level employees perceive that Performance Management System does not empower them (Umashev and Willett, 2008). In other organisations, Performance Management System entails a state of perceived vulnerability or risk that is derived from individuals' uncertainty regarding the motives, intentions, and prospective actions of managers on whom they depend. This perception insinuate strategy implementation failure through performance management (Macky and Boxall, 2007). Employees reciprocated their perception of performance management’s fairness, accuracy and management’s trustworthiness through increased loyalty and commitment. If management avail more resources to employees, this elevates their positive perception of managerial support and lead to improved strategy achievement (Ahearne et al., 2014).

The following hypothesis was developed for performance management:

H2-1: 0: Employee perceptions of performance management positively influences organisational performance
2.11.3 Organisation Variables

Organisation obstacles relates to structure, culture and competence (Darmin et al., 2013). Shah (2005) found that indistinct structure and unclear lines of responsibility are parts of the main obstacles in strategy implementation. Unclear organizational structure makes employees confused and frustrated, and impedes successful strategy implementation (Roth et al., 1991).

Organizational culture defined as dominant ideologies, traditions, values and standards is highly rated as an obstacle to strategy implementation (Li et al., 2008). Max Saunders, Mann, and Smith (2008) inferred that implementing new strategy requires making changes in taken-for-granted assumptions and routines that are elements of culture. Organizational culture underpins success in strategy implementation (Darmin et al., 2013). An initiative that matches the culture of an organisation can ensure a rapid and successful implementation. A study by Aaltonen and Ikävalko (2002) highlighted the importance of organisational structure and culture receptive to change in order to increase effective strategy implementation. Tan (2004) also noted the importance of positive culture commitment and loyalty of employees to support the strategy implementation. Unclear or negative corporate culture may lead to poor strategy implementation. Aldehayyat, Khattab, and Anchor (2011) concluded that strong cultures can either enhance or inhibit the ability of organisations to develop and execute effective strategies, depending on the compatibility of culture with the chosen strategic direction (Glaister et al., 2009).

Competence has been raised by many researchers as an impediment to strategy implementation (Alexander, 1985; Shah, 2005; Al-Ghamdi, 1998; Kalali et al., 2011). Shah (2005) pointed out that insufficient capabilities of employees can result from lack of training and instruction on strategy implementation leading to poor organisational performance. Kazmi (2008) asserted that lack of proper and effective change management may lead to poor strategy implementation. New strategies require change, whether it is structural, cultural, or operational (Darmin et al., 2013). Kaplan and Norton (2010) groundbreaking research exposed lack of a strategic management office that oversee/monitor strategy implementation causing implementation problems. Organisations should have a dedicated office or people responsible for managing and monitoring strategy execution and enhance the organisation’s capabilities.
Some business leaders seem unconcerned about people or, even worse, create a negative organization culture, condemn managers and workers to a situation in which going to work is difficult. In these cultures employee perceptions towards job insecurity became a reality and they are often consumed thinking about the security of their jobs rather than thinking about how to increase performance. Their cognitive culture perceptions of the organization transcends from fear to negativity. Negative perceptions of organizational cultures create an environment where complacency and compliance become safe behaviours. Low employee engagement and participation result in poor organisation performance (Longenecker et al., 1999). Furthermore, negative culture results in lack of trust, negative attitudes, non-acceptor and resistive behaviours by employees (Verlag and Studies, 2010). This usually results in poor or inadequate information and knowledge sharing between individuals and/or business units responsible for strategy implementation (Hrebiniaak, 2006). Organizational climate and culture research also suggest that employees form similar perceptions of their unit’s or organization’s safety, service, and innovation climate which either hinder or drive strategy performance (Gong et al., 2013).

Tan (2004) revealed that structure was felt to have caused implementation problems. It created multiplication of efforts between different departments. In addition to causing confusion, the structure increased perception of silo mentality within each of the departments of the organisation. In their results some departments perceived themselves to be more responsible in taking initiatives and their performance was good. This showed a number of things: one, the different departments had different perceptions of the process; two, they do not fully understand their responsibilities; and three, their perceptions of the outcome of the strategy are different. For an implementation to be successful, the differences in perception from all parties needed to be overcome (Engdahl, Keating and Aupperle, 2000). Caniëls and Stobbeleir (2014) research found that employees perceive a transparent organisation structure with clarity procedures as critical to acquire financial resources and political backing for their ideas and information sharing thereby promoting creative idea generation. Use of flat, team-based organizational structures, quality improvement or problem-solving groups allow individual workers some degree of autonomy in determining their work methods and priorities, and strategies for enabling better communication among employees and with management (Macky and Boxall, 2007).
Seijts and Roberts (2011) investigated how individual characteristics, work-related attitudes, and perceptions concerning the organizational context relate to employees’ views regarding the success of an ongoing change effort. The effect of perceived sense of competence, affective commitment, satisfaction with organizational members, perceived opportunities to participate in decision making, perceived opportunities for growth and development, and respect in the workplace on the perceived success to change the working atmosphere in an organization. They demonstrated that these perceptual variables are a crucial ingredient of leading a successful change effort and therefore organisation performance.

Droussiotis and Austin (2007) expanded Lee, Ashford, and Bobko (1990) research on group level issues of organisation behaviour. The group level issues included group decision making, leadership/trust, work teams, conflict, power/politics, communication, and group structure (Robbins, 2001). The amount of control/autonomy employees have in the workplace also impacts job satisfaction. For example, Type A employees who perceive they have control have better performance and higher levels of job satisfaction than those who perceive they have little control over their jobs (Lee et al., 1990). Savery and Luks (2001) found that employees who have autonomy in decision making have lower job stress than other employees and also have the highest levels of job satisfaction. While Wagner (1994) proposed that participation significantly affects performance and satisfaction, he found the average size of these effects to be small. Research also shows that employees who have more work variety and more job autonomy are more satisfied than employees in very bureaucratic organizations (Finlay et al., 1995).

We developed the following hypothesis for Organisational Variables:

H2-2:0: Employee perceptions of organisational variables positively influences organisational performance

2.11.4 Leadership and Management

Bossidy and Charan (2011) stated that strategy execution is not just tactics, it is a discipline and a system that have to be built into a company’s strategy, goals, and culture. The leader of the organization must be deeply engaged in it, for it is not top leaders’ formal strategies that
determine how business gets done, but all the managers and leaders who make decisions in a
daily manner (Darmin et al., 2013). Shah’s (2005) summarised that inadequacy in
management skills and leadership and direction provided by departmental managers, along
with poor comprehension of roles, may affect the quality of strategy implementation. Bower
and Gilbert (2007) revealed that managers’ everyday decisions can create or destroy a
company’s strategy (Tan, 2004).

Szabla (1961, p.6) ground breaking research suggested that, “a significant relationship exists
between the perception of planned organizational change leadership strategy and response to
change along cognitive, emotional, and intentional dimensions. Hypothesis testing revealed
that perception of a rational-empirical or normative-reeducative change leadership strategy
elicits positive responses along cognitive, emotional, and intentional dimensions; perception
of a power-coercive strategy produces ambivalence across those dimensions”.

Jooste and Fourie (2009) emphatically explained the importance of employee perceptions on
strategic leadership actions on strategy implementation. They concluded that positive
perception of employees on leadership actions on strategy implementation helps improve
strategy implementation (Macky and Boxall, 2007). Management practises build and shape
employees cognitive perceptions of trust, vulnerability or threat and support of employees
interests. Lindorff (2009) successfully proved that lack of trust in leadership result in negative
employee perceptions. This is unfortunate, as trust in senior management is positively
associated with job satisfaction and career security, affective commitment to the organisation
and perceptions of job security, and negatively associated with change cynicism and turnover
intention (Albrecht 2003; Dvir et al., 2004).

Leadership Hypothesis:
H2-3:0: Employee perceptions of leadership positively influences organisational performance

2.11.5 Communication
Numerous researchers emphasized the importance of communication during the process of
strategy implementation (Alexander, 1985; Schaap, 2006; Li et al., 2008; Darmin et al., 2013).
Communication was raised by (Ivančić, 2013; Li et al., 2008; Schaap, 2008; Rapert,
Velliquette, and Garretson, 2002) as a premise to realize commitment, consensus and helps employees to know more organisation’s vision, objectives and strategy (Ouakouak, 2013). Management should communicate the strategy effectively. Frequent vertical communication and constant adequate communication with functional managers enhanced understanding of the strategy and improves implementation success. Lack of clear, open and supportive communication during strategy formulation, and within the organisation resulted in poor implementation (Pump, Centre, and Dutka, 2013; Buluma, Keror, and Bonuke, 2013). Beer and Eisenstat (2000) revealed that two out of six of the silent killers to implementation (unclear strategy and conflicting priorities; and poor vertical communication) identified, relate to managers being effective communicators. This showed that communication can be a significant barrier to strategy implementation (Cma, 2013; Al-Ghamdi, 1998).

Adsit, London, Crom, and Jones (1996) pointed that employee attitudes of communications can be used to predict organisational performance. Management communicates to ensure employees understand organisation strategies. Employee perceptions of managerial communication and organizational strategies are important to customer satisfaction and departmental performance (Adsit et al., 1996).

Macky and Boxall (2007) cited (Guest, 1999; Rhoades, 2002) postulating that practises that foster two-way communication and build employee perceptions of fairness inculcate improved employee attitudes. Positive perceptions cognitively build trust in management and organisational commitment. Consequently, organisational performance is enhanced (Macky and Boxall, 2007). There is support that middle manager’s uncertainty may be aided by their perception that they received effective communication with senior management (Herzig and Jimmieson, 2006). Ineffective communication creates perceptual gaps about the organisation’s current position and its future strategy leading to poor execution (Cocks, 2010).

The following communication hypothesis was developed:

H2-4:0: Employee perceptions of communication positively influences organisational performance
2.11.6 Resources

The strategy implementation stages may be carried out well, but if an organization does not place its capabilities into implementing strategy, then the strategy becomes ineffective (Darmin et al., 2013). Resources are classified as either tangible or intangible resources (Ivančić, 2013; Perrott, 2011). Companies with good strategy, but with negative cashflow, will not be able to support all strategy implementation activities (Miller and Dess, 1997). Resources are critical because they enable the firm to take advantage of opportunities in the environment (Li et al., 2008). Furthermore, findings indicate that firms dedicating attention to the alignment of resources are able to “realize significantly greater successes in their strategy implementation” (Chimhanzi and Morgan, 2005). Shah (2005) added poor information system resources as one of the main obstacles to successful strategy implementation. Information systems result in capabilities by activating, managing, and achieving strategy effectiveness. Lack of support from information technology systems inhibits an organization’s capability to implement strategy successfully (Darmin et al., 2013). Organization must have sufficient resources and capabilities to implement strategies so as to avoid capability gaps. Resources need to be translated into capabilities that will effectively support strategies (Perrott, 2011).

Wiley (2010) concluded that resource conceptualization and development of resources in a dynamically complex and highly competitive industry with homogeneous resources influences strategy performance. Different expectations about the value of strategies may reflect uncertainty in the competitive environment facing firms or misunderstanding of the processes underlying the strategy (Barney, 1986). Elbanna (2006) reported that successful decisions were more likely to result from decision processes for which resources were available. These findings may suggest a positive interaction between rationality and performance which, in turn, influences strategic decision success.

Rahman, Hussain, and Haque (2011) model’s results indicated that scarce resources are a significant determinant of superior politics. In addition, path analysis results showed that superior politics and scarce resources have a significant negative association with organisation performance. The model test findings also demonstrated that superior politics and scarce resources are negatively associated with job satisfaction.
Also, companies focus on short term profits where resources are perceived to be limited or inadequate (Barbosa and Romero, 2012). In similar situations, political conflicts might arise over resource allocation (Rahman et al., 2011). This might result in employee despondence and counterproductive (Andrews et al., 2009; Jones et al., 2008). Ramseook-munhurrun and Naidoo (2009) pointed that perceptions related to tangibles such as “modern-looking equipment”, “resources in the workplace” and “comfortable and attractive workplace environment” have been significant in explaining overall job satisfaction and employee engagement (Choo et al., 2013) which are antecedents to organisation performance. All these form of job resources may assist employees to reduce their physiological and psychological costs at work, which aid them to complete their jobs easily. Subsequently, these job resources motivate them to dedicate more energy and time in work (García-Morales et al., 2006; Bakker et al., 2003; Choo et al., 2013). This research seeks to establish how employee perceptions affects strategy performance considering that low level employees make few decisions regarding resource allocations (Bower and Gilbert, 2007). Employees can redirect a strategy or improve it through different perceptual cognitions (Li et al., 2008). They can resist management decisions as in the case of Intel’s intended strategy to move from the memory business and Toyota’s entrance into low-cost vehicles. In both cases, employee perceptions were against management and the strategic change took longer to implement due to negative perceptions (Bower and Gilbert, 2007).

Villiers-Scheepers (2012) revealed that time and resource availability influences employees’ perceptions of the feasibility of entrepreneurial behavior, more specifically resource availability for entrepreneurial activities (Pinchot, 1985; Covin and Slevin 1991; Kreiser et al., 2002).

The following hypothesis was developed for Resources:

H2-5:0: Employee perceptions of resources positively influences organisational performance

2.11.7 Environment

Successful organisations stay tuned to their external environments and adapt quickly and flexibly by changing their internal processes, systems, competencies, products and services (Cocks, 2010). The organizational structure should adjust to changes in the
competitive environment. “If a firm lags in making this realignment, it may exhibit poor performance and be at a serious competitive disadvantage” (Li et al., 2008, p.25). Ali and Hadi (2012) pointed out lack of proper attention to the effects of competitive environment (competitors’ status, market, etc.) in developing and implementing the strategy as an environmental obstacle to strategy implementation. They asserted that companies which predict these issues and take necessary measures, may achieve a competitive advantage and may surpass other competitors and realize its strategies and goals more quickly. If strategies are not in line with conditions of the environment, strategic gaps impede the ability to achieve organizational objectives (Perrott, 2011).

Kloninger (2010) illuminated that environmental uncertainty influences employee perceptions. In an uncertain environment, the perceived performance risk on employees increases despite level of skills, education and training. Low level employees resist variable pay if perceived business risk are high during uncertain environment. Consequently, relationship between strategy and variable pay will be strongly negative.

Lehner (2004) used a different dimension to explain how environment perception influenced leadership style. The environmental equivocality is instrumental in determining employee’s self motives. In uncertain environment management became autocratic whilst more participative in a stable predictable environment. Low and Cheng (2006) concluded that perceived environment is positively associated with strategy performance. Moreover, Johansson and Winroth (2010) found that environmental issues influences the decision criteria and strategy formulation process(Panagiotou, 2008). If management perceive uncertainty, they spent most of their time in strategy planning and formulation(Mufudza et al., 2013;Elbanna and Child, 2007;Grant, 2003). Villiers-Scheepers (2012) supported consideration of environmental perceptions not only because they include individual cognitions and organisation factors, but also because employees use it to exploit opportunities that can enhance strategy performance. This study seeks to understand further how employee perceptions of the environment influences organisation performance. The perceptions are moderated by personality and attitudes of low level employees (Oreg, 2011). This is because dissatisfaction with the work environment has been associated with negativity, low morale, bitterness, frustration, low worker effort and low productivity(Weakliem, David L.Frenkel,
2006). Rosen, Levy, and Hall, (2006) proposed a model suggesting that organizational environments supporting high levels of informal supervisor and co-worker feedback are associated with lower employee perceptions of organizational politics. Lower levels of organisational politics reduces perceptions of politics by employees and this improves organisation performance (Rahman et al., 2011).

The following hypothesis was developed for Environment:

H3:0: Employee perceptions of the environment positively influences organisational performance

### 2.12 Employee Perceptions and Strategy Implementation

According to Otara (2011) perceptions is the way human beings interpret our experiences. Perceptions shape the climate and effectiveness of the working environment. Ground breaking research by WielheimWundh in Germany revealed that no two people experience and interpret situations the same way. Consequently, perceptions of situations differ among people and they can either be positive or negative. “Despite a myriad number of things that tend to influence the way people perceive things or situations the most pertinent ones are those that are within oneself like habit, motivation, learning, specialization and social background” (Otara, 2011, p.22).

The researcher will try to understand the effects of employee perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles to organisation performance. Previous research by Alexander (1991) assessed strategy understanding among employees from various firms. The findings revealed that 8.7 % of participants understood their firms strategy. Daily employees understood the company strategy less than all other levels of employees. Shah (2005) indicated that lack of good understanding of company’s strategy might result in low commitment.

Li et al. (2008, p.23) asserts that, “shared understanding without commitment may result in counter effort and negatively affect performance”. Some authors take shared understanding as a commitment. Shared understanding of middle management and those at operational level and top management team’s strategic goals is of critical importance to effective implementation and organisation performance (Rapert, 2002).
Guth (1986) suggested that there are three fundamentally different sources of low to negative individual manager commitment to implementing a particular strategy: low perceived ability to perform successfully in implementing that strategy; low perceived probability that the proposed outcomes will result, even if individual performance is successful; low capacity of the outcome to satisfy individual goals/needs. Middle managers with low or negative commitment to the strategies formulated by senior management create significant obstacles to effective implementation (Li et al., 2008; Ahearne, Lam, and Kraus, 2014). The researcher would like to establish if these results would apply to low level employees involved in actual execution of tasks.

Li et al. (2008) revealed that few authors study the impact of lower management and non-management on strategy implementation. Gronroos as cited in Li et al. (2008) believes that the importance of strategy must be persuaded and emphasised to employees before turning to customers. Alexander (1985) suggests many corporations experience employee related problems such as insufficient capabilities by employees to perform their tasks, inadequate training of lower-level employees, and inadequate leadership by departmental managers to provide direction.

Consequently, if line-level employees perceive that change is threatening or disagreeable they may use delay or prevent it altogether (Li et al., 2008). Nutt (1986) suggests that management should be versatile to overcome lower-level obstructionism that is prevalent (to some degree) in many strategy implementation efforts. Cognitive strategic management decisions should be formulated with consideration of lower level employee functional level perceptions (Nutt, 1986). This research endeavours to establish the effects of these perceptions on organisation performance. Lack of shared knowledge and consensus regarding information and how it flows between management and employees creates a barrier to successful strategy implementation (Noble, 1999; Li et al., 2008) resulting in poor organisation performance.
Li et al. (2008) divulged that, most studies focus on the influence of middle managers on strategy implementation. Some authors concur that non-managerial employees should be considered in strategy implementation but there is scarce or no special research relating that (Alexander, 1985; Rapert, 2002; Nutt, 1986; Noble, 1999). Scanty studies analyse the influence of non-managerial employees on strategy implementation (Li et al., 2008). The researcher is convinced that a gap exists in understanding strategy implementation through non-managerial employee’s perceptions on obstacles to strategy implementation.

### 2.13 Strategy Implementation Conceptual Models

The study seeks to develop a strategy implementation model or framework that encompasses employee perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles. Li et al. (2008) did a comprehensive study on sixty articles of strategy implementation and identified three distinct conceptions of strategy implementation. He coined Process Perspective as strategy implementation model that sequentially followed carefully planned consecutive steps. Behavioral perspectives treated strategy as a series of more or less concerted (but often parallel) actions. The third perspective was a hybrid of process and behaviour perspective. In their analysis they concluded that several strategy implementation researches stress the role of top management (such as Schaap, 2006). Only a few definitions stress the external environment (Lehner, 2004). Surprisingly, previous researches does not mention the crucial role of non-managerial employees in turning strategies into results. Consequently, the validity of their research which managed to include soft factors of strategy implementation i.e implementation tactics, consensus, commitment, communication, executors. However, the model does not include non-managerial perceptions on obstacles to strategy implementation.
In their model in Figure 2.2, strategy formulation is the first stage and it is both institutional and interpersonal process that gathers data and viewpoints with strategic decisions as meridians. The strategic decisions impacts strategy implementation success variedly. Hard and Soft factors influences strategy implementation outcome dialectically. There are complex mutual influence among mixed factor, soft factors and hard factors. “These factors in turn are influenced by four generic phases of strategy implementation: pre-implementation, organizing implementation, managing implementation, and sustaining performance” (Li et al., 2008, p.38). This sequence is based on Noble’s (1999) framework and revised by Li et al. (2008).

Raps (2005) developed a strategy implementation model based on ten-point checklist to eliminate implementation obstacles:

- Commitment of top management
- Involve middle manager’s valuable knowledge
- Communication is what implementation is all about
- Integrative point of view
- Clear assignment of responsibilities
- Preventive measures against change barriers
- Emphasise teamwork activities
- Respect the individual’s different characteristics
- Take advantage of supportive implementation instruments
- Calculate buffer for the unexpected incidents

HillMan (2007) developed a strategy implementation model based on strategic leadership alone as shown in Figure 2.3 below.

![Figure 2.3: The role of leadership in strategy implementation](Source: Adapted from Hillman (2007)).

In figure 2.3 leaders are critical in each strategic actions in the model. The model emphasise that strategic leadership actions positively contributes to effective strategy implementation. Griffin (1996) developed a model for strategy implementation by identifying factors critical for effective strategy implementation. Their research introduced structure, leadership, human
resource, culture, technology and information systems as critical factors which influence strategy implementation. Their model is in Figure 2.4 below.

![Strategy Implementation model](image)

**Figure 2.4: Strategy Implementation model** *Source: adapted from Griffin (1996).*

### 2.14 Literature Synthesis and Conceptual Framework

The author revealed that previous literature is devoid of the role and influence of non-managerial employees on strategy implementation. Greater emphasis and studies were placed on the role of top management and middle management without consideration of non-managerial employees. Furthermore, rare studies exists that considers the effect of perceptions on strategy implementation. Perceptions are critical in determining strategy...
implementation success because they influence mood, attitude, moral, motivation and drive to execute implementation activities.

Various researchers have developed a myriad of strategy implementation models. The author has considered all strategy implementation models with obstacles to strategy implementation and developed the model in Figure 2.5. This model is closer to Griffin (1996) but the author developed the model with stronger emphasis on non-managerial perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles. The author also added environment, demography and strategy formulation as variables that either moderate or mediate organisational performance.

**Figure 2.5: Research Conceptual Model**
Explanation of Research Conceptual Model

The input variables are employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles and strategy formulation. Strategy formulation includes strategy content, strategy appropriateness, fit and intended strategy. Employee perceptions (values, beliefs, attitudes etc.) influences how employees perceive challenges they face in executing strategy. This later influences the outcome of the strategy. In addition, employee perceptions act as moderating variables to organisational performance, they moderate the effects of perception of strategy implementation obstacles which later affects organisation performance. All strategy implementation obstacles were articulated in previous sections of this chapter.

2.15 Summary

The chapter explained the strategy process from strategy formulation to strategy implementation. It overly dedicated most sections to barriers to strategy implementation. This demanded particular attention because they either moderate or mediate strategy implementation. Employee perceptions are the Achilles heel of the literature review and the chapter vindicated empirical studies confirming the importance of employee perceptions in strategy implementation. It concluded with a conceptual model that encompasses employee perceptions as either mediating or moderating strategy implementation and organisation performance.
CHAPTER 3

3 Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction
The main aim of the study is to understand how non-managerial employee’s perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation process influences organisational performance in Internet Access Providers companies of Zimbabwe. The researcher used this chapter to explore various methods and techniques used in undertaking the study. It commences by adopting positivist philosophy and its justification. Furthermore, an explication of research methods and sampling techniques used is provided. The questionnaire was designed, pilot tested and subjected to exploratory factor analysis, validity and reliability testing. The final questionnaire was distributed to targeted population for data gathering.

The design and layout of this chapter follows research onion by Saunders et al. (2009) whose propounded methodology starts with research philosophy, research approaches, research strategy, research choice, time horizon and ends with techniques and procedures.

3.2 Research Philosophy
The study uses positivism (quantitative) philosophy. Williamson (2006) stated that positivism consider that, as in the field of science, knowledge can only be based on what can be observed and experienced. Key positivist tenets are therefore “measurement” and “objectivity” resulting in a focus on quantitative data. Positivist position is characterised by testing of hypothesis developed from existing theory through measurement of observable social realities(Saunders et al., 2009). The study’s first hypothesis is that: Employee perceptions on obstacles to strategy implementation positively influences organisation performance. Consequently, a theoretical model was developed that explains cause and effect relationships(Flowes, 2006).
Saunders et al. (2009) stated that, positivism is based upon values of reason, truth and validity and there is a focus purely on facts, gathered through direct observation and experience and measured empirically using quantitative methods – surveys and experiments - and statistical analysis. Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) compared this to the organisational context and asserted positivists assume that scientific measurement and categorisation of human behaviour, systems and language in organisations is truly representative of the reality.

The Positivist approach suits well because it allows for objectivity, value freeness, deductions, quantitative analysis and the truth will conform to empirical evidence (Saunders et al., 2009). The researcher categorised the research into different parts of independent variables and isolated them. Also, dependent variables were categorised into individual and organisational performance. This gave results in a mechanical process that allowed the researcher control and ability to predict and explain causation of employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles on organisation performance.

Furthermore, positivist approach allowed the researcher to reach out to more people and have more conclusive objective results within the Internet Access Providers. There are many Internet Access Providers in Zimbabwe which means quantitative philosophy is more appealing and cost effective as a methodology. Also, previous studies on perceptions used quantitative methodology (Adsit et al., 1996; Ahearne et al., 2014; Ali and Hadi, 2012; Cohen and Avrahami 2006; Dvir et al., 2004; Ince and Gül 2011; Seijts and Roberts 2011). Lastly, the researcher prefers a quantitative approach because of his background. He is actively involved in quantitative analysis most of the time.

3.3 Research Design

Robson (2002) postulated research design as framework that specifies the type of information to be collected, the sources of data and the data collection procedures and analysis. It serves as the overall guide upon which the research will be carried out and therefore directs the flow of the whole project. The process of research design can be thought of as turning your research question into a research project (Robson, 2002). Saunders et al. (2009, p.136) regarded research design as, “the general plan of how you will go about answering your research question(s)”. Consequently, the study designed the research based on the research questions. The importance of the research questions and objectives cannot be overemphasised.
as they form the backbone of the research design. These influenced research strategies, sources of data collection, research constraints and ethical issues. Considering the quantitative philosophy used, the research design was more explanatory in nature.

Explanatory research emphasise on investigating a problem or situation in order to understand relationships between the variables (Saunders et al., 2009). The study sought to explain relationships between non-managerial perceptions, obstacles to strategy implementation and organisation performance. This required quantitative analysis and correlational analysis of the different variables. Consequently, the research strategy is a descriptive survey with questionnaires as research instruments.

3.4 Survey
The study implemented a survey strategy to gather information. The survey strategy is usually associated with deductive approach. It augurs well for quantitative data gathering because it is most often used to answer many questions especially of type how, what, much, who, and where (Saunders et al., 2009). The study applied explanatory and descriptive research which favours quantitative data gathering. Surveys are standardised and they allow collection of a large amount of data economically. Because of their standardisation, they are easy to compare (Saunders et al., 2009). Furthermore, they allow quantitative analysis using descriptive and inferential statistics. Since the research use explanatory approach, “a survey strategy can be used to suggest possible reasons for particular relationships between variables and to produce models of these relationships” (Saunders et al., 2009, p.144).

3.5 Target Population
Target population as an aggregation of items from which the sample is drawn. The sampling technique for companies was purposive. Africom, Powertel, Aquiver and Aptics were selected as Internet Access Provider operators to be studied. Consequently, target population consisted of non-managerial employees among these companies. The sample size had 250 non-managerial employees from these four companies. Find table 3.2 for sample that was used in the study.
3.6 Sample

The selection of the four Internet Access Providers was purposive using convenience sampling method. The selection of the target sample in these companies was simple random sampling. Simple random sampling was convenient because the researcher was not aware of target respondents in other companies except Africom. The questionnaire was distributed to only one person in these companies who is knowledgeable and knows employees in these organisations. Consequently, all non-managerial employees had equal chances of participating in the study. The distributors randomly selected employees from various departments without age, gender, education, marital-status etc. considerations. Simple random sampling helped improve efficiency because it does not require the researcher to know the full attributes of the population.

3.7 Sample Size Determination

Krejcie and Morgan (1977) developed sample size determination table using population size. The table is shown in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Table for Determining Minimum Sample size for a Given Population Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population size</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Population size</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margin of error=0.03; alpha = 0.05; t=1.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>Margin of error=0.03; alpha = 0.05; t=1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table developed by Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001).
The population size was five hundred for all the selected four companies. Therefore the sample size for the study was supposed to be ninety six non-managerial employees. However, since the researcher works for Africom and has good contact relations with targeted companies the sample size was therefore determined as in Table 3.2 from each company. The Internet Access Providers sector has ten companies operational. The big players consist of Liquid Telecoms, Powertel and Africom. Powertel and Africom were selected to be representative of big players whereas Aptics and Aquiver represents the small players. Variability might result from age and size but the selected companies reduce material differences because they are true reflection of the industry. Practical consideration led to the selection of these companies as study on all ten firms require long period of study.

Table 3.2: Target sample size by company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africom</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powertel</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquiver</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptics</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 Data Collection
To achieve research objectives the researcher designed and executed an ambitious study which took six months of intensive work. The main data source included primary data gathered through administered questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to non-managerial employees from among selected companies. Electronic and hard copies were distributed to target respondents. A maximum of one week was allocated to each respondents. The questionnaire had ten sections with fifty questions based on five point Likert Scale. All scales had more than one question (variable) valued from one to five (1-5) Likert types of equal intervals. The minimum scale one (1) means Strongly Disagree and maximum value of five (5) means Strongly Agree.

The first part of the questionnaire consists of the demographic variables, the second part to eighth part consists of perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles. The ninth part
included questions on individual performance whilst the tenth section had variables of organizational performance.

3.9 Research Instrument
The research used a questionnaire as a research instrument. The instrument was completed by interviewees using pen and paper method. This research attempted to establish how perceptions of employees on obstacles to strategy influences organisation performance. The following were identified as obstacles to strategy implementation from literature review: Resources, Communication, Strategy Formulation, Leadership and Management, Environment, Performance Management, Organisational Variables like culture, capabilities and structure. Below is a discussion of how research questions were developed for each strategy implementation obstacle.

The questionnaire comprises of ten sections. The first section collected information about employee’s background information like education, gender, marital status and education levels. Background information is critical because it acts as moderating variables in the conceptual framework. Section two to eight collects information concerning obstacles under study i.e. the independent variables of the study. Section nine records personal performance perceptions whilst section ten collects information about perception of organisation’s performance.

3.10 Independent Variables
3.10.1 Leadership
The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Bass (1985) was adopted after thorough literature review of leadership questionnaires. The more recent version by Bass and Avolio (2006) was suitable because it contained nine sub scales to measure leadership scales of task orientation, relationship orientation and behaviour. This version contained the following categories: (a) idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration are considered transformational leadership; (b) contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive) are considered transactional leadership; and (c) laissez-faire is considered non leadership. In this research ten
sub scales were developed and responses were grouped into Likert scales ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Leadership questions used were adopted from work by Drury (2004) and Wiswell et al. (2003).

3.10.2 Communication
The second section of the research instrument measured communication perception based on Downs and Hazen’s ‘Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire’. The questions were derived from Downs and Hazen (1977) and the following sub-scales were tested: organisation communication climate, relation with supervisor, organisation perspective, organisational integration, horizontal and information communication and personal feedback. About seven items were used to measure employees’ perceptions of communication within the organisation, between work mates and management.

3.10.3 Performance Management
Performance management was tested using an instrument developed by the Australian government (Commission, 2013). The instrument used seven sub-scales namely: performance management tool, performance climate, performance indicator alignment, feedback effectiveness, reward system, performance empowerment, and performance alignment.

3.10.4 Organisational Variables
Organisational variables instrument was designed using literature review. The sub-scales under study were structure, culture, capability and shared values of the organisation.

3.10.5 Strategy Formulation
Literature review was used to develop five item instrument to test perceptions of strategy formulation. The following measures were tested: commitment objectives, process satisfaction, supportive of strategy, individual goal alignment, understanding of vision and goals.

3.10.6 Environment
Questions were adapted from Beard (1984) and Tan and Litschert (1998) to develop a seven item environmental questionnaire. The items attempted to measure dynamism-complexity-
diversity-heterogeneity-munificence/hostility and employee insecurity of the environment (García-Morales et al., 2006).

3.10.7 Resources
Organisational resources questions were formulated using literature review. The following subscales were constructed: budget alignment, activity funding, resource availability, resource allocation empowerment, distribution fairness, innovativeness and obstacle management. Literature from (Hase, 2000; Preziosi, 1978) was used to develop seven items to test perception of employees on organisational resources.

3.11 Dependent Variables
3.11.1 Organisation Performance

The research instrument tested organisation’s performance using Huang (1999) questionnaire which has been thoroughly used in organisation performance measurement linked to strategy (Gates and Langevin, 2010). Performance was measured based on respondent’s perceptions, therefore, bias is expected due to perceptual differences. However, when objectives are not available, subjective measures have been tested to be good measures (Dess and Robinson, 1984; Venkatraman and Vasudevan, 1987).

3.11.2 Individual Performance
Questionnaires adapted from Meyer, Allen, and Gellatly (1990) were used on organisational commitment to test individual performance. A ten item five point scale was developed to measure individual performance within the organisation.

3.12 Pilot Study
The questionnaire was piloted on ten employees in order to ensure clarity and help instrument refinement. The pilot sample included employees from Africom who were selected using convenience sampling to guarantee validity and reliability of the items under study. Feedback on the presentation, layout and understanding of the questions was considered from the pilot sample. Some questions were removed or reworded to avoid ambiguous items.
3.13 Data Analysis
Quantitative data analysis methods were used in the study. Raw quantitative data was processed and analysed to make useful meaning from the data. Quantitative analysis techniques such as graphs, charts and statistics allowed exploration, presentation, description and examination of trends and relationships within our data (Saunders et al., 2009). SPSS statistical package was used for all statistical computations and analysis.

The researcher ensured preparation with a quantitative mind-set beforehand. They prepared, checked and input data into a computer. The most appropriate tables and diagrams helped explore and present the data. Appropriate statistics were selected for descriptive and relationship analysis.

3.14 Validity Tests
The output of pilot study from twelve respondents was thoroughly analysed. SPSS was applied in testing constructs validity through Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy. Kaiser-Meyer-Olin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was conducted to determine whether adequate correlation exists between the individual items contained within each of the sections of the questionnaire. This test employed a KMO statistic which is an associated Bartlett’s p-value and anti-image correlation statistic. This test was conducted to determine suitability of factor analysis. To justify factor analysis a KMO statistic should be greater than 0.6, an associated p-value should be less than or equal to 0.05 and Anti-image correlation statistic should be greater than 0.6. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity and the KMO revealed that the results from the pilot study were both highly significant. Consequently, this variable was suitable for the factor analysis.

Factor analysis was used in questionnaire design. In this study, questions relating to the construct were measured (Field, 2012). The questionnaire was categorised into different structures and construct validity was performed using factor analysis. This was to investigate the underlying structure of non-managerial employee perception scale. Factor analysis determined the different categories of strategy implementation obstacles and influence on organisation performance as measured by employee perceptions on obstacles. Principal factor analysis was used with an oblique rotation. A factor loading of greater than or equal to 0.4 was accepted as an indication of a relationship between the items. Generally, the factor is the
natural affinity of an item for a group. The higher loading (factor) indicates the stronger affiliation of an item to a specific factor (Rahman, 2012). This study indicated that each of the seven dimensions was homogeneously loaded to the different factors.

### 3.15 Reliability tests

Cronbach’s alpha test was used to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire and measured items. Reliability is the degree to which the observed variable measures the “true” value and is “error free”; thus, it is the opposite of measurement error. If the same measure is asked repeatedly, for example, more reliable measures will show greater consistency than less reliable measures (Hair et al., 2006). The coefficient alpha estimates for the multi-item scales used in the pilot study were first calculated to test internal consistency. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s Alpha) were computed for the items that formed each factor. The reliability coefficients for the data was 0.70 which exceeded the minimum benchmark recommended by (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1999) for basic research. Thus, the results indicate that these multiple measures are highly reliable for measuring each construct.

### 3.16 Regression Testing

Regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis and develop the study’s model. Regression helps to determine how much the independent variables (strategy implementation obstacles) causes variation in the dependent variable (organisation performance). In other words, regression analysis helped investigate how and whether perceptions on implementation obstacles predict organisational performance. The significance of each factor (leadership, communication, strategy formulation, organisation variables, environment, performance management, resources) was analysed and ascertained if they predict organisation performance. The data was first tested for multi-collinearity by considering the VIF for each variable under study. A predictive model was formulated from only those factors (communication, performance management and organisation variables) that significantly contributed to organisation performance.

### 3.17 Correlation Tests

Correlation statistic describes association between two variables. It can be used for continuous variables or binary variables or a combination of continuous and binary variables. T-test was performed to examine significant differences between group means. The groups
resemble data collected from different companies under study. Significant group differences then imply a correlation between the independent and dependent variable.

3.18 Hypothesis Stating
The following hypothesis was tested:

Main Hypothesis
H0: Employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles influences organisation performance.

3.19 Conclusion
The study’s purpose was to establish the influence of non-managerial employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles on organisational performance. It sought to establish how these perceptions affects organisational performance. A detailed review of literature was performed to acquire knowledge on the subject and based on that literature, the researcher developed a conceptual model upon which the study was based. This chapter provided a detailed description of the research methodology and design adopted to meet the objectives of the study.

The researcher employed quantitative/positivist methodology for the research. Data was collected through questionnaires. Purposive simple random sampling was adopted for data gathering. A pilot study was conducted to assist in content and construct reliability of the research instrument. Validity and reliability tests were performed on the questionnaire to ensure the instrument is consistent and provide different categories of employee perceptions and strategy implementation obstacles. Independent and dependent variables of the conceptual model were articulated and their formulation from literature was explained. The following chapter will present the results obtained during the field work.
CHAPTER 4

4 Data Analysis and Presentation

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 explained the literature review of obstacles to strategy implementation as being: leadership, communication, strategy formulation, resources, performance management, environment and organisation variables. The main purpose of this Chapter is to provide data analysis and findings from the study. It starts by providing sample description of the respondents. It explains the response rate and demographic information of the respondents. Normality, reliability, factor analysis, correlation, regression, Mann-Whitney, and Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed and results are presented in tables. It concludes by providing a model for the study following regression analysis.

4.2 Sample Description

4.2.1 Frequencies

Non-managerial employees from Internet Access Providers of Zimbabwe being Powertel, Africom, Aptics and Aquiver were interviewed during the study. Questionnaires were sent using emails, physical hard copies and online survey systems. The targeted sample size was two hundred and fifty employees from four companies but one hundred and thirty three responses were received after fourteen days yielding 53.2 % response rate. The high response rate is attributed to the fact that the researcher is familiar with most of the organisations targeted. The researcher used to work for Africom which yielded 57.5% of the responses. In Africom, the researcher attempted to get responses from almost all non-managerial employees, which improved the response rate. Powertel had the second highest (27.8%) response contribution. The researcher is also familiar with some Powertel employees since some of them were former work mates. Online survey and electronic mail distribution was employed to Powertel non-managerial employees. Hard copies were also physically
distributed by friends in Powertel. These efforts significantly improved response rate in Powertel. The other two companies recorded response contribution of less than 10% because they are very small companies in size and number of employees. The frequency distribution of the company responses are shown in Table 4.1.
### Table 4.1: Responses by Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africom</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powertel</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquiver</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.2 Demography

The demographic data consisted of 68.4% males and 31.6% females. The modal age group was 26-36 years constituting 86.5% of the respondents. A large majority of the respondents (67.5%) have attained a Bachelor’s degree followed by diploma level (22.6%), Master’s Degree (4.5%), O-Level (3.0%) and the lowest A-level (0.8%). About 62.4% were married whilst 36.1% were still single. Please refer to Appendix II for all demographic frequency distributions explained above. These frequencies are a true reflection of the population within the Internet Access Providers.

### 4.3 Descriptive

#### Length of service in Organisation and with supervisor

Descriptive statistics performed on Table 4.2 indicated that on average employees have served their organisations for 2.34 years. The length of period reveals high labour turnover in the Internet Access Providers sector as employees move to bigger companies like Econet, Telecel and NetOne. The short average period of years non managerial employees worked with their supervisors is 1.7 years. This also means they are a capable to answer questions on leadership perceptions competently.
Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum Statistic</th>
<th>Maximum Statistic</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you worked for the organisation?</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you worked for your Immediate Supervisor?</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources Descriptive

Table 4.3: All our strategic activities from top management to low level employees are adequately funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents indicated a dire impecunious state of resources in the Internet Access Providers sector. Table 4.3 shows that 24.1% strongly disagree with the assertion that strategic activities were adequately funded whilst a further 52.6% concurred disagreeably. Consequently, about 76.7% pointed that strategic activities were inadequately funded. The researcher established through interviews that companies like Africom, Aptic and Aquiver had no specific budgets allocated to strategic activities. Some strategic activities remain unimplemented for more than two years due to lack of funding. Operational cash flows was precariously used further constraining working capital for the business.
Table 4.4: I have adequate financial, technological and physical resources required to achieve my objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.4 revealed how Internet Access Providers are struggling to adequately resource strategic activities. These include computers, furniture, vehicles, and tools of trade. About 67.7% indicated negative perceptions on adequacy of non-financial resources for carrying out their duties. We followed up with some members within Africom who grisly indicated shortage of vehicles for customer projects. Customer services department were also humiliated by lack of stock in shops for humdrum period of six months. Network operations indicated unavailability of tools and obsolete computers.

Table 4.5: Insufficient resources does not negatively affect my ability to achieve objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 revealed that resources were a great impediment towards organisation performance attainment where 66.2% of the respondents vehemently deny that resources does not affect their ability to achieve set objectives. Follow-ups on interviewees indicated that very few individuals were achieving performance goals for the organisation.

This shows resources are a great implementation obstacle negatively viewed across the Internet Access Providers sector. This is evidenced by failed implementations and high rate of company failures within the Internet Access Providers. About fifteen licenses were granted but only ten Internet Access Providers are operational.

4.4 Tests for Normality
There are requirements that should be satisfied for data analysis. Before data analysis and testing, the normality and homogeneity of data should be determined and confirmed so that type of tests between parametric or non-parametric test can be decided. Kolmogorov-Smirnov technique was used to test normality of the sample. The results of the tests on the data constructs are shown Table 4.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmgorov-Smirnova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgPerformQ</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadershipQ</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommunQ</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrganVarQ</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResourcesQ</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerfMgtQ</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvironmntQ</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StratFormQ</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PersonalQ</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test procedure tested goodness-of-fit whether the collected data is normally distributed or not. This test was performed to guide further data analysis tests like hypothesis, regression and correlation tests. The significance of the calculations were considered after performing the test. A probability of 0.05 means that there is only a 5 per cent chance that the two distributions differ by chance alone, and is termed statistically significant. Therefore, a probability of 0.05 or smaller means you can be at least 95 per cent certain that the difference between your two distributions cannot be explained by chance factors alone (Saunders et al., 2009). As shown in Table 4.6 above, the results indicate that the results are statistically significant and the implication being that all the variables are not normally distributed. Consequently, non-parametric tests were used for further tests.

4.5 Reliability Analysis
Cronbach alpha was used to measure reliability for a set of available constructs. The Cronbach alpha has alpha coefficient ranging between 0 and 1 with higher values indicating higher reliability (Hair et al., 2006). The reliability analysis of all variables was 0.883 as shown in Tale 4.3 which indicates very high reliability of the data used. The accepted range of Cronbach’s alpha is between 0.7 and 0.8 (Field, 2012). However, for exploratory studies, one can accept results of 0.6 and above.

4.6 Reliability test of each item under each factor after factor analysis

Reliability is the degree to which the observed variable measures the ‘‘true’’ value and is ‘‘error free’’; thus, it is the opposite of measurement error. If the same measure is asked repeatedly, for example, more reliable measures will show greater consistency than less reliable measures (Hair et al., 2006). Table 4.7 presents the coefficient alpha estimates for the multi-item scales used in this study. Cronbach’s Alpha (Reliability coefficients) were computed for the items that formed each factor. The reliability coefficients for the factors are shown in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Reliability of factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Variables</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Formulation</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Performance</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation’s Performance</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As depicted in Table 4.7, all Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients for the data exceed the minimum standard for reliability of 0.70 recommended by Nunnally (1978) for basic research. Thus, the results indicate that these multiple measures are highly reliable for measuring each construct. Consequently, the dataset is reliable to be used for further similar researches and produce similar results.

4.7 Non Parametric Tests

4.8 Mann-Whitney Test

The Mann-Whitney test was performed on Gender and whether being supervisor or not were explanatory variables of organisational performance. Mann-Whitney test is therefore non-parametric equivalent of the independent groups t-test(Dancey and Reidy, 2008).
The results in Table 4.8 above shows that the results were not statistically significant and therefore gender was not an explanatory variable of organisational performance as far as these non-managerial employees were concerned. The test on Gender tested if perceptions of organisational performance was influenced by Gender. A Mann-Whitney U test revealed no significant difference in the perceptions of organisational performance levels of males (Md=66.25, n=91) and females (Md=68.63, n=42), U=1842.5, z=-0.333, p=0.739. The results supports previous studies by (Femi, 2012) whose research indicated that there is no significant gender difference on the perceived organisational performance.

Below (Table 4.9) are the results performed on Question Do you Supervise others?

Table 4.9: Do you supervise others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OrgPerformQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>1241.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>7019.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results also show that perceptions of organisational performance is independent of whether an employee is a supervisor or not. A Mann-Whitney U test revealed no significant difference in the perceptions of organisational performance levels of Supervisors (Md=72.77, n=26) and Non-supervisors (Md=65.6, n=107), U=1241, z=-0.855, p=0.393. However, these results differ from (Femi, 2012) who pointed that employee grade level has a significant relationship on the perceived organisational performance. This difference was expected
because our research targeted non-managerial employees where there is slight difference in grades between supervisors and non-supervisors.

4.9 Kruskal-Wallis Test

Kruskal–Wallis is non-parametric test used when you have more than two groups (Dancey and Reidy, 2008). Kruskal–Wallis is a rank-based non-parametric test which does not consider the scores themselves in computing the statistic. It helps in determining if there are statistically significant differences between two or more groups of an independent variable on a continuous or ordinal dependent variable. Table 4.10 below shows the results of perceptions of organisational performance from respondents of different independent groups answering the following questions (1) How long have you worked for the organisation? (2) How long have you worked for your immediate supervisor? (3) What is your age group? (4) What is your highest level of Education? (5) What is your marital status? and (6) What department are you in?. The test was done to check if perceptions of organisational performance is influenced by any of the mentioned demographic factors.

Table 4.10: Kruskal-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How long have you worked for the organisation</th>
<th>How Long have you worked for your supervisor</th>
<th>What is your age group</th>
<th>What is your highest level of education</th>
<th>What is your marital status</th>
<th>What department are you in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>4.568</td>
<td>5.731</td>
<td>7.509</td>
<td>11.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.11: How long have you worked for the organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to less than 3 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid 3 to less than 5 years</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings revealed no statistically significant difference between perceptions of organisation performance among the different categories for the responses in the Table 4.10 except for question on Marital Status and Department. Results on education and lengthy of services contradicts (Femi, 2012; Hemdi, 2009; Ogungbamila, 2013; Cohen and Avrahami, 2006) who concurred that there is statistically significance difference in education and lengthy of service on perceived organisation performance. However, results on Table 4.11 shows that 96% of the respondents were less than five years. This data shows a high degree of homogeneity which does not result in any statistically significant variations in organisation performance perceptions. However, there is statistically significant difference on perceptions of organisation performance and marital status of respondents. The Rank values of marital status are shown in Table 4.12 below.

Table 4.12: Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your marital status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ranked results showed a very high mean rank for those divorced (118), mean rank score of 71.27 for Married and 57.49 for Single. This finding supports (Murugesan, Raja, and Kannan,, 2013; Mathew and Selvi, 2011) who concluded that unmarried and married differ significantly with regard to perception score of the organisation. Divorced people might have high perceptual mean score because of independence and being too optimistic about the future. They have more time and energy and highly committed to the organisation. In contrast, married people have more commitments and are usually unsatisfied due to high family demands. Further studies might be required to understand why perceptions of organisation performance vary between marital statuses.

The mean rank results for department are shown in Table 4.13 below.

**Table 4.13: Department Mean Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OrgPerformQ</th>
<th>What department are you in</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Marketing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems and IT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Operations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate a very high mean rank for Network operations department of 83.13 and the lowest recorded in Information Systems and IT with 47.50. This means perceptions of organisational performance is statistically different between the different departments with Network operations being most positive than other departments. The researcher established that Network Operations departments were the core skills in Internet Access Providers. The skills are inadequate resultantly culminating in high salaries. Therefore, they maintain a reciprocal positive attitude towards organisations because of granted organisational positive treatment. In contrast, the Information systems department painted a gloomy picture due to
lack of trust in prevailing leadership. The Africom Information Systems team underwent three restructuring exercises within one year leading to low morale and uncertainty. They were also heavily understaffed leading to staff burnout. Consequently, they have negative perceptions towards leadership for failing to stand their cause.

Further Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed across the different companies as independent variables on organisation performance. Results on Table 4.14 reveals that Africom had the highest mean rank value of 70.48. Most Africom employees were positive but Table 4.15 shows that organisation is not statistically significant in determining perception of organisation performance (i.e. significance >0.05).

Table 4.14: Organisation Kruskal Wallis Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africom</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powertel</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquiver</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15: KruskalWallisTest Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OrgPerformQ</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Organisation
4.10 Correlations

Correlations test were performed to assess the strength of relationship or association between independent and dependent variables. The Independent variables were perceptions of non-managerial employees on Leadership, Strategy Formulation, Resources, Organisational Variables, Performance Management, Environment and Communication. The Dependent variable was Organisational Performance. Non parametric tests using Spearmans rho produced the results in Table 4.16 below. A correlation coefficient enables quantification of strength of the linear relationship between two ranked or numerical variables. This coefficient can take on any value between -1 and +1. The value +1 represents strong perfect positive correlation, -1 represent strong perfect negative correlation. Correlation coefficients between -1 and +1 represent weaker positive and negative correlations, a value of 0 meaning the variables are perfectly independent (Saunders et al., 2009). Also the nearer to 1 (+ or -) a correlation coefficient is, the stronger the relationship. The nearer to 0 (meaning no relationship), the weaker the correlation. Correlations of 0.4 to 0.5 are moderate (Dancey and Reidy, 2008).

Table 4.16: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leaders Q</th>
<th>Commun Q</th>
<th>OrganVar Q</th>
<th>Resourc Q</th>
<th>PerfMgt Q</th>
<th>Enviro Q</th>
<th>StratFor Q</th>
<th>Persona Q</th>
<th>OrgPerform Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Q</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrganVar Q</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Q</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerfMgtQ</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environm tQ</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StratFormQ</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Q</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgPerfomQ</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*  . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

This part of study focuses on analysing the links between perception of obstacles to strategy implementation on one hand, and company performance on the other. The relationships among these variables are first analysed by using bivariate spearman’s correlation coefficients. The results show that not all perceptions of obstacles are significantly linked with organisation performance.

Surprisingly, all perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation are positively correlated to organisational performance. All the independent variables were positively correlated with organisation performance. Therefore we can conclude the main hypothesis that: Employee perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation positively influences organisational performance. The literature provides limited possibilities to compare this conclusion with
results from similar studies regarding employee perceptions. However, discrete studies performed on different distinct elements under study proved the negative effects of negative perceptions on organisational performance. The importance of perception variables such as communication, leadership, strategy formulation, environment, performance management, resources, and organisation variables for organisational performance can be found in previous independent studies. However, these results are not in full comparison directly with our results because they focus on dissimilar sets of variables and use un-comparable methodologies. Consequentially, the correlation analysis enabled us to deduce five (out of seven) obstacles to strategy that are significantly correlated with organisation performance. Resources and Environment were not statistically significant to explain organisational performance in this study.

The independent variable organisation’s resources was not statistically significant (p= 0.451. The following questions were asked under resources: (1) All our strategic activities from top management to low level employees are adequately funded (2) I have adequate financial, technological and physical resources required to achieve my objectives (3) Insufficient resources does not negatively affect my ability to achieve objectives.

Resources are negatively perceived because companies are failing to provide enough resources for strategy implementation. This can be attributed to challenges in raising operational funds and prevailing liquidity crunch. Non-managerial employees perceive resources as affecting their ability to achieve strategic objectives. The researcher established that Internet Access Providers were struggling to raise funds for strategic activities. The problems were compounded by unhealthy balance sheets which exposed them to catastrophic risks of hostile takeover. Investors lacked confidence to inject more capital into despondent business models. Consequently, they hopelessly ineptly utilise cash flows to fund strategic activities further crippling their doodling cash cow products. Africom failed to successfully commission their Wimax, IMS and CDMA services due to funding gape. Similar fate surmounted Aquiver and Aptics who garbled VOIP services with inferior technologies. Powertel’s backbone infrastructure is gangrenous as they succumb to obsolescence and theft. It is believed they cannot maintain it and implementing new technologies at the same time.
The results on Environment questions are shown in Appendix III. The results of environment unpredictability revealed 55.4% of the sample perceive a tumultuous and uncertain environment. Also, 63.9% of the respondents believe that the work environment is not conducive for individual excellence and achievement of objectives. There was mixed response regarding how economic challenges influence ability to achieve objectives. A higher percentage (38%) perceive neutral followed by those who agree 36.1%. Economic challenges was perceived to cause insecurity by 55.6% of the respondents. The findings indicates uncertain environment is highly perceived negatively and it is not statistically significant in influencing organisational performance.

The researcher sought to understand more on why the environment was negatively perceived by non-managerial employees. The work environment was at the epicentre of environment negative epiphany. Unequivocally, all companies have undergone expurgated transformation exercises. They expostulated transformation exercises as clandestine management activities gruesomely lead to job insecurity and victimisation. The work environment was a cosmopolitan of political conflagrations. Unequal treatment between individuals precipitated attitudes with some people receiving cosset treatment.

The respondents revealed economic insecurity. They indicated that the liquidity crunch paralysed the nervous system of operations. Demand of products was boldly plummeting resulting in falling revenues. Competition from Telecel and Econet was directly diluting their capabilities sending feeble management scurrying for retreat. Consequently, non-managerial employees have negative perceptions on the economy due to feelings of insecurity since Internet Access Providers are under the threat of takeovers from big operators or risk closing business.

4.11 Regression
Regression uses a coefficient of determination to measure the strength of cause and effect between independent and dependent variables. This test is performed where a sample was randomly selected. The coefficient of determination can take on any value between 0 and + or minus 1. It measures the proportion of the variation in a dependent variable (organisation
performance) that can be explained statistically by the independent variable (leadership) or variables (communication, organisation variables, strategy formulation, resources, environment, performance management). If 50 per cent of the variation can be explained, the coefficient of determination will be 0.5, and if none of the variation can be explained, the coefficient will be 0. Table 4.17 below shows regression results of the model.

Multiple regression analysis was performed to test how perceptions on seven variables representing obstacles for strategy implementation (independent variables) influence organisation performance (dependent variable). The model predicted the factors of perception of strategy implementation obstacles that lead to organisation performance. From Table 4.17, R is the value of multiple correlation coefficients between the predictors (independent variables) and the outcome (dependent variable). The findings show the correlation between the factors that lead to organisation performance of non-managerial employees is 0.661. The R-square, is a measure of how much of the variability in the outcome (organisation performance), is accounted by the predictors (independent variables). In this study, the R-square value is 0.437 which means that factors of perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles accounts for 44% of the variation in organisation performance. This means the other 56% of organisation’s performance is explained by other factors not included in the model. The adjusted R-square shows how well the model generalizes and the value of the adjusted R-Square are close to the value of R-square.

**Table 4.17: 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>.661(^a)</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>2.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Predictors: (Constant), PersonalQ, ResourcesQ, OrganVarQ, EnvironmtQ, StratFormQ, CommunQ, LeadershipQ, PerfMgtQ

b. Dependent Variable: OrgPerformQ

ANOVA(Table 4.18) partitions the variability among all the model constructs into one component that is resultant of variability among group means and another component that is due to variability within the groups(residual variation). There are two sum of squares that are
calculated being residual sum of squares and treatment sum of squares. Residual sum of squares is computed from variability within groups whilst treatment sum of squares is derived from variability among groups. Therefore, the F Ration shows the ratio of the two mean square values. A true null hypothesis have an F value close to 1.0 most of the time whereas a large F ration indicates variation among the group means is more than expected from occurring by chance. The p-value is determined from the F ratio and 2 values of degree of freedom being of regression and residual as shown in Table 4.18. It tests null hypothesis that data from all groups are drawn from populations with identical means.

Table 4.18 shows the ANOVA results with F-ratio 12.022 revealing that the model is significant (P < 0.001) and is very unlikely to have happened by chance. The model can help significantly to improve the ability to predict the outcome variable (organisation performance). Consequently, we are better of using the model than estimating results.

The beta value tells about the relationship between organisation performance and each predictor. In this model the t-test associated with the beta value of the predictor (communication, performance management and organisation variables) is making a significant contribution to the model. This is supported by p values less than 0.05 for the mentioned predictors. Resources, leadership, strategy formulation and environment contribute insignificantly to organisation’s performance. The worst is environment and resources whose t-test values shows negative contribution. Hence, regression analysis results showed that above mentioned factors are closely associated with perceptions of organisation performance whilst resources and environment were negatively associated.

Table 4.18: ANOVA

<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>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>781.672</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97.709</td>
<td>12.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1007.772</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1789.444</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: OrgPerformQ
b. Predictors: (Constant), PersonalQ, ResourcesQ, OrganVarQ, EnvironmtQ, StratFormQ, CommunQ, LeadershipQ, PerfMgtQ

### Table 4.19: Collinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Toler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeadershipQ</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommunQ</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrganVarQ</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>3.454</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResourcesQ</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-1.214</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerfMgtQ</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvironmtQ</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StratFormQ</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PersonalQ</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 illustrates results of Variance Inflation Factors (VIFS) and Condition Indices for each variable in the model. These tests were performed to test for multi-collinearity among the predictor variables. The VIFs ranged between 1.138 and 1.834. The results indicates the absence of multicollinearity among all predictor variables because the tolerance values are higher than the minimum 0.10 level. The VIF statistics are all below 10.0 critical level (Pallant, 2007). Table 4.19 shows collinearity diagnostics values. The results revealed that none of the dimensions in the model had a condition index equal to or above the threshold value of 30.0.

The collinearity results indicate that there are no violations of the assumptions of multicollinearity. Hence, we can reasonably state that the standard multiple regression model above is stable and good in explaining the variance in organisation performance. The model implies that there is a significant positive relationship between communication, performance management, organisation variables and organisation performance. The total variance in
organisation performance explained by the model as a whole is 44% (Table 4.17), where F (8, 124) = 44, p < 0.001 (Table 4.16).

4.13 Predictive Model
As explained before, only three independent variables (communication, performance management and organisational variables) are statistically significant, with performance management and organisation variables recording a higher beta value (beta = 0.287, p <= 0.002) than communication (beta = 0.167, p <= 0.05). This means about three hypotheses are fully supported and four hypothesis are not supported. Leadership, Resources, Strategy Formulation and Environment dimensions are therefore removed from the model because they are not statistically significant to organisation performance. However, leadership and strategy formulation are positively related to organisational performance but not statistically significant (p<0.05) to predict organisational performance.

Therefore, in mathematical terms, the multiple regression (MLR) model equation that predicts organisation performance can be depicted as follows, where b are beta coefficients of regression:

where: Y (OP) = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + b4X4 + b5X5 + b6X6 + b7X7 + e

Y = Organisation Performance (OP)
X1 = Communication
X2 = Performance Management
X3 = Organisation Variables
X4 = Leadership
X5 = Strategy Formulation
X6 = Resources
X7 = Environment
a = Constant
e = Error terms

Based on the MLR result above (Table 4.19), the estimated MLR equation is as below:

OP = 2.838 + 0.175 (X1) + 0.249 (X2) + 0.309 (X3) + e
The result for the regression coefficient for resources (X4), (X5), (X6) and (X7) is not statistically significant (beta = 0.40, p > 0.05), (beta = 0.079, p > 0.05), (beta = -0.129, p > 0.05) and (beta = -0.002, p > 0.05) respectively and are removed from the model.

One of the main objectives of this research was to understand the main obstacles to strategy implementation within the Internet Access Providers. The correlation results and regression analysis showed that resources and environment were main obstacles affecting strategy implementation within the Internet Access Providers. This was supported by high negative perceptions as indicated in the descriptive information. Furthermore, correlation results for resources and environment were statistically insignificant in explaining organisational performance. Consequently, they were removed from the regression model.

4.14 Discussion of findings

The main finding showed that employee perception are positively correlated with organisation performance, implying they predict organisation performance. These results supports findings of prior work that positive perceptions and attitudes results in high performance for individuals and the organisation (Macky and Boxall, 2007; Ince and Gül, 2011; Rosen, Levy, and Hall, 2006) and that work established positive correlation of positive attitudes and high organisation performance as found in our research.

The key finding in the study was that sex, education, level in the organisation, lengthy of service, lengthy with the supervisor and age was not statistically significant in explaining perceptions of organisation’s performance. The results found in this analysis are consistent with the previous studies, such as Hsu, Chen, and Chen (2008) who concluded perceptions of employees don’t vary with these demographic factors. However, the finding that marital status influences employee’s perceptions of organisation performance contradicts previous studies by (Hsu et al., 2008). The finding that department influences employee perceptions also supports studies by Hsu et al. (2008) who highlighted that employees from different departments have varying perceptions especially towards their leaders which influences their perceptions of organisation performance.
In addition, performance management was demonstrated to predict and significantly contributing to organisation performance. These results are consistent with (Teeratansirikool, Siengthai, Badir, and Charoenngam, 2013; Joiner, Spencer, and Salmon, 2009; Micheli, Mura, and Agliati, 2011; Gates and Langevin, 2010) who claimed that performance measurement of the strategic priorities of the firm positively affects organisation performance. These results contradicts Verbeeten and Boons (2009) who found no support for such claims. Also, Ali, Ahmadi, and Salamzadeh (2012) cogently showed that organisation variables of culture are positively correlated with strategy implementation and organisation performance (Ismail et al., 2012). This is consistent with our findings. The results on communication supports Abdullah and Antony (2012) whose paper incisively pointed that communication is positively correlated with and predicts organisation performance (Dlodlo, 2011).

The study revealed that environment was negatively perceived resulting in poor organisational performance. Al-Ghamdi (1998) concluded that uncontrollable factors in the external environment had an adverse impact on implementation was cited by their interviewees as an obstacle to strategy implementation resulting in poor organisational performance. Srivastava (2008) contradicted the results through findings that proved that employee perceptions of the environment in his model predicted 8.30% of organisational performance. This contradiction can be attributed to different environments, resource availability and attitudes of employees. However in their assessments (Srivastava, 2008; Pindelski and Mrowka, 2011) demonstrated that perceived adequacy or inadequacy of work environment, both physical and psycho-social, extends noticeable effect on employees’ job satisfaction and performance, and perception of organization performance (Andrews et al., 2009).

Strategy formulation was not statistically significant in predicting organisation performance among the Internet Access Providers. This supports Schaap (2006) who contradictorily discovered that employees who understand and agree with the company's strategic plan will most likely have a higher commitment to the firm's success than employees who do not know or agree with it. However, Schaap (2006) paper and our research both showed positive correlation between strategy formulation and performance. Andrews et al. (2009) corroborated that strategy formulation positively affect organisation performance.
The study’s findings of leadership are unique in that it contradicts most previous studies (Jooste and Fourie, 2009; Lindorff, 2009; Silverthorne and Wang, 2001; Richmond, Wagner, and Mccroskey, 1983; Cavusgil, 2007; Day and Lord, 1988) who concurred that leadership predicts organisational performance. Furthermore, resources were found to predict organisation outcomes by a paucity of empirical evidence by (Salanova, Agut, and Peiró, 2005; Bakker, Demerouti, de Boer, and Schaufeli, 2003). This contradicts our regression results which accentuated resources as contributing nothing and not contributing towards organisation performance. The uniqueness of our findings is overwhelming because resources, environment and leadership are the pillars of organisation’s performance whereas our results contradicted that assentation.

4.15 Conclusion

This chapter provided discussion of data analysis performed. The response rate was 54.6% and there was non-normal distribution of the responses. The study focused on perceptions of non-managerial employees on strategy implementation obstacles and how this influences organisation performance. Normality tests showed that data was not normally distributed attributing to application of non-parametric tests. Reliability analysis results revealed Cronbach's Alpha of 0.720 which is within acceptable range. Factor analysis test performed pointed to Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) of 0.720 and the results were statistically significant (p<0.05). Consequently, reliability test were performed on the model factors and the results revealed that all factors in the model were reliable. Non-parametric test on demographic factors showed that only marital status and department had statistically significant differences in perceptions on organisation performance. The model constructs were all positively correlated with organisation performance. However, resources and environment were not statistically significant in explaining organisational performance. Regression analysis developed a model with communication, performance management and organisational variables as factors which were statistically significant in influencing organisation performance. The developed model showed that 44% of organisation performance was explained by the factors under study. Leadership, environment, resources and strategy formulation were removed from the model because they were not statistically significant in contributing to organisation performance. The Chapter summarised with discussion of key findings.
CHAPTER 5

5 Conclusion, Recommendations and Further Research

5.1 Introduction
The purpose of this study was to investigate non managerial employees’ perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation and the relationship of these perceptions to organisational performance. Discussion of results and findings in Chapter 4 precedes conclusion and recommendations presented in this Chapter. Research objectives and research questions are considered in drawing finality to the study. The chapter postulates contribution to academic study with considerations of research limitations in undertaking the valuable study. The contributions and conclusions are discussed in depth with respect to existing literature and past studies.

5.2 Conclusions
The following were conclusions drawn in this study:

5.3.1 Employee Perceptions
Tests of employee perceptions on obstacles to strategy and how they relate to organisational performance were conducted as part of this study. The correlation results showed that perceptions on all variables were positively related to organisation performance. It is thus concluded positive perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles (resources, environment, organisation variables, performance management, communication, leadership, and strategy formulation) is positively correlated with organisation performance.

Regression tests on the model led to the conclusion that perception on communication, performance management and organisation variables were the main predictors of organisation performance in the Internet Access Providers sector of Zimbabwe. However, these variables explained 44% of organisation performance model meaning management should look for other drivers of organisation performance. These variables had results that were statistically significant on organisational performance.
5.3.2 Strategy Drivers
Employee perception of communication was statistically significant and positively correlated with organisation’s performance. It be can concluded that positive perception of communication is positively associated with organisation performance. Internet Access Providers value communication and they disseminate effective and relevant information within organisations. Non managerial employees in Internet Access Providers are proud of vision, mission, values and clarity of communications. It is thus concluded that top down, bottom up and horizontal communications enhanced positive attitude towards communication climate.

Performance management was also statistically significant in predicting organisation performance. The researcher concluded that positive perception of performance management by employees help predict organisation performance. This means performance management systems being used by Internet Access Providers were generally good. Employees were adequately measured and the performance management tools were aligned to strategy achievement. In addition, the performance management tools empowered employees and encourage constructive feedback between management and employees.

In addition, the study concluded that perceptions on organisational variables were critical for organisation performance. Organisation variables under study were structure, culture and capabilities. Generally, employees were happy with existing structures and cultures within Internet Access Providers. Also, Internet Access Providers had good capabilities that enhanced organisation performance.

5.3.3 Control Variables
The control variables used in the study were Qualification, Lengthy of Service, Lengthy of Service under Supervisor, level in organisation, Age, Gender, Marital Status and Department. Tests were performed on the 9 control variables to investigate if they were explanatory on organisation performance. The results revealed that marital status and department were statistically significant in explaining organisation performance. The divorced and widowed had the highest positive perceptions on organisation performance. We can conclude that
perceptions of organisation performance vary between marital status categories in the Internet Access Providers with those unmarried (single and divorced and widowed) being most positive than married people. They should also ensure that most of the staff are youthful or unmarried people to boost performance of the organisation. Unmarried people are more positive, committed and have less family responsibilities. Consequently, they tend to be more productive because of their attitudes towards employers as shown in this research. The study concluded that departments were explanatory on organisation performance within the Internet Access Providers. Network operations were optimistic and positive about organisation performance. Tests on employers showed that perception on organisation performance was not explained by the employers.

5.3 Discussion of hypotheses

The main objective of the study was to understand how employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles influences organisational performance. The study proved the main hypothesis true since correlation results indicated that employees perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles was positively correlated with organisation performance. Also, employee perceptions predicted organisation performance using the regression model. Tests on hypothesis proposed in Chapter 2 led to the conclusion that H2-1, H2-3, H2-5 had strong positive relationships with organisation performance. Table 5.1 below shows results of tested hypothesis that predicted organisation performance.

Table 5.1: Hypothesis that predicted organisation performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Employee perceptions of strategy formulation positively influences organisational performance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;: Employee perceptions of performance management positively influences organisational performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;: Employee perceptions of organisational variables positively influences organisational performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;: Employee perceptions of leadership positively influences organisational performance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H2: Employee perceptions of communication positively influences organisational performance  Yes

H2: Employee perceptions of resources positively influences organisational performance  No

H3: Employee perceptions of environmental factors positively influences organisational performance  No

5.4 Answer to research questions

The main purpose of this study was to find the influence of employees’ perceptions’ of strategy implementation obstacles on organisational performance. For this purpose we asked five questions and developed seven hypotheses to find the influence of seven basic dimensions of strategy implementation obstacles on organisation performance. The results of the regression analysis showed the significant impact of each dimension on organisation performance. The answers to the research questions are as follows:

What are the main obstacles to strategy implementation for Internet Access Providers?

This research question examined the main impediments of strategy implementation among the Internet Access Providers of Zimbabwe. The study through regression analysis concluded that environment and resources were the main strategy implementation obstacles. Environmental uncertainty, work environment and employee security were perceived negatively by employees leading to poor organisational performance. This finding supports previous researches by (Kloninger, 2010; Perrott, 2011; Johansson and Winroth, 2010; Villiers-Scheepers, 2012). These researches concluded that negative perceptions on the environment results in poor perceptions of organisational performance.

Also, unavailability of funding for projects, inadequate resources to perform daily activities led to negative perceptions of resources. Consequently, resources were constraining strategy implementation among Internet Access Providers. They were operating without budgets for strategic activities leading to poor organisation performance. The literature review on resources showed that negative perceptions on resources by employees affect subordinates
performance and consequently that of the organisation (Andrews et al., 2009; Jones et al., 2008; Bower and Gilbert, 2007; Villiers-Scheepers, 2012; Pinchot, 1985; Covin and Slevin, 1991).

**What are the main drivers of strategy implementation for Internet Access Providers?**

The drivers of strategy implementation were those dimensions that were positively perceived by employees as positively contributing to organisational performance. Correlation results indicated that all dimensions were positively correlated to organisation performance. Consequently, all independent variables are critical for organisation performance. However, the researchers concluded that communication, performance management and organisation variables were the main predictors among Internet Access Providers. These dimensions, despite lack of resources and environment uncertainty were perceived as predicting organisation performance.

**Does employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles influence strategy success or failure?**

The study endeavoured to investigate the effects of employee perceptions on organisation performance. Employee perceptions are experiences employees build overtime through experiences with strategy implementation obstacle dimensions. This study concluded that employee perceptions were influential to organisation performance. Correlation results indicated that employee perceptions influences organisation performance. Therefore management should implement programs that promote positive perceptions towards strategy implementation obstacles to boost organisation performance.

**5.5 Theoretical contributions**

This study provides empirical evidence on the nature of influence of employees’ perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles and organisation performance. The major contribution of this study is toward a better understanding of employees’ perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles on organisation performance, particularly within Africom. In this respect, it shows that employees’ perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles has direct influence on organisation performance.
Another contribution is that, it’s the first study of strategy implementation that considered employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles as independent variables for organisation performance. This contradicts previous researches which dwelt on investigating drivers and impediments to strategy implementation. The study took known strategy obstacles and developed a model of how employee perceptions of these obstacles influence organisation performance. Traditional and conventional researches concur that obstacles to strategy implementation negatively work against organisation performance. The study vehemently contributed that against all conventional literature, employee perception on these obstacles are critical for strategy implementation and organisation performance. This distinction is critical as it is arguably the employees’ perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles that directly influences organizational performance. Employees have not been fully involved in strategy studies as more studies focused on management only. Employees are critical as they are involved in daily execution and their perceptions are of uttermost importance as contributed in this study. Another key contribution of our findings, then, is that we present a distinct picture focusing on employees as opposed to generalised findings for all employee categories including management.

In addition, this study differs from all other strategy implementation researches in that the sample was drawn from Zimbabwean Internet Access Providers. This industry and sector is young and it’s unique in that no known similar researches have been done on the sector. The research contributed challenges and drivers towards strategy implementation that influences organisation performance. The results are generalizable as it considered both government owned and private owned companies of diverse size which is a true replica of the real industry.

Following a critical literature review of strategy implementation, an integrated model was conceptualised and tested. The model proposed had eight variables as perception of strategy implementation obstacles. This study performed regression analysis to investigate if employee perceptions on strategy implementation obstacles can predict organisation performance. The model in figure 5.1 is one of the major contributions to theory and academics as this model was developed on employee perceptions.
The model shows that communication, performance management and organisation variables were statistically significant in influencing organisation performance. Consequently, these variables predict organisation performance. Leadership, environment, resources, strategy formulation were not statistically significant and though they were positively related to organisation performance. The predictive model only accounted for 44% of organisation performance resultantly calling for other researchers to embark on further studies to determine other factors leading to organisation performance.

5.6 Recommendations
The current study has implications for both academics and practitioners. For academics, this research provides presumptive evidence for future research on employee perceptions of
strategy implementation obstacles and organisation performance. After thorough analysis and in-depth interpretation of the responses, the following is recommended:

5.7.1 Management of Strategy Barriers

Internet Access Providers management should develop mechanisms to manage strategy implementation obstacles (environment, resources) identified in the study findings. Management should provide adequate resources, enough budget for all strategic activities. Strategic activities should be well funded so as to reduce negative perceptions of employees. Adequate and appropriate resources should be availed for strategic activities, operations and executions. These include physical resources, financial resources, computers and equipment and software required for daily activities.

Management should also consider the environment throughout the strategy management process from planning to review. The environment was found to be a major impediment to organisation strategy performance. Consequently, management should implement programs that reduces employee insecurity of the environment during high uncertainty and turbulence. Adequate support through guaranteed job security should be provided during uncertainty. If employees’ perceptions are transformed from negative to positive, organisation performance will be boosted.

5.7.2 Management of Employee Perceptions

To achieve and improve organisation performance, management should focus on employee perceptions of strategy implementation obstacles. Findings revealed that these perceptions are positively correlated to organisation performance though resources and environment were not statistically significant. We recommend that management should develop programs that enhance positive attitudes and perceptions towards all strategy implementation obstacles. Research showed that if employees have positive perceptions, organisation performance will be improved. Programs that can be implemented include building a conducive work environment that promotes positive perceptions and optimism. Organisations should adopt high performance work systems (Macky and Boxall, 2007; Rosen et al., 2006; Wood and
Wall, 2007) that enhances motivation, job satisfaction, commitment and engagement and trust in leadership.

5.7.3 Management of Strategy Drivers
Management should continuously ensure that organisation variables, communication and performance management which are currently major predictors of organisation performance receive support to enhance continued improvement in organisation performance. Further improvements through team building sessions, communication training, agile structures, top and bottom up communication, open door policy, and employee development has potential to enhance organisation performance. Management should also focus of salient factors like leadership and strategy formulation which were neither drivers nor impeders. Leadership can be enhanced through implementation of leadership development programs and adoption of situational and transactional leadership styles that are associated with high organisation performance. Management should adopt strategy formulation tools capable of overcoming implementation barriers.

5.7 Research limitations and generalisation
The major limitations of the study is that the dimensions of strategy implementation obstacles were derived from literature review and strategy implementation frameworks. However, further scrutiny of these variables shows that the constructs are not comprehensive leading to 44% contribution to organisation performance being explained by the model.

Another limitation is that, the study did not include one of the largest Internet Access Providers in Zimbabwe, Liquid Telecoms. The researchers were constrained in getting permission to conduct the research within Liquid Telecoms. Consequently, the perceptions of Internet Access Provider’s employees on strategy implementation obstacles were partially represented since Liquid Telecoms command a significant influence within this sector. Liquid Telecoms seems different from all other operators in that it has strong financial muscle, consequently, perhaps the conclusion on resources might have been different.
In addition, the questionnaire was developed from literature review. However, these questionnaires were not related to this study of employee perceptions which makes it difficult to fully conclude on the findings. The questionnaires were adapted to this study but no thorough validation was done on the research instrument. Moreover, contextual factors such as organisation variables, resources, industry environment and leadership and employee culture may result in different perceptions of employees towards organisation performance. Consequently, the study cannot be generalised elsewhere. The Internet Access Providers industry is the youngest sector in Zimbabwe and its contextual variables may not be generalised elsewhere.

Another limitation is that the research measured perceptions or opinions on strategy implementation obstacles using research instruments that were completely based on non-managerial employee’s perceptions. The study utilised quantitative methodology to investigate employee perceptions. Implementation of questionnaire surveys depend on the truthfulness of the respondents. However, reliability tests provided some assurance on the instrument ability to capture useful measures.

Furthermore, the research was confined to employees within Harare. This limitations is worth considering because employee perceptions might be moderated or influenced by geographical locations.

5.8 Areas of further research

The study recommends future studies to include geographical spread of employees within the Internet Access Providers. Some Internet Access Providers have offices in Mutare, Bulawayo, Gweru and even outside the country. Further research should be undertaken to determine how location influences perceptual cognitions of employees on strategy implementation obstacles and organisation performance.

The study established that marital status and department were statistically significant in explaining organisation performance. Further studies within Internet Access Providers should be undertaken to investigate the causes of this and provide managerial recommendations.

The developed model predicted 44% of organisation performance. The researcher recommends thorough investigations on other factors that predicts organisation performance. A more comprehensive model should be developed to assist management and employees.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE


Dear Colleague

Thank you for participating in this study which being conducted in part fulfilment of the UZ MBA course. It endeavours to understand how employee perceptions of obstacles to strategy implementation influences individual performance and organisational performance. The information will be kept confidentially.

The obstacles to strategy formulation are: Resources, Communication, Formulation, Leadership and Management, Environment, Organisational Variables like culture, capabilities and structure.

The researcher commits to uphold all research ethics which includes assurance of confidentiality.

Thank you for your support

Yours faithfully

Initial Mlambo

MBA Graduate Student (UZ)
Section 1: Background Information

The following questions concern your position and other personal information. Completion of this information is voluntary and confidentially is assured. No individual data will be reported.

THANK YOU!

1. What is your Gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2. Do you Supervise others?
   - Yes
   - No

3. How long have you worked for the organisation?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 to less than 3 years
   - 3 to less than 5 years
   - 5 to less than 7 years
   - 7 to less than 10 years
   - 10 to less than 15 years
   - More than 15 years

4. How long have you worked for your Immediate Supervisor?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 to less than 3 years
   - 3 to less than 5 years
   - 5 to less than 7 years
   - 7 to less than 10 years
   - 10 to less than 15 years
   - More than 15 years

5. What is your Age Group?
   - Under 26
   - 26 to 35
   - 36 to 45
   - 46 to 55
   - 56 to 65
   - 66 or older

6. What is your highest level of Education?
   - ‘O’ Level
   - Bachelors Degree
7. What is your marital status?

- [ ] Single
- [ ] Married
- [ ] Divorced/Separated
- [ ] Widowed

8. What department are you in?

- [ ] Sales and Marketing
- [ ] Finance and Accounting
- [ ] Human Resources
- [ ] Information Systems and IT
- [ ] Network Operations
- [ ] Customer Support
- [ ] Legal and Compliance
- [ ] Internal Audit
- [ ] Risk
- [ ] Revenue Assurance
- [ ] Others

**Section 2: Leadership Questionnaire**

Generally my perception of leaders in this organisation is that: Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instills pride and trust in me for being associated with him/her/them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provides assistance in exchange for my efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Keeps track of all employee mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Avoids getting involved when important issues arise/Avoids making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goes beyond the self-interests for the good of the organisation

Encourage workers to work *together* rather than competing against each other

Build people up through encouragement and affirmation

Provide mentor relationships in order to help people grow and achieve personal and organisational goals

Communicate clear plans and goals for the organization

---

**Section 3 : Communication Questionnaire**

Generally my perception of communication in this organisation is that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The vision, mission and strategy is clearly communicated and understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information is readily available for anything i.e my job, how the company is performing, about products and services to assist achieving objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organization’s communication motivates and stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Management and low level employees are receptive to each other’s ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attitudes toward communication in the organization are basically healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Organisation Variables

Generally my perception of organisation variables in this organisation is that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation structure is flexible to suit uncertain environments and achieve strategic objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear definition of duties, roles and responsibilities and how I relate with colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The shared values within the organisation promotes strategy achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation’s dominant culture is positive and it fosters employee commitment and loyalty to achieve objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation promotes innovation through employee training and development, process improvement and recognition of employee original ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5: Resources Questionnaire

Generally my perception of resources in this organisation is that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All our strategic activities from top management to low level employees are adequately funded</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I have adequate financial, technological and physical resources required to achieve my objectives</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Insufficient resources does not negatively affect my ability to achieve objectives</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6: Performance Management

My perception of performance management is that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The organisation’s employee performance management system is a useful tool, it provides clear, frequent and useful information on how well employees are performing and tells what to do to improve results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The performance management system in this organisation is fair, accurate, motivates and instils trust, confidence and employee security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management provides open and constructive feedback during the performance management review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The reward system facilitates implementation of strategy by motivating desired levels of performance, attracting and retaining the right kind of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Performance Management System empowers me to set my own objectives further increasing my commitment and loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to the organisation.

6 | The Performance Management Systems helps employees realise their performance goals which translates to strategic objectives of the organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 7: Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My perception of the environment is that:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There are no unpredictable changes in the economy that could affect achievement of organization objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The work environment is supportive and conducive for individual excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The economic challenges positively influences my ability to achieve strategic goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The economic challenges does not make me feel insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 8: Strategy Formulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My perception of strategy formulation is that:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I identify and I am committed to the achievement of the organisations’ strategic objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the strategy formulation exercises and my participation in the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am fully supportive and in agreement with formulated strategies and goals of this organisation

My individual goals are aligned to the organisations’ formulated goals

I understand and am committed to the organisation’s vision, mission and goals.

---

Section 9: Personal Questionnaire

In viewing my own role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel appreciated by my supervisor for what I contribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am working at a high level of productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have achieved most of my objectives in the past 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I anticipate to accomplish most of my objectives in this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am listened to by those above me in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My job is important to the success of this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I trust the leadership of this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I enjoy working in this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 10

Please rate your Organisation Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This organisation has achieved its objectives for the past 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The organisation will accomplish its future objectives for the next 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overall business performance is high compared to that of others in the same industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staff turnover is highly satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We have gained market share relative to competitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Our profit growth compares favourably with that of our competitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Staff morale in our company compares favourably with that of our competitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II : Demographic Frequencies

Responses by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses by Tenure in Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in Organisation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to less than 3 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Responses by Education

**What is your highest level of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O Level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate or Professional Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses by Marital Status

**What is your marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses by Department

**What department are you in**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Marketing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems and IT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Operations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: Environment Frequencies

There are no unpredictable changes in the economy that could affect achievement of organization objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work environment is supportive and conducive for individual excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The economic challenges positively influences my ability to achieve strategic goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The economic challenges does not make me feel insecure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>