

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGY AND COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE AMONG  
KENYA'S TOP 100 MEDIUM ENTERPRISES**

**Swabra Abdallah Soud, Maina Muchara, & Joyce Ndegwa**

Chandaria School of Business, United States International University-Africa

Correspondence: [swabraabdallahsoud@gmail.com](mailto:swabraabdallahsoud@gmail.com), [swabra\\_abdallah@yahoo.com](mailto:swabra_abdallah@yahoo.com)

*Submitted: 24<sup>th</sup> June 2025; Accepted: 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2025; Published (online): 4<sup>th</sup> October 2025*

---

**ABSTRACT**

The pursuit of long-term success and sustainability in the business world hinges on establishing and maintaining a competitive advantage. Without it, businesses become vulnerable to intense market pressures and face a high risk of failure. This susceptibility is particularly evident among small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which, despite their essential role in global economies, often struggle with higher failure rates as they navigate an increasingly competitive business landscape. Despite extensive research on the challenges faced by SMEs, a significant empirical gap remains in understanding the specific strategies successful firms use to achieve a competitive advantage. To fill this gap, this study examined how organizational strategy influences the competitive advantage of Kenya's top 100 medium-sized enterprises. Adopting a descriptive cross-sectional approach, the study collected data from 407 senior managers within the chosen firms using a census technique. An online survey was then distributed, yielding 311 completed responses. Data were analyzed using correlation and regression techniques with SPSS version 23. The results showed a statistically significant moderate positive correlation between organizational strategy and competitive advantage. Regression analysis further confirmed this relationship, revealing that organizational strategy has a statistically significant positive influence on competitive advantage. Specifically, the study found that focus and differentiation strategies had a stronger positive effect on competitive advantage compared to a cost leadership strategy. The findings imply that for SMEs in similar emerging markets, creating unique value propositions and tailoring products to specific customer segments is a critical determinant of competitive advantage. These strategies, however, must be adaptable and context-specific.

**Keywords:** Competitive Advantage; Organizational Strategy; Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), Top 100 Medium-sized enterprises.

**INTRODUCTION**

In the contemporary business environment, achieving and maintaining a competitive advantage is crucial for an organization's long-term success. This strategic advantage allows firms to outperform rivals, secure a dominant market position, and achieve sustained profitability and growth (Hussein *et al.*, 2024). Conversely, without this advantage, a firm becomes highly vulnerable to market pressures, increasing its likelihood of failure (Abid *et al.*, 2023; Tedja, 2022).

**Soud *et al.***

---

Therefore, firms must actively cultivate this advantage by aligning and leveraging core internal factors, such as their organizational strategy. This cultivation is directly informed by the use of Porter's (1985) generic strategies, such as cost leadership, differentiation, and focus strategies, which provide a foundational framework for enhancing a firm's competitive standing.

Beyond simply implementing these strategies, firms must accurately measure their competitive advantage, which now requires a more comprehensive and holistic approach. Acknowledging this, firms are now adopting the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework to evaluate their competitive advantage (Bhuiyan *et al.*, 2023). This framework evaluates an organization's performance across three fundamental dimensions: economic, social, and environmental (Elkington, 1994). This comprehensive viewpoint is especially pertinent because it enables organizations to enhance their market position and appeal to stakeholders who prioritize sustainable practices alongside financial returns. Consequently, researchers and practitioners now recognize these social and environmental outcomes as key measures of a firm's competitive position, in addition to conventional economic factors (Bartosiewicz & Kucharski, 2024; Bhuiyan *et al.*, 2023).

Building on this foundational understanding, numerous empirical studies have since investigated the relationship between organizational strategies and competitive advantage, often focusing on Porter's generic strategies. For instance, Farida and Setiawan (2022) demonstrated that business strategies positively influence the competitive advantage of firms in the Indonesian construction and real estate SME sector, highlighting performance and innovation as critical mediating factors. In another study, Haque *et al.* (2021) established a positive relationship between cost leadership and differentiation strategies and competitive advantage within the Indonesian culinary sector, with cost leadership exhibiting a more pronounced effect. In the Nigerian flour-milling sector, Egwakhe *et al.* (2020) also reported a positive relationship with competitive advantage, emphasizing the importance of product differentiation, market expansion, and strategic realignment.

Nonetheless, in the Kenyan context, Ouma and Oloko (2017) observed a positive relationship between Porter's generic strategies and competitive advantage among Kenyan bus companies operating on the Kisumu-Nairobi route, with differentiation being the most commonly employed strategy. In contrast, research from other contexts presents varied findings. For example, in the Zambian real estate sector, Nalucha and Mwanza (2022) found no statistically significant relationship between Porter's generic strategies and competitive advantage. Similarly, Mwakawi and Kavale (2020) observed no direct influence of cost leadership or differentiation strategies on competitive advantage at Toyota Kenya. These varied results highlight the context-dependent nature of the relationship between organizational strategies and competitive advantage.

Despite extensive research on this topic, a significant empirical gap remains. Specifically, there is a lack of empirical evidence on how organizational strategies influence competitive advantage among Kenya's high-performing SMEs. While much of the existing research has focused on the challenges faced by African SMEs, there is a critical need to understand the specific strategies that enable certain enterprises to not only survive but also prosper and achieve a competitive advantage (Wamalwa *et al.*, 2019).

**Soud et .al.**

---

To address the aforementioned gap, this study examined the influence of organizational strategy on competitive advantage among Kenya's top 100 medium-sized enterprises. The hypothesis guiding this investigation stated that organizational strategy has no significant influence on the competitive advantage of these firms. Thus, by investigating these high-performing companies, recognized for their exceptional performance, financial stability, and market leadership (East Africa Top 100, 2022), the study aims to enhance the current knowledge base and provide practical guidance for other SMEs, policymakers, and business leaders on how to improve a firm's competitive standing.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study employed a descriptive cross-sectional design to align with its core objective: to describe the relationships and patterns between organizational strategy and competitive advantage as they currently exist. This design centered solely on the current state of the relationship and was not intended to establish causality, which is better suited to longitudinal studies that track variables over time. Consistent with this design, the study utilized a census technique to ensure a comprehensive data collection process. This approach targeted all 407 senior managers within the 100 firms listed in the 2019 Kenyan Top 100 Mid-Sized Companies Survey. This yielded 311 responses, achieving a strong 76.4% response rate. While the census technique aimed to minimize sampling error, the missing responses may introduce a degree of non-response bias, which could affect the generalizability of the findings.

It is important to acknowledge that the study relied on pre-pandemic data. The use of the 2019 list of top-performing companies was necessary due to logistical difficulties in obtaining and verifying new post-pandemic data caused by delays from survey organizers. Although the study's findings may not be fully representative of the current business landscape, this context provides a crucial foundational baseline on the strategies that enhanced competitive advantage in a pre-pandemic context. It also offers a vital reference point for future research to explore how these same strategic approaches can enable firms to adapt to and recover from subsequent market shocks and disruptions, helping them sustain or enhance their competitive advantage.

Given these constraints, the researcher took deliberate steps to ensure the rigor of the data collection process. Informed by existing literature, the questionnaire was developed with structured items using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 denoted strong disagreement and 5 signified strong agreement. The full questionnaire has been included in Appendix A. Before data collection, however, a pilot study was conducted with 30 senior managers from a separate group of firms to evaluate the survey instrument's clarity and reliability.

To ensure measurement accuracy and establish instrument validity, a series of tests were conducted. Seasoned supervisors first established face and content validity through their feedback and thematic assessment of the survey instrument. Subsequently, construct validity was established using factor analysis, which confirmed that the survey items accurately measured their intended

**Soud et .al.**

---

theoretical constructs. Pearson's correlation analysis was then used to verify the expected relationships between these validated constructs. Finally, the scales' internal consistency for organizational strategy was confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.710.

Following validation, the study's primary data was collected through online questionnaires distributed via Google Forms to the senior managers. This digital approach was chosen to accommodate social distancing during the pandemic and to leverage the practicality and efficiency of online platforms. The instrument's structured format also ensured efficient data coding, clear trend identification, and consistent responses across participants, thereby enhancing data comparability.

Following data collection, responses were analyzed using SPSS version 23. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the dataset, while Pearson correlation and linear regression analysis were used to examine the relationship between organizational strategy and competitive advantage. Prior to the regression analysis, diagnostic tests were performed to ensure all statistical assumptions were met, including checks for linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. For instance, the absence of multicollinearity was confirmed as all variables had VIF values below 10 (Myers, 1990), ensuring the data's suitability for this analysis.

### **Ethical Considerations**

To guarantee compliance with existing ethical standards and national laws, the research secured all required authorizations. Approval for these research protocols was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the United States International University-Africa (USIU-Africa) [Ref: USIU-A/IRB/319-2020] as well as from the National Commission for Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI) in Kenya [Ref: 400826]. To safeguard the rights and well-being of participants, the researcher instituted multiple precautionary measures. Informed consent was obtained from the senior leadership of participating organizations to ensure voluntary participation. The researcher upheld data privacy and confidentiality by removing identifiable information from all surveys and presenting findings only in aggregate form. Additionally, participants were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without adverse consequences. The researcher also confirmed no conflicts of interest that might compromise the study's integrity or participant well-being. To ensure data security, all responses were handled with strict confidentiality, stored in password-protected folders, and accessible only to the research team. Furthermore, the data will be securely retained for three months after the final thesis has been approved, then permanently discarded. These strategies collectively maintained ethical guidelines and safeguarded participant welfare throughout the study.

## **RESULTS**

### **Response Rate**

Out of 407 distributed questionnaires, 311 were completed and returned, yielding a 76.4% response rate. Such a high response rate strengthens the representativeness and generalizability of the findings. Table 1 provides a summary of the results.

Soud *et al.*

**Table 1:** *Response Rate of the Study's Participants*

Respondents	Description	
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Participated	311	76.4
Abstained	96	23.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>100</b>

### Demographic and Organizational Profile

To contextualize the sample, the demographic and organizational profiles of the participating firms were examined. The analysis revealed a sample predominantly consisting of well-established firms, with the highest proportion (38.3%) having been in operation for 11 to 15 years. This profile was further defined by a majority of firms (41.2%) employing a workforce of 71 to 90 people and having an annual sales turnover between KES 50 million and KES 250 million (the most common range at 42.8%). The consumer and retail sector also had the highest representation of firms (36.0%), and the primary respondents were senior leaders, with heads of finance making up the largest group at 27.0%. Table 2 provides a detailed breakdown of these characteristics.

**Table 2:** *Demographic and Organizational Profile of Participating Firms*

Profile Category	Description	Percentage of Sample (%)
<b>Organizational Tenure</b>	11–15 years	38.3
	6–10 years	24.1
	>21 years	19.9
<b>Annual Sales Turnover</b>	Between KES 50–250 M	42.8
	Between KES 451-650 M	22.5
	Between KES 251-450 M	15.4
<b>Workforce Composition</b>	71–90 employees	41.2
	51–70 employees	28.9
	<50 employees	24.1
<b>Sector Representation</b>	Consumer and Retail	36.0
	Manufacturing	22.5
	Information and Communication	16.1
	Technology	
<b>Respondent Job Title</b>	Heads of Finance	27.0
	Heads of Operations	25.7
	Heads of Information Technology	14.1

### Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage

As presented in Table 3, the descriptive analysis of organizational strategy and competitive advantage indicates that senior managers hold a favorable view of their firms' strategic approaches.

**Soud et .al.**

The high mean scores and low standard deviations demonstrate a strong consensus among managers regarding the widespread implementation of a blend of cost leadership, differentiation, and focus strategies in enhancing their firm's competitive advantage.

**Table 3:** *Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage*

Items	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
The organization yields high revenue.	311	3.79	0.517
The organization prioritizes efficiency in managing overhead and administrative costs.	311	3.87	0.487
The organization employs various cost- reduction techniques.	311	3.91	0.487
The organization prioritizes cost-efficient operations.	311	3.93	0.503
The organization's products or services are unique and valuable to its buyers.	311	3.94	0.517
The organization directs its offerings towards a specific market segment.	311	3.79	0.664
The organization provides buyers with products or services perceived to be of higher value.	311	3.91	0.552
The organization tailors its offerings to meet unique customer demands.	311	3.95	0.502
The organization caters to specific niche markets.	311	3.88	0.547
The organization fosters strong coordination across its R&D functions.	311	3.94	0.443
The organization has a reputation for high-quality products and services.	311	4.01	0.447

### **Correlation between Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage**

Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between organizational strategy and competitive advantage. As presented in Table 4, the analysis revealed a statistically significant moderate positive correlation between the two variables ( $r(311) = 0.623, p < 0.001$ ). This finding indicates that as firms strengthen their organizational strategy, their competitive advantage tends to improve. The results highlight the key role of organizational strategy as a primary driver of a firm's competitive advantage.

**Table 4:** *Correlation between Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage*

		Organizational Strategy	Competitive Advantage
Organizational Strategy	Pearson Correlation	1	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N		311
Competitive Advantage	Pearson Correlation	.623**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	311	311

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

**Regression Analysis and Hypothesis Testing**

To test the research hypothesis, linear regression analysis was employed to examine the influence of organizational strategy on competitive advantage.

**Diagnostic Tests Results**

Prior to conducting the regression analysis, a series of diagnostic tests were performed to verify key statistical assumptions. The assumption of linearity was confirmed by a scatterplot of the residuals, which showed a random distribution with no discernible pattern. Normality of the residuals was also confirmed using a Q-Q plot, as the residuals closely followed the diagonal line. To assess for multicollinearity, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was calculated, and all values were well below the recommended threshold of 10, as shown in Table 5. The assumption of homoscedasticity was verified using Levene's Test, which produced a p-value of 0.098. As this value exceeds the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis of equal variances was not rejected. The findings from these tests confirmed that all key assumptions for a valid parametric regression analysis were met. This supports the robustness of the regression model and ensures the reliability of its outputs.

**Table 5:** *Multicollinearity Test Results*

Collinearity Statistics		
Organizational Strategy Dimensions	Tolerance	VIF
Cost leadership strategy	.783	1.278
Differentiation strategy	.661	1.513
Focus strategy	.664	1.505

Soud *et al.*

**Regression Model Summary for Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage**

As shown in Table 6, the model's R-squared value of 0.395 indicates that organizational strategy accounts for 39.5% of the variance in competitive advantage. The remaining variance is attributed to other factors not captured by the model and the inherent error term.

**Table 6:** *Regression Model Summary for Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.629 <sup>a</sup>	.395	.389	.268

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational strategy  
 b. Dependent Variable: Competitive advantage

**ANOVA Regression Model for Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage**

Although organizational strategy explains a portion of the variance in competitive advantage, the regression model as a whole is statistically significant, significant ( $F(3, 307) = 66.892, p < 0.05$ ). This finding highlights that even though additional factors contribute to a larger proportion of the overall variance ( $R^2=0.395$ ), organizational strategy remains a reliable and essential predictor of competitive advantage among the top 100 medium-sized enterprises in Kenya. Table 7 presents the results of the ANOVA regression.

**Table 7:** *ANOVA Regression Model for Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.443	3	4.814	66.892	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	22.096	307	.072		
	Total	36.539	310			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational strategy  
 b. Dependent Variable: Competitive advantage

**Regression Coefficients for Organizational strategy and Competitive Advantage**

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between organizational strategy and competitive advantage, the results presented in Table 8 reveal a statistically significant positive influence of organizational strategy on competitive advantage within the top 100 medium-sized enterprises in Kenya ( $\beta=0.706, t=14.012, p<0.05$ ). This relationship can be expressed through the following regression formula, with the specific coefficients detailed in Table 8 below:  $Y=1.204+0.706(\text{Organizational Strategy})+\epsilon$

**Soud et .al.**

The proposed formula implies that, assuming all other factors remain constant, for every one-unit rise in organizational strategy, there will be an equivalent increase of 0.706 units in competitive advantage.

**Table 8: Regression Coefficients for Organizational Strategy and Competitive Advantage**

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.204	.197		6.111	.000
	Organizational Strategy	.706	.050	.623	14.012	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Competitive Advantage

**Regression Coefficients for Sub-Variables of Organizational Strategy**

This study further investigated which indicators of organizational strategy have the most significant effect. As presented in Table 9, the analysis revealed that all three sub-variables of organizational strategy, namely, cost leadership, differentiation, and focus strategies, exerted a statistically significant positive effect on competitive advantage.

Specifically, the results showed that the focus strategy ( $\beta = 0.324$ ,  $t = 5.942$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) had the strongest positive effect, followed by the differentiation strategy ( $\beta = 0.248$ ,  $t = 4.540$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), while the cost leadership strategy ( $\beta = 0.210$ ,  $t = 4.180$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) exhibited the least pronounced effect of the three. This finding implies that within the top 100 medium-sized enterprises in Kenya, a strategy that focuses on specializing and catering to distinct niche segments is a more effective driver of competitive advantage than strategies based on differentiation or cost leadership. Table 9 details the specific coefficients and significance values for all variables.

**Table 9: Regression Coefficients for Sub- Variables of Organizational Strategy**

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.180	.199		5.932	.000
	Cost leadership strategy	.185	.044	.210	4.180	.000
	Differentiation strategy	.204	.045	.248	4.540	.000

**Soud et .al.**

---

Focus strategy	.321	.054	.324	5.942	.000
----------------	------	------	------	-------	------

---

a. Dependent Variable: Competitive Advantage

---

## DISCUSSION

Building on the compelling evidence that organizational strategy significantly enhances the competitive advantage of Kenya's top 100 medium-sized enterprises, this study also reveals specific insights into the effectiveness of various strategic approaches. The focus strategy exhibited the most pronounced positive effect on competitive advantage, followed by the differentiation strategy. Conversely, cost leadership showed a comparatively lesser impact, suggesting that for these firms, competitive advantage is driven more by unique value propositions and niche specialization than by price alone. This distinct outcome, even within Kenya, underscores that strategic pathways to competitive advantage can vary considerably across industries and national landscapes, highlighting a crucial need for managers to contextualize their strategic choices to the specific dynamics of their operating environment.

The findings of this study generally align with prior research from other emerging economies, which similarly demonstrated a positive relationship between business strategies and competitive advantage. For instance, the work of Farida and Setiawan (2022) on Indonesian construction and real estate SMEs, Egwakhe *et al.* (2020) on the Nigerian flour-milling sector, and Ouma and Oloko (2017) on the Kenyan bus companies all affirmed the fundamental role of organizational strategy in enhancing a firm's competitive advantage within their respective industries and countries.

However, a closer look at the literature reveals several distinctions regarding the effectiveness of specific strategic approaches in enhancing a firm's competitive position. For example, the study by Haque *et al.* (2021) identified cost leadership as the primary factor in enhancing firms' competitive advantage in the Indonesian culinary sector. This research, however, found a contrasting result: that the focus strategy was the most effective. A similar pattern of divergence is seen in the Egwakhe *et al.* (2020) study, which emphasized product differentiation as a primary driver of competitive advantage in the Nigerian flour-milling sector. In a more profound contrast, the current research also differs from studies by Nalucha and Mwanza (2022) and Mwakawi and Kavale (2020), who found no significant relationship between generic strategies and competitive advantage in the Zambian real estate sector and at Toyota Kenya, respectively.

The divergence across these studies provides compelling evidence that the effectiveness of Porter's generic strategies is not universal. Furthermore, these findings enrich Porter's framework by highlighting its application and limitations within a developing context. To illustrate this, the present study's findings on the Kenyan SME context confirmed that the focus strategy has a significantly greater effect on competitive advantage compared to the cost leadership strategy. This specific finding challenges the universal applicability of a single strategic pathway, suggesting that firms in emerging economies may find greater success by carving out niche markets and offering unique value rather than engaging in a price war. This theoretical divergence is rooted in the unique characteristics of the Kenyan SME environment.

**Soud et .al.**

---

The Kenyan SME market is characterized by intense competition, a significant informal sector, and rapidly evolving consumer preferences. These factors often make a cost leadership strategy less viable for firms that lack the economies of scale and sophisticated supply chains of larger, multinational corporations. Therefore, these SMEs can gain a competitive advantage by leveraging their inherent agility and proximity to customers to effectively implement tailored focus and differentiation strategies. By creating specialized products or services that cater to specific, underserved customer segments or building unique brand loyalty through superior customer service, these firms demonstrate the need for strategic pathways to be adaptable and context-specific to a firm's environment.

## **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, this study highlights the significant influence of organizational strategy in enhancing the competitive advantage of Kenya's top 100 medium-sized enterprises. The findings offer two key, generalizable takeaways for firms in similar emerging markets. First, the effectiveness of Porter's generic strategies is not universal but rather context-dependent. Second, success in these markets often stems from creating unique value for distinct segments rather than competing solely on price, as evidenced by the superior performance of focus and differentiation strategies over cost leadership. Ultimately, future growth among SMEs will depend on their ability to transition from a responsive to a proactive stance in implementing a blend of context-specific strategies that align with their unique market realities. By doing so, these firms can secure a stronger and more sustainable market dominance.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the study's findings on organizational strategy and competitive advantage, several recommendations are proposed. SMEs in Kenya should strategically prioritize and integrate focus and differentiation strategies rather than relying solely on cost leadership, dedicating resources to creating unique value for specific customer segments. Firms must conduct thorough analyses of both their internal resources and the external market environment to ensure alignment with market realities and distinctive value propositions. Policymakers should develop targeted programs to support SMEs in market research and strategic planning, guiding them beyond basic cost-cutting toward the creation and implementation of unique value propositions, while government agencies could establish strategic frameworks that provide clear, actionable guidance tailored to the Kenyan market. Future research should include longitudinal studies to examine the long-term effects of implementing focus, differentiation, and cost leadership strategies on the market positioning of Kenyan SMEs, as well as comparative studies in other East African emerging economies to explore the influence of these strategies on competitive advantage and assess the generalizability of the findings across the region.

**REFERENCES**

- Abid, N., Dowling, M., Ceci, F., & Aftab, J. (2023). Does resource bricolage foster SMEs' competitive advantage and financial performance? A resource-based perspective. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 32(8), 5833–5853.
- Bartosiewicz, A., & Kucharski, A. (2024). Indicators of port sustainability: The example of Baltic Sea container ports. *Sustainable Development*, 32(3), 2371–2384.
- Bhuiyan, F., Rana, T., Baird, K., & Munir, R. (2023). Strategic outcome of competitive advantage from corporate sustainability practices: Institutional theory perspective from an emerging economy. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 32(7), 4217–4243.
- East Africa Top 100. (2022). *East Africa Top 100*. <https://eastafricatop100.com/>
- Egwakhe, A. J., Falana, R. B., Asikhia, O. O., & Magaji, N. (2020). Business strategies and competitive advantage: Evidence from flour mill companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 12(2), 17–26.
- Elkington, J. (1994). Towards the sustainable corporation: Win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development. *California Management Review*, 36(2), 90–100.
- Farida, I., & Setiawan, D. (2022). Business strategies and competitive advantage: The role of performance and innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(3), 1–16.
- Haque, M. G., Munawaroh, M., Sunarsi, D., & Baharuddin, A. (2021). Competitive advantage in cost leadership and differentiation of SMEs “Bakoel Zee” marketing strategy in BSD. *Pinisi Discretion Review*, 4(2), 277–284.
- Hussein, H., Albadry, O. M., Mathew, V., Al-Romeedy, B. S., Alsetoohy, O., Abou Kamar, M., & Khairy, H. A. (2024). Digital leadership and sustainable competitive advantage: Leveraging green absorptive capability and eco-innovation in tourism and hospitality businesses. *Sustainability*, 16(13), 1–21.
- Mwakawi, M. E., & Kavale, S. (2020). Influence of competitive strategy on competitive advantage in Toyota Kenya. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Review*, 5(5), 61–75.
- Myers, R. H. (1990). *Classical and Modern Regression with Applications* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: PWS and Kent Publishing.
- Nalucha, I., & Mwanza, B. G. (2022). A study of the effectiveness of competitive strategies employed by real estate organizations in Lusaka. *European Modern Studies Journal*, 6(4), 33–48.
- Ouma, G., & Oloko, M. (2017). The relationship between Porter’s generic strategies and competitive advantage: A case study of bus companies plying the Kisumu-Nairobi route, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 3(6), 1058–1092.
- Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. New York, NY: Free Press.

**Soud et .al.**

---

Tedja, W. (2022). Improving knowledge management for better competitive advantage through strategy execution. *International Journal of Management, Entrepreneurship, Social Science and Humanities*, 5(1), 47–62.

Wamalwa, H., Upadhyaya, R., Kamau, P., & McCormick, D. (2019). Strategies of Kenyan firms: A case study of food processing firms in Nairobi. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 10(4), 507–520.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Questionnaire**

Dear Respondent,

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study, whose objective is to examine the relationship between organizational strategy and competitive advantage among high-performing firms. This survey will take you around 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and used solely in an aggregated format, ensuring no individual responses are linked to any company. Your insights are invaluable to the success of this research.

**SECTION 1**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Please indicate with a tick (✓) or provide a brief response to the statements that require you to write down your opinion.

- 1. Name of the organization ..... (Optional)
- 2. Period of operation in Kenya (Years).....

0-5 [ ] 6-10 [ ] 11-15 [ ] 16-20 [ ] 21 and above

- 3. Please indicate your average annual sales turnover in millions.
  - Between Ksh. 50-250 [ ]
  - Between Ksh. 251-450 [ ]
  - Between Ksh. 451-650 [ ]
  - Between Ksh. 651-850 [ ]
  - Above Ksh. 851 [ ]

- 4. Please indicate the number of full time employees:
  - Below 50 [ ]
  - Between 51- 70 [ ]
  - Between 71-90 [ ]
  - Between 91-110 [ ]
  - Above 111 [ ]

- 5. Industry or sector

<b>Sector</b>	
Manufacturing	
Consumer and retail	
Infrastructure/ Construction	
ICT	
Transport	
Travel	
Health	

**Soud et .al.**

<b>Sector</b>	
Real Estate	

**6. Job title/ Position**

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	
Head of Finance	
Head of Marketing	
Head of Operations	
Head of Information Technology	
Others /Specify	

**SECTION 2**

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGY**

Indicate your level of agreement (by ticking the appropriate box) with the following statements on organizational strategy, using the following scale: **Where 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree and 5= Strongly Agree**

<b>Cost Leadership</b>		Level of Agreement				
No.	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	The organization yields high revenue.					
2	The organization prioritizes efficiency in managing overhead and administrative costs.					
3	The organization employs various cost- reduction techniques.					
4	The organization prioritizes cost-efficient operations.					
<b>Differentiation Strategy</b>		Level of Agreement				
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	The organization's products or services are unique and valuable to its buyers.					
2	The organization directs its offerings towards a specific market segment.					
3	The organization provides buyers with products or services perceived to be of higher value.					
<b>Focus Strategy</b>		Level of Agreement				
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	The organization tailors its offerings to meet unique customer demands.					
2	The organization caters to specific niche markets.					
3	The organization fosters strong coordination across its R&D functions.					
4	The organization has a reputation for high-quality products and services.					