ISSN 2319-345X
Vol. 5, No. 4, October 2016

IJMRBS

International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy

International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy

ISSN 2319-345X www.ijmrbs.com
Vol. 5, No. 4, October 2016

THE EFFECTS OF MONITORING PROCESS ON STRATEGY EXECUTION IN THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY IN KENYA

Ole Mapelu Zakayo[1*], Dr. Jane Omwenga[2] and Dr. Mike Iravo[3]

*Corresponding Author: Ole Mapelu Zakayo, ✉ mapeluole@gmail.com

The main objective of this study was to determine the effects of monitoring process on strategy execution in the airline industry in Kenya. The population for this study consisted of the employees of sixteen airlines operating internationally, regionally, and locally in Kenya. Descriptive survey design was used for the purposes of this study. Primary and secondary data was collected for analysis. Self-administered questionnaire was used to collect primary data alongside evaluation reports that were obtain for the secondary data on strategy execution. The data collected was then analysed by both descriptive and inferential statistical tools. Quantitative data was then presented using statistical techniques including tables while qualitative data was presented using charts, graphs, and percentages. The research used multiple linear regression model as tools of analysis and the results generated through SPSS is presented in form of tables, charts and percentages. Correlation analysis showed a positive and significant relationship between monitoring process and strategic execution (rho = 0.454). This implies that a unit change in monitoring process increases strategic execution by 45.4%. A keen investigation of monitoring process showed that the direct participation by the leader and selection of the representation of the affected groups usually helps to ensure the timetable of the desired strategic goals are met and were found to be critical ingredients in enhancing business strategy execution in any industry. The study recommends that the leaders in the airline industry should participate and enhance monitoring process. The current study findings are aimed at benefiting the policy makers in the airline industry, the government of Kenya and the scholars at large.

Keywords: Leadership, Strategy, Strategy execution, Strategic management

INTRODUCTION

A leader is a person who influences a group of people towards the achievement of strategic goals. Since bold strategies often require breakthroughs along a number of fronts, organisations need stronger and more dominant leadership at all levels if these strategies are to succeed. Examining strategy through the lens of leadership focuses the current study on the critical roles that a leader must undertake in the process of strategy execution. In choosing this focal point, leader may find that some strategic activities such as industry analysis, competitive analysis, and internal analysis become their second priority because it is not as important for the leader to do them as it is to make sure such activities get

[1] School of Business, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya.
[2,3] School of Entrepreneurship, Procurement and Management, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya.

done. Kathleen (2012) maintains that the leader must embed strategy in the organization: choose an excellent team, pick the right roles, and let the rest of the team make the strategic moves. The challenge is not only producing a winning strategy at a point in time but getting employees smart enough and motivated enough to execute the strategy and change it as conditions change. This requires the leader to focus as much on the process used to develop the strategy, the human dimension, as the content of the strategy, the analytical dimension. Agbejule and Jokipii (2009) indicate that, for prospector firms, high degrees of internal control activity and low degrees of monitoring ensure a greater effectiveness of the internal control system. On the other hand, for analyzers a high degree of internal control activity and high degrees of monitoring lead to a highly effective internal control system in strategy implementation. In addition, the findings indicate no significant differences between defenders and analyzers.

Das *et al.* (2012) reveal that there is no single strategy that can address all aspects related to process monitoring and fault detection efficiently and there is a need to mesh the different techniques from various process monitoring and fault detection strategies to devise a more efficient strategy. Customer accounting, competitive position monitoring, competitor performance appraisal based on published financial statement and quality costing represent the most widely used strategic management accounting techniques in the Italian sample (Cinquini and Tenucci, 2010). Successful leaders have adopted a variety of strategies to strengthen and monitor compliance by their suppliers, including codes of conduct, direct monitoring by their own personnel, more stringent contract conditions, and reduction in the number of contractors (Bremer and Udovich, 2001).

Increasingly, visionary leaders are turning to what are termed as “monitoring coalitions”, membership organizations that undertake to organize the monitoring of labour or other standards in the factories. To be effective, these emerging systems must address a range of issues, including how to manage the monitoring process, what standard to set, how to finance monitoring, how to disseminate the information collected, and, most difficult, how to accomplish cost-effective monitoring in tens of thousands of production facilities in Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa (Bremer and Udovich, 2001).

Collins and Burt (2003) drawing on the transaction cost and power literatures, proposes that leaders tradeoff monitoring intensity against market orientated sanctions to protect against supplier opportunism. Based on a survey of 55 food manufacturers, the findings demonstrate that retailers’ productrelated monitoring intensity is positively related to the retailer’s strategic use of retail brands, positively related to the manufacturer’s specific investments in the relationship with the retailer, but negatively related to the retailer’s ability to impose marketorientated sanctions on the manufacturer (Collins and Burt, 2003). To conclude these views, Labianca and Fairbank (2005) argue that the depth or intensity with which the monitoring process is pursued as well as the breadth or degree of overlap in the sets of organizations chosen to monitor, determines the volume and diversity of information acquired, the strength of the signal sent to constituent groups, and the amount and type of change likely to emerge from the process. All of these factors will ultimately affect the firm’s strategy implementation (Labianca and Fairbank, 2005).

Answering the same question from the perspective of the human dimension, Quong and Walker (2010) states that the leadership role is to be the architect of the perfect strategy process. Leaders holding this perspective see the process as the primary outcome and the product, while important, can and should be monitored. There is a recognition that the end result will necessarily evolve so the more important endpoint is to build the capacity for strategic thinking across the group so that change, when it occurs, can be absorbed more quickly and more completely. Leaders who lean to the human dimension see strategy execution as a continuing work in process, something that is more free-flowing, never truly complete but continuously being shaped as interactions occur with external and internal environment and as new issues and knowledge emerge from the people throughout the organization. Leadership is required to continuously monitor process thus circling back on key ideas that will frequently drive the strategy execution process to re-visit critical assumptions and, based on the insights gained, alter course (Phipps and Burbach, 2010).Vision is the core of leadership and is at the heart of strategy execution. The leader's role is to create the vision for the organisation in a way that will engage both the imagination and the energies of its people. According to Drucker (2012), an effective leader knows that the ultimate role of leadership is to create human energies and human vision during the execution process. Leaders have primary responsibility of executing the chosen strategy. While an action plan involves many discrete tasks, at the core, the leader must build an organization that can carry out the formulated strategy. The leader, builds both an organizational culture and an organizational capability for executing the strategy. As the number of strategic dimensions and corresponding initiatives increases, so does the pressure on leadership.

Successful leaders have adopted a variety of strategies to strengthen and monitor process, including codes of conduct, direct monitoring by their own personnel, more stringent contract conditions, and reduction in the number of contractors (Bremer and Udovich, 2001). Labianca and Fairbank (2005) argue that the depth or intensity with which the monitoring process is pursued as well as the breadth or degree of overlap in the sets of organizations chosen to monitor, determines the volume and diversity of information acquired, the strength of the signal sent to constituent groups, and the amount and type of change likely to emerge from the process. All of these factors will ultimately affect the firm's strategy implementation (Labianca and Fairbank, 2005). Quong and Walker (2010) found out that the leadership role is to be the architect of the perfect strategy execution process. Leaders holding this perspective see the process as the primary outcome and should therefore be monitored. There is a recognition that the end result will necessarily evolve so the more important end-point is to build the capacity for strategic thinking across the group so that change, when it occurs, can be absorbed more quickly and more completely. Phipps and Burbach (2010) found that leaders who lean to the human dimension see strategy execution as a continuing work in process (progress), something that is more free-flowing, never truly complete but continuously being shaped as interactions occur with external and internal environment and as new issues and knowledge emerge from the people throughout the organization. Leadership is required to continuously monitor process thus circling back on key ideas that will frequently drive the strategy execution process to re-visit critical assumptions and, based on the insights gained, alter course.

The airline industry in Kenya is run by several airline companies including those operating international routes, regional and local routes. The industry has become very competitive as more and more airline companies launched their operations in Kenya. Kenya Airways (KQ) used to command a good and significant position within the African region but of late its fortunes have been dwindling rapidly due to among other issues, increased competition on key routes in Africa coupled with pricing pressure.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Mingjian Zhou and Shi (2014) conducted a study on why people blame leaders for team relationship conflict. The roles of leader-member exchange differentiation and ethical leadership and found out that Leader Member Exchange (LMX) differentiation was positively related to team relationship conflict, and ethical leadership weakened the relationship between LMX differentiation and team relationship conflict. Allio (2013) did a study on leaders and leadership, various theories but what advice is reliable? The study concluded that invisible forces act on the leadership monitoring process: the expectations of the followers, the culture of the organization and the circumstances at play. The task at hand and the context seem to dictate when and how monitoring process appears. The strategy execution dynamics thus depends on the situation. McLaughlin and Mott (2010) did a study on leadership brand equity. In a similar manner, the implicit monitoring process on strategy execution may influence their appraisal of a leader's performance. This according to this study will affect the level of strategy execution in a particular industry. The ability of an organization to compete in a flat world is enhanced when all elements of the enterprise are in close alignment. A key role of the leader of the enterprise of the future is to create and maintain the alignment of monitoring process to strategy execution (Murray and Greenes, 2006). If monitoring process is not maintained, the execution of the strategy cannot be enhanced. One study that was conducted in South African strategic leaders by Jooste and Fourie (2009) on the role of strategic leadership in effective strategy implementation concluded that for strategic leadership to positively contribute to effective strategy execution, then there is need for leadership participation in monitoring process during the actual implementation.

Given the severe consequences of a monitoring process gap on strategy execution, the best-planned strategy is no more than wishful thinking if it can't be translated from concept to reality. Why do so many organisations discover shortfall in monitoring process only when executing their strategies? This question raises another, more fundamental one regarding strategy and leadership: which is the chicken and which is the egg? While some studies look at monitoring process from the theoretical perspective, others look at it from the situational perspective. However, these studies do not directly assess the effects of monitoring strategy on strategy execution in Kenya Scenario; neither do any of them link the role of monitoring process on strategy execution. The overview of the airlines industry in Kenya clearly shows that there exist a disconnect between monitoring process and strategy execution. The study therefore aimed at determining the role of leadership in strategy execution in the airline industry in Kenya.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE

The main objective was to determine the effects of monitoring process on strategy execution in the airline industry in Kenya.

LITERATURE FRAMEWORK

This section presents a framework of diverse studies explaining the role of leadership in strategy execution. This framework therefore aims at giving the study a foundation for the gaps the study will address.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Participatory Theory

Participation is viewed as an important means for promoting the sustainable management of natural resources. However, participation is not always successful. Conflicting values and power inequalities are all factors that can severely undermine participatory processes (Marjanke *et al.*, 2012). Participatory democracy is a process of collective decision making that combines elements from both direct and representative democracy: Citizens have the power to decide on policy proposals and politicians assume the role of policy implementation (Enriqueta and Santiago, 2009).

Kautz (2011) affirms that genuine customer and user participation carried out by onsite customers and by other operational staff in the form of direct and indirect participation and with functional and democratic empowerment. The onsite customers played informative, consultative and participative roles. The analysis revealed that planning games, user stories and story cards, working software and acceptance tests structured the customer and user participation. This form of user participation supported a balance between flexibility and project progress and resulted in a project and a product which were considered a success by the customer and the development organization. The analysis showed that the integrative framework for user participation can also successfully be used in a new context to understand what participatory design is and how, when and where it can be performed as an instance of a design process in agile development. By drawing on innovation theory it was found that participatory design in agile development bears the characteristics of a successful organizational innovation. Grounding further explanations in complex adaptive systems theory, the study provides an additional argument why participatory design despite some identified challenges fosters project staff to successfully carry out the agile development project (Kautz, 2011).

Birgit (2006) posits that participatory processes can be better assessed from a social learning and organisational learning perspective, emphasizing non-linear criteria for the quality of the process in terms of depth and meaningfulness as well as criteria for the quality of the outcome in terms of knowledge generation and innovation. Birgit (2006) also points implicitly to the need of considering double- and triple-loop learning, if a culture of participation towards sustainability is to be pursued, and underline the high impact of institutional governance. If people participate, what are they aiming to gain by participating? One view is instrumental whereby participation increases the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of 'formal' development programs (Mayo and Craig, 1995).

The broad goals of development are valid, but the institutional practices are not working, but can be improved by direct involvement of the beneficiaries. An example is the Women in Development (WID) initiatives of the 1970s aimed at incorporating women into the planning process (Moser, 1989). Others see participation as part of a more transformative agenda (Esteva and Prakash, 1998) which might be anti-developmental. Esteva and Prakash (1998) see the Zapatistas of Mexico as an anti-developmental movement par excellence. Despite these differences, there has been a growing acceptance regarding the importance of local involvement. At the root of this 'consensus' is the belief in not relying on the state the prime institution of modernity—or development. So, it might not be coincidental that participatory development gained popularity around the same time as the neo-liberal counter-revolution of the early 1980s with its discourse of self-help and individualism (Toye, 1987).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section seeks to describe the research design adopted by the study. Research methodology was be used in the study to guide the investigation of the identified research objective.

Research Design

Bellmann and Upward (2007) defined research design as a roadmap that a research can use to answer the research questions posed by the study. Sekaran (2010) stated in his study that a good research design has a clearly defined purpose and synchronizes consistency between the research questions and the proposed research method. The study adopted descriptive survey design to examine the role of leadership in improvement of strategy execution in the airlines industry in Kenya. According to Jackson (2009), descriptive design involves observation, case study or survey methods that are mainly used for describing situations. A mixed method approach involves both quantitative and qualitative analyses. According to Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008), descriptive survey enables the collection of information from a large population or phenomenon in a relatively short time and yields both qualitative and quantitative information to be used for prediction and generalization of the findings of the study.

The study used qualitative and quantitative approaches. Considering the strength of mixed methods research with respect to understanding and explaining complex organizational and target population, there was clearly a need for this study to conduct a research that employs mixed methods as proposed by Cao *et al.* (2006). Diversity in research methods is considered a major strength as it was the case of information systems research (Sidorova *et al.*, 2008). Mixed methods research has been termed the third methodological paradigm, with quantitative and qualitative methods representing the first and second paradigms respectively (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2010). Spillman (2014) observed that mixing methods and including some quantitative evidence in a qualitative research design can indeed strengthen explanation of a phenomenon but not for conventional reasons. In this study, the sampling frame was the target population of 4560 employees from 16 airlines from where the sample of respondents was drawn.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of the Results

This section describes the methods that were employed in the achievement of the research objective. Specifically, the data analysis is in line with specific objective where patterns were investigated, interpreted and implications drawn on them.

The specific objective sought to determine the effects of monitoring process on strategy execution in the airline industry. In order to achieve this, the level of agreement on the monitoring process assessed on 5-point Likert scale. First, the study sought to find whether the level of agreement to the statement that monitoring the strategy execution process facilitated continuous improvement of strategies and determined the success of strategic goals in a company. Majority (46.6%) of respondents strongly agreed to this, 36.7% agreed, 12.5% took a neutral stand while 3.3 disagreed and 1% strongly disagreed. Secondly, on whether leadership participate directly in monitoring the strategy execution process, respondent 43.3% strongly agreed, 37% agreed, 10.2% were neutral while on the other hand 6.9% and 2.6% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with this statement.

Thirdly, the respondent were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement that company leadership normally identified group leaders that consist of representatives from each affected group that monitor and ensured that the execution team met its timetable for desired strategic goals. Large proportion of the respondents (41%) agreed followed by 39% who strongly agreed, 12.5% took a neutral stand, 5.2% disagreed and 2.3% strongly disagreed with this statement. Finally, on whether the respondents agreed to the statement that it is the responsibility of leadership to put a monitoring system in place, analysed the data that was generated during the execution and made any necessary changes to make the strategy execution more efficient in the company, 43% strongly agreed, 29.8% showed agreement to the statement while 7.5% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. These findings are illustrated in percentage in Table below.

The impact of directly involving leaders in the monitoring process has been found to lead to successful strategy execution. As noted by Quong and Walker (2010) leaders usually sees strategy execution in as continuous and ever changing process when the internal and external environment interacts and new issues emerge from the people to the organization. Phipps and Burbach (2010) concludes that as the new ideas materializes, it prompt a need to recheck the critical assumptions from what has been realised so far and in case of any divergence(s) then the full course can be traced back to meet the set timetable and desired strategic goals. Most of the respondents were of the opinion that efficiency in the companies could be arrived at by monitoring systems, analysing the data presented and making any necessary changes to the strategy being executed. According to International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN, 2014) posits that monitoring process tracks and reports on progress in executing the project in its life cycles which be in monthly, quarterly semi-annually and annually. This is vital in improving strategy work plan which must be in line with supervision missions of the leaders.

Further probing on the strategy execution was sought in the study. This was done by prompting the response from the participants on their level of agreement with regard to several statements on 5-point Likert scale. These findings have been summarized in percentage as shown in Table below. It was found out that it was not clear to

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis for Monitoring Process on Strategy Execution

	Percentage of Responses (n = 305)						
	SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
Monitoring the strategy execution process facilitates continuous improvement of strategies and determines the success of strategic goals in our company.	1	3.3	12.5	36.7	46.6	4.3	0.9
Our leadership participate directly in monitoring the strategy execution process	2.6	6.9	10.2	37	43.3	4.1	1
Company leadership normally identifies group leaders that consist of representatives from each affected group that monitor and ensure that the execution team meets its timetable for desired strategic goals.	2.3	5.2	12.5	41	39	4.1	1
It is the responsibility of leadership to put a monitoring system in place, analyze the data that is being generated during the execution and make any necessary changes to make the strategy execution more efficient in our company	3.3	7.5	16.4	29.8	43	4	1.1
Overall						**4.1**	**1**

Note: * SD-Strongly disagreed, D-Disagreed, N-Neutral, A-Agreed, SA-Strongly agreed.

many respondents as to whether strategy execution had been successful in their company since response were well-spread on the scale of agreement. 39.9% strongly agreed to this, 27.9% agreeing, 20.6% were undecided while 8.3% and 3.3% showed disagreement and strong disagreement respectively. Also, the level of agreement on whether leadership involvement in strategy execution had enabled their organization realizes their strategic goals successfully and in a timely manner was sought. 44.7% showed a strong agreement, 26.5% agreed, 20.2% remained neutral while 4.66 disagreed and 4% strongly disagreed.

In addition, the study probed whether the role of leadership in strategy execution had enabled their organization gain a competitive advantage in the market. 34.8% indicated a strong agreement, 34.4% agreed, 14.4% did know whether to agree or disagree whilst 9.8% and 6.6% showed a disagreement and strong disagreement respectively. As to whether the role of leadership in strategy execution in the airline company led to increased sales. Most respondents (34.4%) strongly agreed to this statement, 33.4% agreed to it while 11.8% and 4.9% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with 15.4% remaining neutral.

Further, the level of agreement on whether leadership role in strategy execution had enabled organizations to achieve their strategic goals and hence increase in profits was pursued. 38.7% indicated their agreement, 35.1% showed strong agreement, 17 remained neutral while 5.2% disagreed and 3.9% strongly disagreed. Lastly, the level of agreement on whether leadership involvement in strategy execution results had high productivity among the team members was studied. 35.4% showed strong agreement, 31.1% agreed to this statement, 17.4% were undecided while 11.1% showed disagreement and 4.9% strongly disagreed.

Sanders and Schyns (2006) points that when a leader is perceived to be highly transformational

Table 2: Descriptive Analysis for Strategy Execution

	Percentage of Responses (n = 305)						
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std. Deviation
Strategy execution has been successful in our company	3.3	8.3	20.6	27.9	39.9	3.9	1.1
Leadership involvement in strategy execution enables our organization realize its strategic goals successfully and in a timely manner.	4	4.6	20.2	26.5	44.7	4	1.1
The role of leadership in strategy execution enables our organization gain a competitive advantage in the market.	6.6	9.8	14.4	34.4	34.8	3.8	1.2
The role of leadership in strategy execution in our airline company leads to increase in sales.	4.9	11.8	15.4	33.4	34.4	3.8	1.2
The leadership role in strategy execution enables organizations to achieve their strategic goals hence increase in profits	3.9	5.2	17	38.7	35.1	4	1
Leadership involvement in strategy execution results to high productivity among the team members.	4.9	11.1	17.4	31.1	35.4	3.8	1.2
Overall						**3.9**	**1.1**

Note: * SD-Strongly disagree, D-Disagree, N-Neutral, A-Agree, SA-Strongly agree.

by followers, then there are increased chance of cohesiveness and vertical solidarity. Going by this stand the current study seems to support this point, whereby majority of the respondents demonstrated agreement on leaders being united with the strategy execution team which then transpire to successful business strategy. Therefore, strategic leadership can be concluded to have more meaning in the management and monitoring process of strategic plan.

Correlation Analysis

The study sought to find out the strength of the relationship between the strategic execution and monitoring process. To achieve this Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used since the study variables were in ratio scale after consolidating them to form average index. Kothari (2007) argued that product moment correlation should be carried out if and only if both dependent and independent variables are in either ratio or interval scale and if this condition is not satisfied then Spearman's rank correlation should be applied to test the strength of the relationship. Correlation coefficient (rho) was used as the strength of the relationship measure. The study findings showed that there was a positive and significant relationship between monitoring process and strategic execution at (rho = 0.454). This implies that a unit change in monitoring process increases strategic execution by 45.4%. Since predictor variables has no correlation coefficient greater than 0.700 then there is no multicollinearity. This corroborates the findings of Gujarati (2013) which reiterated that

Table 3: Correlation Analysis

	Strategic Execution	Monitoring Process
Strategic Execution	1	
Monitoring Process	.454**	1

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

multicollinearity is a problem that exist between the predictor and the response variable when correlation coefficient is greater than 0.7 units.

Relationship Between Monitoring Process and Strategic Execution

The model summary shows that 20.6% of the changes in the strategic execution can be explained by changes in monitoring process, the remaining variation in strategic execution can be explained by other factors not included in the model.

A result in Table 4 shows that monitoring process had a significant influence on strategic execution in the airline industry.

Results in Table 5 shows that a positive and significant relationship between monitoring process and strategic execution (β = 0.534, T = 8.873, p-value <0.05). This implies that a unit change in monitoring process increases strategic execution by 0.534 units.

Strategic Execution = 1.638 + 0.534 (Monitoring process) ... Equation.

Labianca and Fairbank (2005) findings were supported by current study findings where the depth or the intensity of the monitoring process conducted were found to determine the type, volume and differences in the information gathered which ultimately had impact on strategy implementation. Also, the findings of the study revealed majority of the respondents indicating their agreement on monitoring the strategy execution process so as to facilitate continuous improvement of strategies and determines the success of strategic goals in the airline industry.

Table 4: Model Summary on Monitoring Process and Strategic Execution

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.454[a]	0.206	0.204	0.20083

Note: [a] Predictors: (Constant), MP.

Table 5: ANOVA OF Monitoring Process on Strategic Execution

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.175	1	3.175	78.727	.000[b]
	Residual	12.221	303	0.04		
	Total	**15.397**	**304**			

Note: [a] Dependent Variable: SE. [b] Predictors: (Constant), MP.

Table 6: Regression Coefficient on Monitoring Process and Strategic Execution

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.638	0.168		9.755	0
	MP	0.534	0.06	0.454	8.873	0

Note: a Dependent Variable: SE.

Agreeing to what Bremer and Udovich found in year 2001. The two scholars noted that the issue of managing the monitoring process has to be given an utmost importance in order to achieve cost- effective systems in the production facilities of the countries in Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa.

CONCLUSION

The study aimed to determine the effects of monitoring process on strategy execution in the airline industry in Kenya. The study adopted the two monitoring processing measurement of direct involvement and choice of monitoring systems as a way of investigating the extent to which the strategy being implemented are done. From multiple regressions, the study findings depicted monitoring process beta of 0.434 and p-value of 0.00 which is below 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between monitoring process and strategic execution and therefore there is an indication that any unit increase in monitoring causes an increase in strategic execution by 4.34%. The findings of the study revealed that effective monitoring process would be followed by a successful strategy execution as the regression results showed a positive and significant relationship thus rejecting the null hypothesis. A keen investigation of monitoring process showed the direct participation by the leader and selection of the representation of the affected groups usually helps to ensure the timetable of the desired strategic goals is met. In the process of monitoring, continuous improvement are made which determines the success of strategic goals in the company. Therefore, leadership in an organization need to possess skills to monitor the system in place and evaluate the data generated so as to ensure a more efficient strategy execution.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings from this study indicates that monitoring process is necessary for the execution and therefore, it is recommended that the airline industry should adopt and participate in monitoring process that will help them in strategy execution. It was found that monitoring process positively affects strategy execution process in the airline industry. In light of the above the industry should adopt a very clear procedure and the process that also defines a disciplinary and sanction mechanism process that would be undertaken in case of breach of the agreement by members of the specific industry. Direct participation of the leaders in the monitoring has been found to impact on the execution of strategies hence it is highly encouraged in the industry. To add to that, leaders need to be responsible in ensuring that monitoring systems are well placed and any data is properly analysed and in case they need assistance, representative leaders should be able to stand in for them and some members should be appointed to keep track of the desired goals.

REFERENCES

1. Agbejule A and Jokipii A (2009), “Strategy, Control Activities, Monitoring and Effectiveness”, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 500-522.
2. Babbie R (2010), *The Practice of Social Research*, 12th Edition, Wadsworth-Cengage Learning, California.
3. Bellmann T and Upward R (2007), “The Takeover and Selection Effects of Foreign Ownership in Germany: An Analysis Using

Linked Worker-Firm Data", *GEP Research Paper*, 2007/08.

4. Birgit S (2006), "The Role of Implicit Leadership Theories in the Performance Appraisals and Promotion Recommendations of Leaders", *Equal Opportunities International*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 188-199.

5. Bremer J and Udovich J (2001), "Alternative Approaches to Supply Chain Compliance Monitoring", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 333-352.

6. Cao J *et al.* (2006), "Interactions Between System Evaluation and Theory Testing: A Demonstration of the Power of a Multifaceted Approach to Information Systems Research", *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 207-235.

7. Cinquini L and Andrea T (2010), "Strategic Management Accounting and Business Strategy: A Loose Coupling", *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 228-259.

8. Collins A and Burt S (2003), "Market Sanctions, Monitoring and Vertical Coordination Within Retailermanufacturer Relationships: The Case of Retail Brand Suppliers", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 37, Nos. 5/6, pp. 668-689.

9. Cooper R and Schindler S (2011), "Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches", Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

10. Das J and Banerjee N (2012), "Process Monitoring and Fault Detection Strategies: A Review", *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 29, No. 7, pp. 720-752.

11. Drucker P (2012), "Leadership: More Doing than Dash, Managing for the Future", Truman Talley Books/Dutton.

12. Enriqueta A and Santiago S (2009), "A Theory of Participatory Democracy Based on the Real Case of Porto Alegre", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 90, Nos. 1/2, pp. 927-943.

13. Esteva G and Prakash M (1998), "Grassroots Post-Modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures", Zed Books, London.

14. Frankfort-Nachmias C and Nachmias D (2008), *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, 7th Edition, Worth, New York.

15. Gujarati D and Porter D (2013), *Basic Econometrics*, 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill Irwin, New York, US.

16. Hanah H and Camillah C (2008), "Branding Strategies of MNCs in International Markets", Lulea University of Technology, Sweden.

17. Hillman A and Hitt A (1999), "Corporate Political Strategy Formulation: A Model of Approach", *Participation and Strategy Decisions, Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 825-842.

18. Jooste C and Faurie B (2009), "The Role of Strategic Leadership in Effective Strategy Implementation: Perceptions of South African Strategic Leaders", *Southern African Business Review*, Vol. 13, No. 3.

19. Kathleen E (2012), "Has Strategy Changed?", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Winter.

20. Kothari R (2009), *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques*, 4th Edition, Willey Eastern Ltd., New Delhi, India.

21. Kumar A (2013), Modeling Strategic Performance Factors for Effective Strategy Execution", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 62, No. 6, pp. 554-582.

22. Kumar A (2014), "Modelling Drivers of Adapt for Effective Strategy Execution", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 21, No. 6, pp. 369-391.

23. Kumar A (2015), "Modeling Organizational and Information Systems for Effective Strategy Execution", *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 556-578.

24. Kumar R, Tore M and Uday K (2006), "Implementation and Execution of Industrial Service Strategy: A Case Study from the Oil and Gas Industry", *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 105-117.

25. Labianca G, James F and Fairbank F (2005), "Interorganizational Monitoring: Process, Choices, and Outcomes", in Gabriel Szulanski, Joe Porac and Yves Doz (Eds.), *Strategy Process (Advances in Strategic Management)*, Vol. 22, Nos. 1/2, pp. 117-150, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

26. Marjanke A, Permadi B and Yasmi Y (2012), "The Value of Cultural Theory for Participatory Processes in Natural Resource Management", *Forest Policy and Economics*, Vol. 20, Nos. 1/2, pp. 99-106.

27. Mayo M and Craig G (1995), "Community Participation and Empowerment: The Human Face of Structural Adjustment or Tools for Democratic Transformation?", in Craig G and Mayo M (Eds.), *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*, pp. 1-11, Zed Books, London.

28. McLaughlin V and Christina M (2010), "Leadership Brand Equity: HR Leaders' Role in Driving Economic Value", *Strategic HR Review*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 13-19.

29. Mingjian Zhou S (2014), "Blaming Leaders for Team Relationship Conflict? The Roles of Leader-Member Exchange Differentiation and Ethical Leadership", *Nankai Business Review International*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 134-146.

30. Moser C (1989), "Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs", *World Development*, Vol. 17, No. 11, pp. 1799-1825.

31. Murray A and Greenes A (2006), "New Leadership Strategies for the Enterprise of the Future", *VINE*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 358-370.

32. Phipps A and Burbach E (2010), "Strategic Leadership in the Non-Profit Sector: Opportunities for Research", *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, pp. 137-154.

33. Quong T and Walker A (2010), "Seven Principles of Strategic Leadership International Studies and Education Administration (ISEA)", Vol. 38, No. 1.

34. Reed I (2011), "Interpretation and Social Knowledge: On the Use of Theory in the Social Sciences", University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

35. Sanders K and Schyns B (2006), "Leadership and Solidarity Behaviour: Consensus in Perception of Employees within Teams", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 35, No. 5, pp. 538-556.

36. Sekaran U (2010), "Modeling Labour Market Adjustment to Trade Liberalization in an Industrializing Economy", *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 108, No. 447, pp. 509-528.

37. Sidorova A, Evangelopoulos N, Valacich J and Ramakrishnan T (2008), "Uncovering the Intellectual Core of the Information Systems Discipline", *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 467-482.

38. Small M (2011), "How to Conduct a Mixed Methods Study: Recent Trends in a Rapidly Growing Literature", *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 57-86.

39. Smith A (1991), "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations", Prometheus, Amherst.

40. Smith W (2009), "Vitality in Business: Executing a New Strategy at Unilever", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 31-41.

41. Spillman L (2014), "Mixed Methods and the Logic of Qualitative Inference", *Springer Science + Business Media*, pp. 190-193, New York.

42. Teddlie C and Tashakkori A (2010), "Foundations of Mixed Methods Research", Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

43. Thompson A and Strickland I A (2008), *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*, 13th Edition, MacGraw-Hill, New York.

44. Toye J (1987), *Dilemmas of Development*, Blackwell, Oxford.

International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy
Hyderabad, INDIA. Ph: +91-09441351700, 09059645577
E-mail: editorijmrbs@gmail.com or editor@ijmrbs.com
Website: www.ijmrbs.com

ISSN 2319-345X
04
9 772319 345004