STRATEGIC AGILITY AND COMPETITIVENESS OF LARGE FAST MOVING CONSUMER GOODS MANUFACTURERS IN NAIROBI COUNTY

PERIS WAMBUI NYUTU

A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTARTION, FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

2022

DECLARATION

I therefore certify that my research project is an unique piece of work created alone by me and has not been presented at any other institution.

Signature: *Pwn* Date: **25/10/2022**

PERIS WAMBUI NYUTU

D61/20144/2019

This research project has been handed in for evaluation, and I, in my capacity as a supervisor at the University, have given my permission.

Signature : Date: **7/11/2022**

DR. MARGARET M. KARIUKI

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to my parents, my husband & siblings who have continually supported me morally, emotionally & spiritually. Your encouragement has been a source of strength.

To my mentor Dr. KK, thank you for challenging me to enroll in this course. Your support through the years can never be forgotten. God bless you!

To my classmates who became friends and who every day reminded me to keep the focus, thank you.

Lastly to the almighty God whose mercies & graces have been sufficient. I offer to you my knowledge and skills.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My utmost regards to the very many persons who in one way or another contributed to making this research and indeed my entire MBA experience memorable. I thank my teachers at the Faculty of Business for the business knowledge imparted into me. To my fellow students, thank you for the many challenges we overcame together. Immense thanks of my supervisor for painstakingly taking me through the research process.

Above all, to the Almighty God for the gift of life, strength and endurance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ii

CHAPTER ONE 1

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Introduction 1

1.1.1 Strategic Agility 2

1.1.2 Firm Competitiveness...3

1.1.3 Fast moving consumer goods manufacturers in Nairobi County 4

1.2 Research Problem. 5

1.3 Objective of the study 6

1.4 Value of the study 7

CHAPTER TWO 8

LITERATURE REVIEW 8

2.1 The Introduction..8

2.2 Theoretical Framework 8

2.3 Empirical Review of Literature...10

2.4 Summary 14

CHAPTER THREE...17

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY...17

3.1 The Introduction...17

3.2 The Research Design...17

3.3 The Population of Study..17

3.4 The Collection of Data 18

3.6 Data analysis 18

CHAPTER FOUR 20

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSSION......................................20

4.1 Introduction..20

4.2 Response Rate 20

4.3 Demographic Characteristic of the Firm 20

4.3.1. Firm Age Analysis...21

4.3.2 Number of Products in the Market 21

4.4 Descriptive Statistics 22

4.4.1 Strategic Agility 22
4.4.2 Competitiveness 24
4.5 Regression Analysis 26
4.5.1 The Regression Model Summary 26
4.5.2 Regression ANOVA 27
4.5.3 Regression Coefficients 27
4.6 Discussion of the Findings 28
CHAPTER FIVE 31
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 31
5.1 The Introduction 31
5.2 Summary of the Findings 31
5.3 Conclusion 32
5.4 The Study Limitation 34
5.5.1 Implications for Practice 34
5.5.2 Implications for Policy 35
5.5 Further Research Focus 36
REFERENCES 37

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to establish how competitiveness of Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) Manufacturers in Nairobi City County is affected by strategic agility. The study's guiding theoretical propositions were supported by the dynamic capability theory and the business innovation theory. All 42 firms with responses were included in the census research. Data was collected by a questionnaire. According to the descriptive statistics carried out, the elements of strategic agility were represented by clarity of vision, core capacity, choice of strategic aims, sharing responsibility, and taking action. The dependent variable, competitiveness, was also examined in terms of product quality, delivery dependability, process reliability, and innovation levels. Statistical analysis confirmed that competitiveness is a good indicator of innovation levels. The researcher used a linear regression analysis to determine how much strategic agility affects a firm's ability to compete. Clearness of vision, center abilities, choice of vital targets, sharing liability, and making a move aspects of key nimbleness were found to positively and significantly predict firm competitiveness [R2 = 0.346, R2 adj = 0.25, F (5, 34), p 0.05] in the findings of an overall model of regression. 25% of the variation in the competitiveness of the firms was explained by this specific model. The ANOVA regression findings revealed a statistically significant and linear link between firm competitiveness and vision, center abilities, choice of vital targets, sharing liability, and making a move aspects of key nimbleness [F (7, 96), p 0.05]. Further investigation revealed a statistically significant relationship between strategic agility and firm competitiveness among Nairobi County's producers of fast-moving consumer products. According to the study's findings, in order to increase their competitiveness, the majority of FMCG firms in Kenya's Nairobi County must make sure that strategic agility is embraced. Among others, the study recommends that future studies may concentrate on the institutional and legal setting that might facilitate the adoption of strategic agility in Kenya.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Businesses are now going through rapid changes and fierce rivalry in most regions. As a consequence, businesses must adapt in order to compete by hiring employees who have the abilities and skills to cope with these changes. Being strategic is the best way to compete and survive in the market. Offering a broad choice of rapid services and products, as well as engaging in process development, change management, and innovation, are all characteristics of an agile company. An agile firm can adapt to unforeseen changes in the environment (Tikkanen, 2014). Oyerinde et al. (2018), poor strategic adaptation of enterprises results in uneven company performance. Strategic agility, according to Kitonga (2017), helps deal with issues with organizational performance. Organizations encounter a number of challenges as a result of the work environment's quick and unpredictable changes. These changes have been influenced by globalization, innovation, creativity, and changing customer preferences, among other factors. Businesses need to adjust to these developments and increase their competitiveness if they want to remain afloat in the market.

When the work environment was impacted by rapid changes, businesses had to examine their goals and policies as well as react swiftly and adaptably to the needs of the workplace. Companies were forced to reassess their goals and policies as well as react swiftly and adaptably to changes in the workplace. This led to a rise in strategic agility. The pursuit of excellence, the evolution of work processes, and gaining a competitive edge all depend on strategic agility for workplace performance and sustainability. Companies now aim to provide their clients with the greatest value quicker than their rivals (Nembhard, 2015; Cegarra-Navarro et al., 2016).

The dynamic capacities theory and the entrepreneurial innovation theory will serve as the theoretical foundation for this investigation. According to both ideas, agile firms adopt agile strategies, use technology, take advantage of people resources and enhance their talents, build the ability to swiftly satisfy consumer wants, and form and break up alliances, provide new services promptly, seize opportunities, and reduce risks in a dynamic work environment (Qin & Nembhard, 2015).

Success in a dynamic and quickly changing business environment depends on strategic agility in addition to seizing opportunities in a chaotic market. It emphasizes strategic thinking and a distinct vision rather than suggesting that there is no strategy. Nematizadeh and Khoshnood (2017) highlighted many components of strategic agility, including clarity of vision, critical competencies, choice of strategic aim, shared accountability, and decision-making.

1.1.1 Strategic Agility

According to Khoshnood and Nematizadeh (2017), strategic agility refers to an organization's capacity to swiftly adjust by recombining resources, processes, and strategies in response to changes in the business environment as seen via opportunities and threats. In a competitive environment, an agile organization may achieve market competitiveness via responsiveness, competence, flexibility, and speed, according to a thorough examination of the strategic agility literature. Strategic agility is a means through which businesses may change, reinvent themselves, adapt, and ultimately survive (Doz & Kosonen 2008). In order to add value, a firm must be able to continuously modify and adjust its strategic direction in a core business.

Sampath (2015) defined strategic agility as the capacity vital spryness as the limit of an association to adjust to change with regards to business, recognize potential open doors, dangers, and dangers, and send off new essential drives quickly and over and over. Teece, Peteraf, and Leih (2016) defined strategic agility as the capacity of an organization to effectively redeploy and refocus its resources to value-creating and value-protecting activities. Strategic agility, according to Sajdak (2015), is a necessary response to the external environment that comprises polling a sample and assessing the likely effect of trends in a particular sector. Researchers that take a resource-based perspective claim that a company's competitive edge is founded on diversified and unique resources. Finding the causes of variation in business competitiveness is a crucial issue in both industrial organization and strategic management research.

1.1.2 Firm Competitiveness

The characteristics of a competitive company are profitability, cost, productivity, and market share. Achievement and competition are often linked. Success may be summed up simply as the accomplishment of a company's objectives. Therefore, success should be determined by how well a business handles its primary success criteria (Ferguson and Dickenson, 1982). Competitiveness evaluations take into account a variety of variables in addition to monetary or market-based measures, including inventiveness, quality, and social variables including moral standing, social responsibility, and working conditions for employees. are expanding their inclusion.

The ability of a business to outperform its rivals with more distinction in terms of satisfying customer expectations by offering cost-effective, high-quality goods and services while preserving a competitive edge (Gerald, Obianuju, & Chukwunonso, 2020). According to Zhang and Sharifi (2000), a company that implements strategic Agility has the following competitive advantages: speed, flexibility, competence, and accountability. To ensure that innovation occurs rapidly and that consumers have greater power inside the business, strategic agility comprises enhanced information systems and contemporary production technology. The strategic acceleration competitive capabilities of a corporation should thus be centered on creative learning and customer satisfaction. This generally indicates that a company's capacity to meet consumer expectations in contrast to industry rivals determines its competitive capabilities (Sherehiy and Karwowski, 2014).

Businesses need to always be on the lookout for new business opportunities and predict where the next great thing will emerge if they want to succeed in this market. If you want to accomplish the main objective of the organization, you must be able to make rapid judgments to remain ahead of the competition (Qin and Nembhard, 2015). Strategically astute businesses are well equipped to handle these challenges. This study's main concern is how strategic agility affects FMCG companies' ability to compete (Ojha, Patel and Sridharan, 2019).

1.1.3 Fast moving consumer goods manufacturers in Nairobi County

According to Ojha, Patel, and Sridharan (2019), Fast-Moving Consumer Goods Manufacturers (FMCG) are businesses that produce goods that are cheap to produce and sell rapidly. They may also be described as often bought essential or non-essential items (Mandrinos, 2014). Products covered by FMCGs include, to mention a few, cleansers, shaving items, toiletries, cleansers, delicate drinks, handled dinners, consumables, crystal, batteries, beauty care products, and plastic things (Ojha, Patel and Sridharan, 2019).

One reason for the majority of FMCG items' short shelf lives is because they are perishable and deteriorate rapidly. For instance, fruits, meat, baked goods, and vegetables are extremely perishable FMCGs (Ojha, Patel and Sridharan, 2019). From the perspective of marketers, FMCG also benefits from a vast distribution network (Nyaga, 2014). The FMCG industry in Kenya has expanded more quickly during the previous several decades. Numerous new businesses, both local and international, have flooded the market as the industry has expanded to vie for a piece of the action.

Currently, Nairobi, Kenya, is home to several FMCG manufacturing businesses. According to Muhalia, Ngugi and Moronge (2021), a couple of the organizations included are Interconsumer Restricted, Bidco Petroleum Processing plants, Kapa Oil, Finlay, Kenya Seed Organization, Kenya Nut Organization, Dawa Gathering, Maisha Flour Factories, Melvin Bog Global, Settle Food varieties Kenya, Eveready East Africa, Chief Food Ventures, Delegate and Allan (E.A), Coca-Cola, PepsiCo, Some FMCG brands are being quickly destroyed by rising competition and technological advancements. Another issue is complex logistics management, which is made worse by a huge distribution network that moves more quickly (Njambi & Katuse, 2013).

1.2 Research Problem

The workplace is characterized by quick changes and fierce rivalry. Because of this, businesses need to have a staff that is capable of coping with these changes in order to stay competitive and compete against their rivals. Being strategic is the best way to compete and survive in the market. To enable the business to be agile (Tikkanen, 2014). To react to unanticipated changes in the workplace, organizations must become agile, adapt to change, tweak procedures, innovate, and build strong customer connections (Tikkanen, 2014).

Nader & Heidari (2016) assert that changes like economic globalization and evolving technology have given consumers more power while making it challenging for firms to compete. According to Oyerinde et al. (2018), poor strategic adaptation of enterprises results in uneven company performance. Strategic agility, according to Kitonga (2017), helps deal with issues with organizational performance. According to Kumkale (2016), strategic agility is a tool for giving a corporation a competitive advantage. According to Alromeedy (2019), a company's competitive advantage is significantly impacted by its strategic agility. Studies have shown a correlation between strategic agility and organizational success; however, there is no empirical data on this relationship for businesses, especially FMCG manufacturing companies in Nairobi County.

The research focuses on organizational strategic agility, a kind of management used by companies to boost productivity. The following research questions are addressed in this study: Does the competitiveness of manufacturing enterprises in Nairobi County depend on strategic agility?

1.3 Objective of the study

The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of strategic agility on the competitiveness of Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) manufacturers in Nairobi City County.

1.4 Value of the study

Its significance as a study arises from the need for local FMCG manufacturers to increase their competitiveness through strategic agility; however, there is very little strategic agility expertise that can help this effort, particularly in Nairobi County. As a result, the study will offer suggestions to those in control of businesses on how to improve competitiveness through the use of strategic agility, which can assist boost productivity.

This research is relevant and useful from both an academic and a business standpoint. Because of this study, the researcher had a greater knowledge of strategic agility and the effect that it has on competitive advantage. Starting points for further research on strategic agility and competitive advantage may be found in these results.

This study's managerial contribution is to encourage managers to be more strategic and, as a result, increase the competitiveness of the companies they lead. When local enterprises are competitive, the country's GDP rises, and more resources are available for public program development.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The chapter examines theoretical and empirical research on organizational strategic agility as a factor affecting organizations' competitiveness. The chapter opens with a description of the theoretical framework, with an emphasis on the theories of entrepreneurial innovation and dynamic capacities. It then reviews the empirical literature on strategic agility and company competitiveness.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Two theories guided the study: dynamic capabilities theory as well as entrepreneurship innovation theory.

2.2.1 The Theory of Dynamic Capability

Dynamic capability theory (DCT) is explained by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) as an affiliation's ability to integrate, make, and reconfigure internal and outside capacities to manage dynamically developing circumstancess. According to the thesis, firms may adapt to or create changes in their challenging business environment by repurposing their current firm-specific capabilities into new ones. The concept explains how resources, product markets, and competitive advantage are connected to company longevity. It also discusses how companies may gain a sustainable competitive advantage and prosper in a hostile and unstable business environment.

The DCT is based on three fundamental notions. First, the capacity to recognize and shape opportunities The second is to seize chances. Third, to keep the business competitive by rearranging its resources (Teece, 2007). Despite being widely accepted and having a solid theoretical foundation, this approach does not address all issues related to long-term competitive advantage. Zahra, Sapienza, and Davidsson (2006) claim that there are several inconsistencies and ambiguities in the DCT literature. The difficulty of empirical measurement is another critique of the idea. According to Ambrosini, Bowman, and Collier (2009), management views of the need for change as well as perceptions of the firm's internal and external environments are necessary for dynamic capacity. As a consequence, a management may fail to properly implement DCT because they incorrectly understand the need for change.

the cornerstones of long-term business success, while supporting managers in determining crucial strategic considerations and objectives that must be implemented in order to boost business performance and prevent the negative profit tendency brought on by operating in global markets (Teece, 2007). In order to highlight the most important skills that management must have in order to produce better long-term company performance, the framework blends strategy and innovation literature. DCT, according to Easterby-Smith, Lyles, and Peteraf (2009), are higher-level capabilities that make it possible to gather knowledge, act quickly, share it, and continuously update operational processes, as well as engage in interactions with the outside world and evaluations, in order to improve firm performance and competitive advantages.

2.2.2 Entrepreneurship Innovation Theory

The Entrepreneurship Innovation Theory was proposed by Schumpeter in 1934. According to the theory, entrepreneurship is the combining of resources in novel ways, such as the introduction of new products that are more marketable, new production techniques, the discovery of new markets, the identification of new raw material sources, and the alteration of current market structures through innovation that results in significant changes in the market. He views innovation as a tool used by entrepreneurs. The Entrepreneurship Innovation Theory makes the following assumptions: the development of a new method of production, the discovery of a new product, the establishment of a new market, and the restructuring of an industry.

The Entrepreneurial Innovation Theory is criticized by Chepurenko (2015) as one of several factors that cause cyclical changes in a capitalist economy. Additionally, it might be difficult to distinguish between creative and conventional business practices. Recent years have seen a rise in entrepreneurial innovation, making it seem as if Schumpeter overstated the innovator's importance in his paradigm (Small bone & Welter, 2009). The entrepreneur is also seen as a growth engine, one who sees chances to introduce new products, markets, sources of supply, industrial organization forms, or the development of recently found resources in order to enhance the firm's performance and competitiveness (Madsen, 2007).

2.3 Empirical Review of Literature

The ability to provide the correct service or product at the right price, anywhere along the value chain, is referred to as strategic agility. In order to generate fluid operations, a corporation must have the capacity to "transcend production barriers." Therefore, achieving strategic agility requires a corporation to change from a mechanical to an organic organization with quick learning and knowledge production. Knowledge has therefore become the most important organizational resource for attaining strategic agility. According to the firm's knowledge-based approach, which holds that a firm's knowledge base is its most crucial and strategic resource, this is in accordance with (Grant, 1996).

A three-dimensional concept of agility by Sambamurthy et al. is akin to Roth's knowledge-based strategic agility paradigm from 1996. In this concept of strategic agility, there are three interconnected competencies: customer agility, partnership agility, and operational agility. Long (2000) suggests a strategic agility measure that takes into account the three aforementioned aspects of strategic agility. Their scale comprises six components, all of which have been often used to represent the strategic agility construct: clarity of vision, client knowledge, understanding core capabilities, strategic target selection, shared responsibility, competitor knowledge, and taking action.

Clarity of vision and core competencies provide the speed and steadiness' necessary for strategic agility. A corporation will pursue chances it isn't prepared to take advantage of if it doesn't understand its fundamental strengths (Long, 2000). By ensuring that all value chain partners are exactly aligned and driven to exploit relevant opportunities as they emerge, which is connected to higher performance, clarity of vision enables quicker execution.

The growth, improvement, or change of a company's capabilities to suit present and future prospects is facilitated by certain strategic aims. A corporation benefits from the ties with its value chain partners, which is another important characteristic of strategic agility. Shared responsibility is a way to gauge how much our connection with the customer contributes to the creation of value (Long, 2000). The relationships a firm has with the other parties in its value chain may both create and destroy value.

In a partnership, there is a large proportion of value-creating responsibilities and a low share of value-destroying responsibilities. This is analogous to the concept of strategic agility proposed by Sambamurthy et al. (2003), in which a firm concurrently "co-opts" all members of its value network to create and use information. By acting, the company exhibits its capacity to seize opportunities as they present itself. This shows the firm's "speed of reaction," to put it another way. This book is essential reading due to its depth of information and basis in preceding studies (e.g. Roth, 1996; Sambamurthyet.al., 2003). As a consequence, this research makes use of the five-dimensional conceptualization of strategic agility.

In the Nigerian telecoms sector, Oyedijo (2012) looked at the connection between strategic agility and competitive performance. For the objective of determining how strategic agility affects competitiveness, the research analyzed data from nine (9) companies in Nigeria's telecoms sector. A five-point Likert type scale based on 21 questions culled from existing literature was used to analyze and appraise the placement of the selected telecom companies on several aspects of strategic agility. A strategic agility index was created for each participating organization using the sum and average of the respondents' scores on all of the strategic agility themes. Members of each company's Top Management Team completed a questionnaire on their company's strategic agility (TMT). The firms' books were used to obtain information on profit growth, sales revenue, financial stability, operational effectiveness, and performance stability. The results show a relationship between strategic agility and competitive performance. It has been shown that strategic agility affects Nigerian telecommunications companies' ability to compete.

Al-Sani investigated how organizational performance dimensions were affected by strategic agility elements (2017). A questionnaire with 47 statements divided into seven levels was used in the study. The 63 participants in the research discovered that strategic planning significantly impacted organizational performance. Al-Tamimi and Abdul-Ghafour (2017) examined the organizational elements that influence the creation of the best strategies that result in high levels of organizational performance as well as the understanding of the realities of applying agility. The efficiency of the banking industry is impacted by the strategy. The information for the inquiry and the tools for data gathering were the questions that were designed. The assessment stated that the Central Bank of Iraq has implemented strategic agility initiatives.

Hanieh (2016) aimed to ascertain the relationship between institutional performance excellence and strategic agility in the Gaza Strip's food businesses. Among the characteristics taken into account in the research were strategic sensitivity, clarity of vision, core competencies, shared responsibility for choosing strategic objectives, and speed of response. It was shown that strategic agility practice had a good, empirically significant relationship with top-notch performance in Gaza Strip food sector organizations.

The significance of strategic agility in achieving organizational excellence was examined by Hasan (2019). In order to achieve the study goals, two main hypotheses were created, and they were tested using a random stratified sample of 56 staff members. Strategic Agility and organizational excellence scored well in the study that followed the usage of data gathering questionnaires. The research found a connection between organizational excellence and strategic agility.

Ofoegbu and Ayobmi (2012) examined how strategic agility impacts how well-performing Nigerian manufacturing enterprises are perceived. The research investigated the idea that strategic agility may boost output. The results show that resource mobility, strategy knowledge, and group commitment all have positive effects on how well an organization is seen to be doing.

2.4 Summary

Overall, this literature review addresses a broad variety of issues connected to the effect that strategic agility has on firm competitiveness as well as the challenges and possibilities presented by its use. There was a significant vacuum in the literature since there weren't any comparable studies conducted in Kenya, either in the private or public sector, and particularly not in Nairobi. Analogous research were often focused on the strategic agility and competitiveness of firms. This study ought to close that gap. The explanation above clearly shows that strategic agility considerations have a substantial impact on corporate success. Because there hasn't been much study done in this area, it's not apparent how operations managers may utilize this to increase business competitiveness. The United States, Europe, and Asia are where the bulk of research have been conducted. On the other side, the present research focuses on Nairobi County's FMCG manufacturers. The next part presents the conceptual framework to you in its entirety

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Research methodology is described in this chapter, along with the rationale behind it. This section discusses the study's design, the targeted study population, the research instrument, the data collection methods, and the data processing procedures.

3.2 The Research Design

This study used a descriptive technique. In normal descriptive research, attitudes, views, demographic data, situations, and procedures are all evaluated. A cross-sectional descriptive survey approach was employed for this investigation. A survey is an effort to get information from people in a population to find out how that population is doing right now in relation to one or more factors. The research is cross-sectional since there was just one moment at which data was gathered.

3.3 The Population of Study

According to Lewis (2015), the target population is the group to which the researcher wants to publish their research results. The selection of a population must be such that the participants are able answer the research question. The study's target population was all large FMCG enterprises in Nairobi City County. According to KAM (2020), there were 42 companies that qualified as large scale FMCG manufacturers. All the 42 companies were involved as the population. The study was therefore a census study.

3.4 The Collection of Data

Structured questions formed the instrument for primary data collection. The demographic information on the age, size of the respondent companies will be collected. Data on strategic agility was captured in the questionnaire as the independent variable. The dependent variable that is firm competitiveness was also addressed. The respondents were General Managers, Strategy Directors, Commercial Directors or any other suitable offices within the companies.

3.6 Data analysis

Completeness and consistency were checked on the filled questionnaires. According to the responses provided by the respondents, the data was summarized, edited, tagged, and categorized into numerous categories as descriptive statistics. Relationships between independent and dependent variables were tested using linear regression. The model equation for purposes of analysis was as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y = \beta 0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \varepsilon}$$

Y= Firm Competitiveness

β1 to β5 = regression coefficients

X1 = Core Capabilities

X2 = Clarity of Vision

X3 = Selected Strategic Targets

X4 = Shared Responsibility

X5 = Taking Action

ε = error term

The association between strategic agility and competitiveness was determined using Pearson correlation analysis. This included the relationship's nature, magnitude, and relevance. Pearson The correlation study was carried out using a 95% confidence level (= 0.05)

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSSION

4.1 Introduction

The study's focus was on how different characteristics of strategic agility impacted various facets of business competitiveness. The specific goals of the study included examining the various strategic agility practices used, and the conceptual model that demonstrates the relationship between strategic agility and firm competitiveness. The study results are presented in this chapter, together with demographic information, descriptive statistics, and most importantly the degree to which different components of strategic agility affect business competitiveness.

4.2 Response Rate

The study was a census in which a population of 42 organizations was subjected the study questionnaire. Out of the 42 questionnaires distributed, 40 were returned with valid responses, while 2 were not responsive. Thus, analysis of the response rate indicated that a response rate of 95% was achieved, which is above the threshold recommended by Mugenda & Mugenda (2008).

4.3 Demographic Characteristic of the Firm

The demographic data was evaluated on two parameters, which includes age of the firm and number of products a firm has in the market. The following were the findings:

4.3.1. Firm Age Analysis

Table 4.1. Firm Age

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 10 Years	12	30.0
10 and less than 20 years	8	20.0
More than 20 years	20	50.0
Total	40	100.0

Table 4.1 shows the parameters used to evaluate age of the firm as well as the results. the analysis revealed that firms that had Less than 10 Years accounted for 12 (30%), Those that had 10 and less than 20 years accounted for 8 (20%), and those that had More than 20 years accounted for 20 (50. %). Thus, it was found that evident that most of the firms were operators with experience of more than 20 years.

4.3.2 Number of Products in the Market

Table 4.2. Marketed Products

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 10 products	32	80.0
10 – 20 Products	6	15.0
more than 20 products	2	5.0
Total	40	100.0

Table 4.2 shows the marketed products by a firm. The statistics indicate that firms that had introduced Less than 10 products accounted for 32 (80 %), firms that had introduced 10 – 20 products accounted for 6 (15%), and those that had more than 20 products accounted for 2 (5%). Hence, majority of the firms had introduced less than 10 products in the market.

4.4 Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics analysis was done on the basis of a five-point Likert-type scale to measure the strategic agility dimensions on a likert scale as the basis for understanding the level of respondent's opinion on the concept of strategic agility and competitiveness of firms within their organizational context. The following are the findings.

4.4.1 Strategic Agility

The descriptive analysis of strategic agility was based on five dimensions, which included sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, core capabilities, strategic target selection, and taking action, and involved measures of the mean and standard deviations. Table 4.3 shows the findings, which indicate that clarity of vision (mean = 3.91, standard deviation = 1.127) activities were agreed to by the respondents. On core capability (μ = 3.628, S.D = 1.278), the respondents agreed that the activities were being implemented in their respective organizations. Evaluation of selection of strategic targets (μ = 3.925, S.D = 1.090) shows that the respondents had agreed with implementation of the activities. Evaluation of sharing responsibility (μ = 4.012, S.D = 1.129) shows that the respondents had agreed with the implementation status of the activities. Evaluation of taking action (μ = 4.128, S.D = 0.978) shows that the respondents had agreed with implementation of the activities. The average composite score reflects respondents on average agreed with strategic agility (μ =3.921, S.D = 0.978) implementation in their respective organizations. This infers that there was generally a clear respondent's identification with strategic agility activities on-going implementation in the respective organizations.

Table 4.3 Strategic Agility

Strategic Agility Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.Clarity of Vision		
We have a clear sense of purpose and use it to guide our decisions in running the business	3.83	1.174
We find it easy to explain our overall goals and their clearly and effectively to others.	3.93	1.071
We have a high level of agreement about the principles that should guide our behavior in conducting our business unit's operations	4.03	1.074
We are proud of what we are trying to achieve as a business unit.	3.85	1.189
Average score	**3.91**	**1.127**
2.Core Capabilities		
We can describe the special skills, knowledge, and know-how that comprise our greatest strengths and that we rely on to maintain our competitive advantage.	3.93	1.207
When allocating funds for process improvement, we are able to identify those processes that are most likely to add value to our products in the eyes of our clients	3.30	1.285
We have a good understanding of which skills and knowledge are most critical to providing results that are important to our clients.	3.50	1.177
We are well aware of our business unit's reputation among our clients and what we are best known for in the marketplace.	3.78	1.441
Average score	**3.628**	**1.278**
3.Selection of Strategic Targets		
We are able to identify the market/client segments that place a high value on the product attributes we provide.	4.00	.987
We know which of our business unit's core capabilities are most important in creating value for existing or new market/client segments.	3.53	1.339
We know which competencies and process we need to enhance or develop to better serve our targeted client segments.	4.00	1.132
We have in place the processes for identifying and developing products that provide a good match-up between our firm's capabilities and market opportunities.	4.17	.903
Average score	**3.925**	**1.090**
4. Sharing Responsibility		
We ask people on our project teams to treat mistakes as opportunities for learning and improving rather than as occasions for placing blame.	4.05	1.239
We provide easy access to information of interest to our clients and to the people we work with.	4.25	.899

We provide easy access to information of interest to our clients and to the people we work with.	4.25	.899
We encourage people on our project teams, including the client and his or her staff, to behave as though each of us is responsible for the final results of the total project, rather than just for the part we have been assigned.	3.95	1.176
We keep our clients fully involved in the planning and execution of projects and stress the importance of their role in getting results.	3.80	1.203
Average score	**4.012**	**1.129**
5.Taking Action		
We make sure the people we work with are familiar with our strategy and its purpose.	4.13	.883
We are able to adapt our strategy to fit changing circumstances without losing sight of the strategy's overall purpose.	4.23	.947
We involve the key people we work with in discussions of our strategies and solicit their thoughts on the best way to implement them.	3.95	1.260
We frequently discuss with the people we work with the kinds of actions needed to best carry out the business unit's strategy.	4.20	.823
Average score	**4.128**	**0.978**
Average composite scores	**3.921**	**1.120**

4.4.2 Competitiveness

Table 4.4 shows the competitiveness descriptive statistics analysis. This was evaluated on the basis of product quality, delivery reliability, process reliability and innovation levels of the firms. On average respondents agree that product quality (μ = 4.138, S.D = 0.991) activities were being implemented by the organizations. The respondents on average agreed that delivery reliability (μ = 4.29, S.D = 0.817) activities were being implemented by the organizations. The respondents on average agreed that Process flexibility (μ = 3.99, S.D = 1.138) activities were being implemented by the organizations.

Table 4.4 Competitiveness

Competitiveness Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Product Quality		
Our business unit has the ability to provide a high level of service reliability compared with our competitors.	4.32	1.023
Our business unit has the ability to provide products with high level of performance compared with our competitors.	4.12	.939
Our business unit has the high level of product quality as perceived by the client compared with our competitors.	4.38	.925
Our business unit has the ability to provide a high level of conformance quality compared with our competitors.	4.12	.939
Our business unit has the ability to provide products of high level of quality compared with our competitors.	3.75	1.127
Average score	**4.138**	**0.991**
Delivery Reliability		
Our business unit has to promptly handle client complaints compared with our competitors	4.25	.870
Our business unit has the ability to reliably deliver services on time compared with our competitors.	4.33	.764
Average score	**4.29**	**0.817**
Process Flexibility		
Our business unit has the ability to provide broad service mix within same facilities compared with our competitors.	3.95	1.319
Our business unit has the ability to rapidly handle clients' needs compared with our competitors.	4.00	1.198
Our business unit has the ability to rapidly change service mix compared with our competitors.	3.88	1.042
Our business unit has the ability to rapidly change services volume compared with our competitors.	4.13	.992
Average scores	**3.99**	**1.138**
Innovation		
Our business unit has the ability to develop new service technology at a high rate compared with our competitors.	4.38	.925
Our business unit has the ability to develop new features in existing services at a high rate	3.92	1.248
market opportunities, compared with our competitors.	3.75	1.056
Our business unit has the ability to develop new methods at a high rate compare with our competitors.	4.27	1.109
Our business unit has the ability to develop new working methods at a high rate compared with our competitors.	3.85	1.167
Average scores	**4.034**	**1.101**
Average Composite Scores	**4.088**	**1.040**

The respondents on average agreed that innovation (μ = 4.034, S.D = 1.101) activities were being implemented by the organizations. The average composite scores revealed that respondents agreed that competitiveness (μ = 4.088, S.D = 1.040) activities were being implemented by the organizations. The standard deviations also show that majority of the respondents were clustered around the average opinion of the respondents. This infers that there was generally a clear respondent's identification with competitiveness activities on-going implementation in the respective organizations.

4.5 Regression Analysis

A regression analysis was performed to assess the magnitude of the impact of strategic agility on firm competitiveness. The tests performed included model summarization, ANOVA, and regression coefficient evaluation.

4.5.1 The Regression Model Summary

Table 4.5. Model Summary[f]

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.455[a]	.207	.186	.07502	.207	9.903	1	38	.003
2	.474[b]	.225	.183	.07514	.018	.880	1	37	.354
3	.480[c]	.231	.167	.07590	.006	.264	1	36	.611
4	.500[d]	.250	.165	.07598	.020	.920	1	35	.344
5	.588[e]	.346	.250	.07201	.096	4.966	1	34	.033

A. Predictors: sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, strategic target selection, core capabilities and taking action

Dependent Variable: Competitiveness

Table 4.5 displays the model summary, where the independent variables are competitiveness and the dependent variables are clarity of vision, core skills, choice of strategic aims, sharing responsibility, and taking action. The findings reveal an overall model of regression involving five predictors (sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, strategic target selection, core capabilities and taking action) that significantly predict firm competitiveness [$R^2 = 0.346$, R^2 adj = 0.25, F (5, 34), $p < 0.05$)]. This particular model accounted for 25% of the variance in firm competitiveness

4.5.2 Regression ANOVA

Table 4.6 shows the ANOVA regression results, which indicates that the overall model suggests that sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, strategic target selection, core capabilities and taking action have a statistically significant linear relationship with firm competitiveness [F (7, 96), $p < 0.05$)]

Table 4.6. ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
5	Regression	.093	5	.019	3.598	.010[f]
	Residual	.176	34	.005		
	Total	.270	39			

Dependent Variable: Competitiveness
Predictors: sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, strategic target selection, core capabilities and taking action

4.5.3 Regression Coefficients

Table 4.7 shows the coefficients of regression analysis in which the overall model indicates that a unit increase in clarity of vision enhances a firm's competitiveness by 0.155 other predictors being constant, a unit increase in core capability enhances a firm's competitiveness by 0.70 other predictors being constant, a unit increase in selection of strategic target enhances a firm's competitiveness by 0.042 other predictors being constant. a unit increase in sharing responsibility enhances a firm's competitiveness by 0.045 other predictors being constant. a unit increase in taking action enhances a firm's competitiveness by 0.157 other predictors being constant. Thus, the findings suggest that competitiveness and vision, center abilities, choice of vital targets, sharing liability are significant predictors of firm competitiveness.

Table 4.7 Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(constant)	2.828	.352		8.030	.000
1.Clarity of vision	.155	.111	.298	1.399	.171
2.core capabilities	.070	.064	.154	1.087	.285
3.Selection of strategic targets	.042	.064	.096	.665	.510
4. Tharing responsibility	.045	.121	.081	.372	.712
5.Taking action	.157	.070	.330	2.229	.033

a. Dependent Variable: Competitiveness

4.6 Discussion of the Findings

The study's primary goal was to investigate how strategic agility affected company competitiveness among firms. Clarity of vision, core competencies, chosen strategic aims, shared responsibilities, and strategic agility execution in connection to business competitiveness were among the aspects of strategic agility that the research aimed to investigate. In Nairobi County, the research found a strong linear relationship between strategic agility and competitiveness the fast-moving consumer products producers.

The study identifies the main strategic agility practices that have influenced firm competitiveness as clarity of vision, core capabilities, selected strategic targets, shared responsibilities, and implementation of strategic agility. According to the research, strategic agility characteristics had a substantial influence on firm competitiveness among big fast-moving consumer goods businesses in Nairobi County.

Oyedijo (2012), which showed clear connections between strategic adaptability and business success in Nigeria, was supported by Njeru (2015). In order to achieve this goal, companies that need to increase performance should think about using strategic agility.

Regarding clarity of vision, the survey found that the majority of organizations have put in place procedures that, to a significant degree, clearly explain the firm's overarching aims. The study's results validate Hasan (2019), who argued that strategic sourcing increased a company's supply chain agility and its ability to quickly adapt to shifting client needs. The findings further support Al-(2017) Sani's hypothesis that a business has to assure clarity of vision and methods to grasp its key competencies in order to gain speed and responsiveness. Strategic flexibility helps the company maintain its attention on the overarching organizational goal. According to the study's conclusions, Nairobi County's big, fast-moving consumer products producers may adopt tactics that are realistically doable in terms of resource availability, possession of special skill sets, and experience.

In terms of core competencies, the survey found that the majority of producers in are unaware that their position in the market with respect to reputation among their clients. The research showed that in order to keep up with changing market dynamics, the majority of Nairobi County's big fast moving consumer products businesses need to adopt a more adaptable organizational structure. The research found that firms that have been successful in identifying and concentrating on the different business units' core strengths to exploit market possibilities to a significant degree. The study's managerial-level conclusions show that enterprises in Kenya may become much more competitive, especially in unpredictable markets, if they concentrate on specific aims throughout their strategic planning process. Regarding shared duties, the majority of the major producers need project teams to learn from errors and enhance the quality of their output. Shared responsibility promotes employee empowerment. Thus, the study's results support the idea that creativity and teamwork are some of the most important success criteria for the implementation of strategic agility.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 The Introduction

This research looked at how strategic agility might provide fast-moving consumer products producers in Nairobi County, Kenya a significant competitive edge. A summary of our results, judgments, and suggestions is given in this chapter.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

This study's goal was to ascertain how strategic agility affected the competitiveness of Nairobi City County's Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) businesses. The fundamental theories relating to the expected association between strategic agility and competitiveness of businesses were the dynamic capabilities theory and the entrepreneurial innovation theory. The study was census based and had 42 companies as participants. The returned questionnaires showed that a response rate of 95% was achieved in preliminary analysis.

The demographic data showed that most firms had operational experience of more than 20 years, and had introduced less than 10 products in the market. The descriptive statistics analysis done revealed that strategic agility's five dimensions, which included sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, strategic target selection, core capabilities and taking action were substantive activities taking place in the respective organizations and therefore could be analyzed as independent variables to determine whether their operationalization affected competitiveness of the firms. The competitiveness, which was the dependent variable was also analyzed in terms of product quality, delivery reliability, process reliability and innovation levels. The findings revealed that these dimensions of competitiveness were agreeably recognized as activities that were ongoing within the firms and therefore could be assessed. Hence, the study performed a linear regression analysis to evaluate the extent strategic agility influence competitiveness of the firms. The results of the ANOVA tests showed that an overall regression model with five predictors— sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, core capabilities, strategic target selection, and taking action—significantly predicted firm competitiveness [$R^2 = 0.346$, R^2 adj = 0.25, F (5, 34), p 0.05]. 25% of the variation in the competitiveness of the firms was explained by this specific model. The ANOVA regression findings revealed a statistically significant linear link between firm competitiveness and competitiveness and vision, center abilities, choice of vital targets, sharing liability [F (7, 96), p 0.05]. Sharing responsibility, clearness of vision, strategic target selection, core capabilities and taking action, as independent variables, were significant predictors of business competitiveness, according to further findings from the coefficients of regression. The conclusions drawn from the research's results are then presented in the portion of this chapter that follows.

5.3 Conclusion

The study found a positive and statistically significant relationship between strategic agility and organizational competitiveness among consumer goods manufacturers. rapidly at companies in Nairobi County, Kenya. The study concluded that some of the key agile strategic approaches that FMCG producers in Nairobi County, Kenyan businesses should adopt to increase their competitiveness include: vision, core capabilities, selected strategic targets, shared responsibilities, and innovation.

According to the study's findings, the only part of fast-moving consumer goods manufacturers' clarity of vision that they have executed is actions that clearly and effectively describe the business's overarching aims. Other techniques related to vision clarity have also been used, creating a clear sense of purpose that directs decision-making and ensuring that the different functional units in the company are happy with the effort to realize the firm's key strengths.

The study finds that the majority producers’ companies are unaware that market position with respect to their customers' perceptions of them is an important factor, and they are also unable to identify and allocate resources to value-adding processes, use knowledge and know-how to maintain their competitive advantage, identify and allocate resources to value-adding processes, and use knowledge sets that are most crucial to their success.

According to the study's findings, the majority firms have been successful in identifying and concentrating on key skills to take advantage of market possibilities. According to the study's findings, managers can underwrite their companies' capacity by including all project teams, including customers, in the final product. The study also comes to the conclusion that fast-moving consumer goods producers in Nairobi County have generally adopted all the practices associated with implementation of strategic agility, despite the firm's ability to ensure that the key stakeholders are aware of the firm's strategy and purpose.

5.4 Limitations of the study

There are other significant elements that may have an impact on Kenyan firms' ability to compete apart from those investigated. The results may be less applicable to businesses in other sectors in Kenya since the research was limited to a narrow segment of the business sector. The study's narrow emphasis on managers and department heads was another drawback.

The survey could have included all the manufacturing companies in Kenya across all sectors to gain a fair assessment of the responses. Perhaps a longitudinal method might have been used in the research to include all the manufacturing companies in Kenya throughout time. The study's main objective was to identify the connections among five essential strategic agility techniques. Other aspects of strategic agility that potentially have the power to affect corporate competitiveness may have been overlooked by the research.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Implications for Practice

In light of the aforementioned, the research suggests that Kenyan businesses embrace strategic agility strategies to improve their performance since these practices have a big influence on a company's ability to compete. Regarding clarity of vision, the study makes the suggestion that firms in the sector need to establish clear sense their purpose that directs decision-making and put in place mechanisms to ensure that the different functional units in the firm attempt to achieve the strategic agility objectives.

The study advises the firms to invest in enhancing their core competencies, including knowing market positioning in terms of their customers' perceptions of them; putting in place mechanisms to facilitate rational identification and allocation of their resources to value-adding processes; utilizing knowledge and expertise to maintain competitive advantage; and identifying and allocating their resources to value-adding processes.

Businesses in the industry must make an effort to develop and maintain distinctive skills that are impossible for their competitors to copy. The development of procedures to discover and create goods that align capabilities with market possibilities is another issue that needs attention. In terms of shared responsibilities, the research advises businesses in Kenya to make an effort to include all project teams, including the clients, in order to be a part of the outcomes and outcome.

5.5.2 Implications for Policy

The study's conclusions suggest that strategies aimed at boosting business and governmental competitiveness may succeed if they emphasize on strategic agility in Kenya's public and private sectors. According to the study's conclusions, competitiveness will be considerably increased, leading to national competitiveness, if the national policy via the line ministries can enable businesses to become more adaptable to an unpredictable climate and remain ahead of their rivals globally by often modifying and reconfiguring their capabilities.

The study's results suggest, at a theoretical level, that adopting a holistic view of agility provides a crucial way to explain and demonstrate strategic agility company connection with competitiveness. The competitiveness and performance of Kenyan companies may be considerably improved by using agile methods to strategic planning and day-to-day operations. The study's findings make it abundantly evident that strategic managers who can effectively use internalization of corporate vision and concurrent development of policies and appropriate processes may significantly increase company competitiveness.

5.5 Further Research Focus

Future studies may concentrate on the institutional and legal setting that might facilitate the adoption of strategic agility in Kenya's industrial sector. Future academics should also think about figuring out how Kenyan enterprises' adaptability is facilitated by the country's industrialization strategy in order to increase company and national competitiveness.

Future studies should look into examining the relationship between strategic agility and business performance utilizing other factors. There are still few studies on how national policy influences competition at the micro level. Future research must thus ascertain how the government in Kenya contributes to increasing company competitiveness across all industries.

Future research should look at the impact that strategic agility implementation has on company culture, employee relations, and attitudes toward change management. This is because adopting strategic agility is people-oriented. Future academics must determine how much the state has boosted private sector competition via the creation and execution of policies in this setting. It is necessary to conduct studies on the creation of benchmarks for evaluating the competitiveness of a corporation as a result of strategic agility.

REFERENCES

Al-Tameemi, A. H., & Abd-Alghafur, Q. A. (2020). The effect of strategic agility on organizational effectiveness Applied research at the Central Bank of Iraq. *Tikrit Journal of Administration and Economics Sciences*, 16(50), 322-341

Al-Romeedy, B. S. (2019). Strategic agility as a competitive advantage in airlines Case study: Egypt air. *Journal of the Faculty of Tourism and Hotels*-, 3(1), 1-15.

Al-Sani, I. S. (2017) *The Impact of Strategic Agility Determinants in Organizational Effectiveness (Case study of Lafarge Co.Jordan Cement,* MSC, Unpublished MA thesis, Middle East University, Jordan.

Alromeedy, B. (2019). Strategic Agility as a Competitive Advantage in Airlines-Case Study: Egypt Air. 3. 1-15.

Cegarra-Navarro, J.; Soto-Acosta, P. and Wensley, A. (2016). Structured Knowledge Processes and Firm Performance: The Role of Organizational Agility, *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 1544–1549.

Chepurenko A. (2015). Entrepreneurship theory: New challenges and future prospects. Foresight-Russia;9(2):44–57.

Easterby-Smith M, Lyles M.A, & Peteraf, M.A. (2009). Dynamic capabilities: Current debates and future directions. *British Journal of Management* 2009;20:S1-S8.

Ferguson, C.R. & Dickenson, R. (1982). Critical success factors for directors in the eighties, Business Horizons, May-June.

Gerald, E., Obianuju, A., & Chukwunonso, N. (2020). Strategic agility and performance of small and medium enterprises in the phase of Covid-19 pandemic. International Journal of Financial, *Accounting, and Management*, 2(1), 41-50.

Grant, R.M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal,* Vol. 17, pp. 109-122.

Hanieh, M. (2016). *Practicing Strategic Agility and Its Relationship to Institutional Performance Excellence in the Food Industry Sector in Gaza Strip* MSC, Islamic University, Gaza.

Hasan, W. N. (2019). The role of strategic Agility in organizational excellence In Ministry of Construction, Housing, Munic- ipalities and Public Works. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences,* 15(1), 110-132.

Kitonga, D. M. (2017). *Strategic leadership practices and organizational performance in not-for-profit organizations in Nairobi County in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, COHRED, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology).

Kumkale, İ. (2016). Organization's Tool for Creating Competitive Advantage: Strategic Agility. *Balkan and Near Eastern Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3), pp. 118-124.

Long, C. (2000). Measuring Your Strategic Agility, Consulting to Management - C2M, Dec2000, Vol. 11,No. 3, p. 25.

Mandrinos, S. (2014). Internationalisation processes of FMCG products: A study of protected designation of origin (PDO) products : The case of feta cheese in Greece.

Madsen, E.L. (2007). The significance of sustained entrepreneurial orientation on performance of firms: A ;longitudinal analysis. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*;19(2):185-204.

Nader, S., & Heidari, A. (2016). How was competitive advantage sustained in management consultancies during change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 661-685.

Nyaga, J. (2014). Aspects that affect the distribution of FMCG in Kenya: EEA. *Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1(12), 290-302.

Njambi, E., & Katuse, P. (2013). 3PL in efficiency of delivery for competitive advantage of Kenya's FMCG organizations. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1(8), 15-27.

Oyedijo, A .(2012). Strategic Agility and Competitive Performance in the Nigerian Telecommunication Industry: An Empirical Investigation. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research,*Vol. 2 No. 3; March 2012 /2/27.

Oyerinde, A. J., Olatunji, O. C., & Adewale, O. A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility and performance of oil and gas industry in Nigeria. *EKSU Journal of the Management Scientists*, 2(1), pp. 97-106.

Qin, R., & Nembhard, D. (2015). Workforce Agility in Operations Management, *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science*, 20, 55-69.

Roth, A. V. (1996). Achieving Strategic Agility through Economies of Knowledge. *Strategy and Leadership* Vol. 24,No. 2, pp. 30-37

Sambamurthy, V., Bharadwaj, A. & Grover, V. (2003). "Shaping agility through digital options: Reconceptualizing the role of information technology in contemporary firms*". MIS Quarterly*,Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 237-263.

Sherehiy, B., & Karwowski, W. (2014). The Relationship Between Work Organization and Workforce Agility in Small Manufacturing Enterprises, *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 44, 466-473.

Teece, D.J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and micro-foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*;28(13):1319-1350.

Teece D, Peteraf M, Leih S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review*;58(4):13-35.

Teece DJ, Pisano G, Shuen A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*;18(7):509-533.

Tikkanen, J. (2014). *Dynamic Capability Influence on Strategic Agility: A Case Study in Energy Conservation Industry*, Master Thesis, Oulu Business School, University of Oulu.

Zhang, Z. and Sharifi, H. (2000). A methodology for achieving agility in manufacturing organizations. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*. Vol. 20,No. 4, pp. 496-512.

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. DEMOGRAPHICS VARIABLES

1. Name of Company (Optional)………………………………..

2. Age

   ( ) Less than 10 Years

   ( ) 10 and less than 20 years

   ( ) More than 20 years

3. Number of Products in the Market

   ( ) Less than 10 products

   ( ) 10 – 20 Products

   ( ) More than 20 products

II. STRATEGIC AGILITY

A five-point Likert-type scale will be used to measure the strategic agility dimensions, which includes 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

The clarity of vision in your business unit

No.	statements	1	2	3	4	5
1.	We have a clear sense of purpose and use it to guide our decisions in running the business.					
2.	We find it easy to explain our overall goals and their clearly and effectively to others.					
3.	We have a high level of agreement about the principles that should guide our behavior in conducting our business unit's operations.					
4.	We are proud of what we are trying to achieve as a business unit.					

Understanding of core capabilities in your business unit

No.	statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	We can describe the special skills, knowledge, and know-how that comprise our greatest strengths and that we rely on to maintain our competitive advantage.					
2	When allocating funds for process improvement, we are able to identify those processes that are most likely to add value to our products in the eyes of our clients.					
3	We have a good understanding of which skills and knowledge are most critical to providing results that are important to our clients.					
4	We are well aware of our business unit's reputation among our clients and what we are best known for in the marketplace.					

The selection of strategic targets in your business unit

No.	statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	We are able to identify the market/client segments that place a high value on the product attributes we provide.					
2	We know which of our business unit's core capabilities are most important in creating value for existing or new market/client segments.					
3	We know which competencies and process we need to enhance or develop to better serve our targeted client segments.					
4	We have in place the processes for identifying and developing products that provide a good match-up between our firm's capabilities and market opportunities.					

The sharing of responsibility in your business unit

No.	statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	We ask people on our project teams to treat mistakes as opportunities for learning and improving rather than as occasions for placing blame.					
2	We provide easy access to information of interest to our clients and to the people we work with.					
3	We encourage people on our project teams, including the client and his or her staff, to behave as though each of us is responsible for the final results of the total project, rather than just for the part we have been assigned.					
4	We keep our clients fully involved in the planning and execution of projects and stress the importance of their role in getting results.					

The action orientation of your business unit

No.	statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	We make sure the people we work with are familiar with our strategy and its purpose.					
2	We are able to adapt our strategy to fit changing circumstances without losing sight of the strategy's overall purpose.					
3	We involve the key people we work with in discussions of our strategies and solicit their thoughts on the best way to implement them.					
4	We frequently discuss with the people we work with the kinds of actions needed to best carry out the business unit's strategy.					

III. COMPETITIVENESS

No	Product Quality	1	2	3	4	5
1	Our business unit has the ability to provide a high level of service reliability compared with our competitors.					
2	Our business unit has the ability to provide products with high level of performance compared with our competitors.					
3	Our business unit has the high level of product quality as perceived by the client compared with our competitors.					
4	Our business unit has the ability to provide a high level of conformance quality compared with our competitors.					
5	Our business unit has the ability to provide products of high level of quality compared with our competitors.					

No.	Delivery Reliability	1	2	3	4	5
1	Our business unit has to promptly handle client complaints compared with our competitors					
2	Our business unit has the ability to reliably deliver services on time compared with our competitors.					

No.	Process Flexibility	1	2	3	4	5
1	Our business unit has the ability to provide broad service mix within same facilities compared with our competitors.					
2	Our business unit has the ability to rapidly handle clients' needs compared with our competitors.					
3	Our business unit has the ability to rapidly change service mix compared with our competitors.					
4	Our business unit has the ability to rapidly change services volume compared with our competitors.					

No.	Innovation	1	2	3	4	5
1	Our business unit has the ability to develop new service technology at a high rate compared with our competitors.					
2	Our business unit has the ability to develop new features in existing services at a high rate compared with our competitors.					
3	Our business unit has the ability to develop new methods at a high rate compare with our competitors.					
4	Our business unit has the ability to develop new working methods at a high rate compared with our competitors.					

No.	Cost Leadership	1	2	3	4	5
1	Our business unit has the ability to offer lower priced services compared with our competitors.					
2	Our business unit has the ability to provide services at lower internal costs compared with our competitors					
3	Our business unit has the ability to reduce overhead costs compared with our competitors.					