

a propensity towards action perform better than those who don't. Just having a focus on action is not enough.

In the case of companies having low levels of situational awareness (i.e. those in the bottom half) then action (and how well you execute on it) does matter. Those with poor situational awareness and low propensity for action performed negatively whilst those with poor awareness but a high tendency towards action were more neutral. In other words, if you're blind to the environment then it's better to shoot faster and with more impact just in case you do actually hit something. Hence if you're competing against others with poor situational awareness then I can see how an argument that "execution matters more than strategy" can occur.

However, if you have poor situational awareness and are competing against someone with high situational awareness then you might have a much higher propensity towards action and better execution of such but they will still tend to outperform you. I find myself strongly in agreement with Professor Martin that strategy and execution are part of the same thing but also I'll add that situational awareness is a key part of this. This study however was in Silicon Valley and the levels of situational awareness tended to deteriorate outside that cauldron of creativity. It had taken me several years to discover some weak evidence to back up my initial suspicions that corporate blindness (i.e. very low levels of situational awareness) was a problem. But how common place is this?

## **How common is corporate blindness?**