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The study investigated the factors influencing the implementation of strategic plans in public secondary schools in Homa Bay County. The purpose of this study was to determine the factors deterring implementation of school strategic plans in public secondary schools. The objectives of the study were to establish the processes of formulating strategic plan, assess the effect of communication on successful implementation of strategic plan in secondary schools, to establish the influence of resource allocation in schools, to determine the effect of strategic formation in the strategic management plan and lastly to determine the extent to which organizational structure affect the implementation of strategic management plan. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and a random sample of 14 schools selected for the study. Questionnaire was used to collect data from the principals and HODs. Quantitative data from the field was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages. Qualitative data was analyzed by putting the responses under themes consistent with the research objectives. From the findings, majority of the surveyed schools do not carryout SWOT analysis before formulating school strategic plan. Majority of the surveyed school do not have effective communication on implementation of strategic plan. Principals do not discuss the progress of strategic plans with the staff members and other implementers. Most of the surveyed schools do not have enough funds to implement strategic plan. Majority of the schools depend on the government for funds. Majority of the surveyed schools do not have well designed organizational structures on implementation stage most schools don’t hold meetings to review their set structures. The government through the ministry of education should organize for in service programmes for the principals so as to enable them implement relevant practices when implementing strategic plans. There is need to include and define clearly the different roles expected of key players and partners for effective delivery of policy. The principals and the board of management should initiate income generator activities so as to facilitate sustainable projects in schools. The government through the ministry of education should guide and support schools principals on sustaining projects in schools.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Information

A common criticism of strategic planning worldwide among institutions and organizations is that it is overly involved with extrapolation of the past and present and can create the illusion of certainty regarding the future (Heracleous 2000). A good strategic planning process does more than produce a tangible output (a documented plan); it supports ongoing strategic thinking, discussion, and behavior. In a good strategic process the strategic plan provides a dynamic map for an organization’s considered movement through time and sets the stage for organizational improvement efforts. Strategic thinking focuses on finding and developing organizational opportunities and creating dialogue about the organization’s direction. Strategic thinking is creative, divergent, and synthetic while strategic planning is conventional, convergent, and analytical (Liedtka, 1998). When strategic thinking is employed, the planning process itself provides critical value but strategic planning is still required for effective strategic work. If nothing else, the divergent results of strategic thinking must be made operational through convergent strategic planning (Corway 2004). Van der Heijden identifies the ultimate purpose of scenario planning as helping an organization find a good and unique fit with its ever-changing environment (Van der Heijden, 1996).

The strategy paradox is a consequence of the conflict between operational commitment and strategic uncertainty. In The Strategy Paradox, Michael E. Raynor provides this definition of the strategy paradox: “The strategy paradox arises from the need to commit in the face of unavoidable uncertainty. The solution to the paradox is
to separate the management of commitments from the management of uncertainty (Raynor, 2007). Since uncertainty increases with the time horizon under consideration, the basis for the allocation of decision making is the time horizon for which different levels of the hierarchy are responsible: the corporate office, responsible for the longest item horizon, must focus on managing uncertainty, while operating managers must focus on delivering on commitments” (Raynor, 2007). High quality implementation of strategic plans is one of the greatest determinants of success with school reforms around the world (Cooper & Slavin, 1998). Thus, understanding the factors that affect the process of strategy implementation has become increasingly important in the United States given the rates of truancy, delinquent behaviors among student among others. According to Miller, during strategic management process in private and public schools/institutions, one should note that merely a good plan or strategic decision cannot generate value for an organization and its stakeholders; rather, strategies should be implemented effectively. The author notes that organizations have failed in implementing over 70% of their strategic initiatives in the US (Miller, 2002). This show how difficult is even for secondary schools to successfully implement their strategies. It is clear that a poor or vague strategy can limit implementation efforts dramatically. Good execution cannot overcome the shortcomings of a bad strategy or a poor strategic planning effort (Hambrick, 2006). Several studies mention the fact that the kind of strategy that is developed (Alexander, 1985; Allio, 2005) and the actual process of strategy formulation, namely, how a strategy is developed (Kim & Mauborgne; 1991, 1993; Singh, 1998) will influence the effect of implementation. Alexander (1985) believes that the need to start with a formulated strategy that involves a good idea or concept is mentioned most often in helping promote successful implementation. Good implementation naturally starts with good strategic input: the soup is only as good as the ingredients (Allio, 2005).
Whether a strategy itself is consistent and fitting or not is a key question for successful strategy implementation, but even a consistent strategy cannot be all things to all people. Bantel (1997) suggests that particular product/market strategies are effective at achieving particular performance goals to the exclusion of others. One of his conclusions is that synergies between strategy types and implementation capabilities exist and should be exploited.

Beer and Eisenstat (2000) summarized 6 strategy implementation barriers which include senior management's top-down or laissez faire policy, unclear strategy of conflicting priorities, ineffective senior management team, poor vertical relations, poor coordination among functions, boundaries and inadequate down-the-line leadership skills and development (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000). These factors are also very prominent in the United States as far as strategic plan implementation is concerned.

Factors that influence strategy implementation are; the strategy formulation, the strategy executors (managers, employees), the organizational structure, the communication activities, the level of commitment for the strategy, the consensus regarding the strategy, the relationships among different units/ departments and different strategy levels, the employed implementation tactics (Hambrick,2006, Allio,2005, Chimhanzi & Morgan, 2004). There are different factors that affect strategy implementation. It is clear that a poor or vague strategy can limit implementation efforts dramatically.

Good execution cannot overcome the shortcomings of bad strategy or poor strategic effort (Hambrick, 2006). Several studies mention the fact that the kind of strategy that
is developed (Alexander, 1985, Allio, 2005) and the actual process of strategy formulation, namely, how a strategy is developed (Kim and Mauborgne, 1991, 1993; Singh, 1998) will influence the effect of implementation.

Alexander (1985) believes that the need to start with a formulated strategy that involves a good idea or concept is mentioned most often in helping promote successful implementation.

Another is relationships among different units/ departments and different strategy levels. Several studies treat institutional relationships among different units/ departments and different strategy level as a significant factor that affects the outcome of strategy implementation. (Walker and Ruekert, 1987, Gupta, 1987, Slater and Olson, 2001; Walker and Rukert 1987).

Chimhanzi (2004) suggests that cross unit working relationships have a key role to play in the successful implementation of decisions. Implementation effectiveness is affected negatively by conflict and positively by communication and specifically, interpersonal not written.

Effectiveness of strategy implementation is at least in part, affected by the quality of people involved in the process (Govindarajan, 1989) Here quality refers to skills, attitudes, capabilities, experiences and other characteristics of people required by a specific task or position (Peng and Litteljohn, 2001). Viseras, Baines and Sweeney (2005) group 36 key success factors into three research categories; people, organization, systems.
Their intriguing findings indicate that strategy implementation success depends crucially on the human or people side of report management; or less on organization and systems related several researchers have emphasized the effect of top management on strategy implementation (Hrebianiak and Snow, 1982; Smith and Kofron, 1996; Schmidt and Brauer, 2006; Schaap, 2006).

Guth and Mac Millan (1986) found that the level of effort that an individual. Heracleous (2000) also finds that if middle management do not feel that they have the requisite skills to implement it, then they are likely to sabotage its implementation. Alexander (1985) suggests that there are many problems which over half of the corporations experienced frequently, such as the involved employees have insufficient capabilities to perform their jobs, lower level employees are inadequately trained, and departmental managers provide inadequate leadership and direction.

Communication can be a great barrier to strategy implementation. Alexander (1985) points out that communication is mentioned more frequently than any other single item promoting successful strategy implementation. The content of such communications includes clearly explaining what news responsibilities, tasks and duties needed to be performed by the affected employees. Rapert, Lynch and Suter (1986) find that organizations where employees have easy access to management through open and supportive communication environments cited in Rapert, Velliquette and Garretsan (2002) show that effective strategy implementation organizational communication plays an important role in training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation. In fact, communication is pervasive in every aspect of strategy implementation, as it relates in
a complex way to organizing processes which in turn have an effect on the process of implementation according to Heide, Gronhaug and Johanessen, they constitute the key barrier to the implementation of planned strategic activities Rapert, Velleiquette and Garretson (2002) state that communication and shared understandings play an important role in the implementation process.

Nutt (1986,1989) Bourgeois III and Brodwin (1984) Lehner (2004), Sashittal and Wilemon (1996) research the effects of implementation tactics on strategy implementation tactics used by managers in making planned changes by profiling a case study’s intervention participation, persuasion and edict. The study found a 100 percent success rate when key executives used an intervention tactic, but observed this tactic in less than 20 percent of the cases. Lehner (2004) takes implementation tactics as genuine organizational behavior based on the assumption that implementation in general is dependent on the environment and various strategic and organizational variables.

Nielsen (1983) contends that institutions must achieve consensus both within and outside their organization in order to successfully implement strategies. The consensus about an institution’s strategy may differ across levels; if members of the organization are not aware of the same information, or if in an organization, a lower level of consensus may create obstacles of successful strategy implementation, (Noble, 1996).

Dooley, Fryxell and Judges (2000) findings shows that decision consensus appears to result in subsequently higher levels of commitment to the strategic decision among
the members of the decision making team. Moreover, this commitment, once angered by consensus, is positively related to successful decision implementation.

Wodridge & Floyd, 1990, cited in Rapert, Lynch and Suter (1986) contends that shared understanding without commitment may result in “counter effort” and negatively affect performance. Guth & Mac Millan (1986) and Boyer & Mc Dermott (1999) all think that the shared understanding of middle management and those at the operational level to the top management team’s strategic goals is of critical importance to effective implementation. Strategy implementation efforts may fail if the strategy, implementation efforts may fail if the strategy does not enjoy support and commitment by the majority of employees and middle management to. This may be the case if they were not consulted during the development phase (Heracleous, 2000). Guth and Mac Millan (1986) suggest that middle managers with low and negative commitment to the strategies formulated by senior management create significant obstacles to effective implementation.

The organizational structure is the second most important implementation barrier according to Heide & Gronhaug Johannessen (2002) study. Drazin and Howard (1984) see a proper strategy structure alignment as a necessary precursor to the successful implementation.

Beer and Eisenstate (2000) examines 12 profiles in depth from 4 companies, 10 for business units and 2 for corporate. They put forward six silent killers of strategy implementation. Top down or laisser faire senior management styles; unclear strategy and conflicting priorities; an ineffective senior management team; poor vertical
communication, poor coordination across functions and inadequate down the line leadership skills and development.

The goal of education for all is now being looked into a fresh by the organizations concerned to ensure that not just education but quality education is received (UNESCO, 2004). The UNESCO report emphasizes that quality education is a tool to overcome most of the problems in Africa and a means to fulfill other rights. Indicators of quality education must be revised to ensure that standard is maintained worldwide. It is important to realize that poor quality education anywhere in the world is bad for humankind as a whole (UNESCO, 2004).

In Africa, the implementation of strategic plans within secondary schools is also affected by several factors some similar to those in the developed world while others may differ. For instance, in South African schools, a study by Deventer (2009) showed that the implementation of some strategies failed because of poor attitude of the stakeholder most especially teachers towards such strategies. Poor management, political interference was also some of the factors the author noted to be affecting strategic plan implementation in South African schools. In Kenya the situation is similar as relevant authorities responsible for the implementation of several strategies have continued to fail. Amongst the factors affecting the implementation of strategic plans in Kenyan secondary schools according to Omboi (2011), revealed that influence of reward management on implementation of strategic plans, resource allocation, managerial behavior also affects implementation of strategic plans, managerial decision making, managerial philosophy all affect implementation of strategic management plans within schools. Given the fact that strategic plan implementation is a phenomenon that is new to many developing countries, there is
limited or no research done on factors affecting the implementation of strategic plans in secondary schools and the same can be said for international studies which is also greatly lacking in this area.

1.2 Problem statement

Strategic planning is not an individual work but a combined effort of school administration school stakeholders, strategic plan reflect the school’s goals, objectives and ways of attaining them. Strategic planning helps institutions in establishing priorities, ways and methods of accomplishing needs of administrators and stakeholders.

Wirth (2010) argues that strategic planning is the process by which the guiding members of an organization envision its future and develop the necessary procedures, operations to achieve that future. Great strategies are worth nothing if they cannot be implemented Okumus and Raper (2001). Strategic implementation is also portrayed as a lively process by which organizations identify future opportunities (Schaap 2006).

According to Finkelstein (2003), strategic planning is likely to fail during the launching of new ventures, promoting innovation and change, managing mergers and acquisitions and responding to new environmental pressures. He mentions that leadership traps, monolithic cultures and skills, power and politics, and structural memories are the reasons for the failures in strategic plans implementation. In Kenya, secondary schools are trying to implement various strategies due to the challenges they face today and also because they are now required by the government to carry out strategic planning (GOK, 2006). These schools must find new ways of dealing
with the issues facing them including increasing competition from private schools and poor performances (Lewa, Mutuku and Mutuku 2009). In Kenya implementation of several strategies in schools have continued to fail.

Strategic implementation variables may lead to uncertainties in schools both private and state owned and these are: poor academic performance, delinquent behaviors, low quality education and failure in institution strategic initiatives (Miller, 2002). It was therefore the purpose of this study to carry out an analysis of the factors that affect the implementation of strategic plans in secondary schools in Homabay County and established causes of strategic plan implementation failure before it takes place.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

Strategic management plan implementation is one of the tools that various organizations and learning institutions have used all over the world to improve their effectiveness in service delivery and educational institutions are also adopting similar trends for efficient operations and desired outcomes. Within secondary schools strategies have been used not only to improve students’ academic achievements but also to ensure everything is running smoothly. Therefore it was necessary to try and find out the factors that are affecting the implementation of strategic plans within secondary schools in Homabay county Kenya if appropriate results are to be realized and several effects of poor implementation is to be remedied within secondary schools in the county.
1.4 Research Objectives

Broad objectives:
The overall aim was to determine the factors influencing the implementation of strategic plans in public secondary schools in Homabay county Kenya

Specific objectives
The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

i) To establish the processes of formulating strategic plan.

ii) To assess the effect of communication on successful implementation of strategies in secondary schools.

iii) To establish the influence of resource allocation in implementation of strategic management plans in secondary schools.

iv) To determine the effect of strategy formation in the implementation of strategic management plans in secondary schools.

v) To determine the extent to which organizational structure affect the implementation of strategic management plans.

1.5 Research Questions

i) What is the process of formulating a strategic plan in secondary school?

ii) In what ways does communication affect the implementation of strategic management plans in secondary schools?

iii) How does resource allocation affect the implementation of strategic management plans in secondary schools?

iv) Does strategy formulation affect the implementation of strategic management plans in secondary schools?

v) How does organizational structure affect the implementation of strategic management plans in secondary schools?
1.6 Assumption of the study
Most schools in Homa-Bay County have strategic plans and they are implemented by the relevant people. All respondents are to be cooperative and honest in their responses.

1.7 Limitations of the Study
The study area was vast and distance between Schools was wide, which made the researcher Spent too much time. Even though the researchers had sampled the schools well this gave us the correct results.

1.8 Delimitations of the study
Only public secondary schools were to be studied because they are direct beneficiaries of educational provision in Kenya.

1.9 Significance of the Study
Through this study, the executors of strategic management plans in secondary schools would be able to take appropriate measures to curb negative factors affecting strategic management implementation, not to mention that they would also be able to learn on effective ways of implementing school strategies through this study hence making their strategic implementation plans successful. The government would also be able to use this study in order to formulate effective policies governing the implementation of secondary school strategic plans and also create awareness on what works and what does not work as far as secondary school strategic plans are concerned.

Through appropriate and effective strategic plan implementation by secondary schools, all the education stakeholders would be able to benefit as schools would be able to run smoothly and students' academic achievements would be greatly improved.
Theoretical Framework

The strategic planning theories first entered the modern business world when Army officers returned from World War II, bringing their military leadership ideas into the American workplace with them.

The mission statement is vision of where organizational leaders want the organization to go in the future. It generally states the organization's reason for being in existence. This includes what the organization does and why it does it. The mission statement provides a framework for the strategic planning process. The long term objectives of most strategic plans are to align the day to day business practices of the organization with its mission.

SWOT Analysis

The SWOT analysis helps leaders identify the organization's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The school environmental scanning should be approached using SWOT analysis. Through SWOT analysis the school will be able to determine where the school is today.

The strengths and weaknesses are for internal analysis and the opportunities and threats are for external analysis. The OT factors refers to: economical, political, technological and competitive trends and events that could significantly benefit or harm the school organization in the future. When making the strategic plan you outline the O-opportunities which can benefit the school in future. W – Weaknesses are internal and they are controllable activities within the school which can be performed well.
The use of SMART goals to close the gap between where the organization is now and where it envisions itself in future. The smart goal method encourages organizational leaders to develop goals that are strategic in nature, measurable, reasonably attained and relevant to mission. These goals must also be timely, or tied to a specific timeline for implementation.

**Implementation**

Strategic planning generally begins as an abstract vision created within the upper echelons of an organization before being disseminated for implementation by managers at the functional level. Strategies are implemented through the development of specific policies and procedures designed to meet the goals created by organizational leaders.

The SWOT analysis helps the leaders identify the organization's strength, weakness, opportunities and threats. The school environmental scanning should be approached using SWOT analysis where weaknesses of the school are the implementation barriers which may affect the process. The barriers to implementation are the communication, organizational structure, culture, resource allocation and strategic formulation which the school needs to identify.

Threats involve external analysis where the implementation variable is externally generated. The barriers are externally but interfere with the implementation of the school strategy.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

There process of the implementing a strategic plan has several procedures that go with it and if one procedure is not properly followed, everything could be lost. Given the importance of strategic plan implementation to secondary schools all secondary schools are struggling to ensure that they have successfully implemented their strategies but this is not the case as the implementation process is normally faced with several challenges and or factors that affect effective implementation of these strategic plans. These factors include implementation communication, strategy formulation, executors, reward management, resource allocation, management skills, managerial decision making, managerial philosophy as well as financial matters (Raynor 2007). If either of these factors are lacking or poorly handled, the implementation of strategic plans are bound to fail leading to poor academic achievements, increased levels of truancy, and delinquent behaviors among others. Okumus (2001) presents strategy implementation frameworks, highlighting key implementation variables identified by key authors. From these frameworks, ten common variables are identified. These are strategy formulation, environmental uncertainty, organizational structure, culture, operational planning, communication, resource allocation, people, control, people, control and outcome.

**Strategic formulation**

Strategy formulation is often seen as a process which involves decision to shape the path an organization takes to meet its objectives Eisenhardt & Zbaracki (1992). With this in mind, the implementation stage is the realization process of the strategy that had been developed in the formulation stage. Therefore, if the formulation stage is not
done well it will have a direct impact on the implementation stage, potentially becoming a barrier to implementation.

Furthermore, there is a tendency for the formulation and implementation process to be done separately by two different groups of people (Guth & MacMillan, 1986). Hence, most of the people in the organization who are crucial to successful strategy implementation probably had little, if anything to do with development of the corporate strategy.

Therefore, there is possibility that they are completely unaware of the effort and information that went into the formulation process (Heracleous, 2000).

People
This variable represents people within the organization, not the individual personalities but the demographics of the organization. The importance of people in the study of strategic management is also evident in different implementation framework e.g. Candido & Morns (2002) which included people as a variable that is crucial to ensure successful implementation. For example, in their discussions on principles recommended by Beer & Eisentat (2000) was that “the change process should develop a partnership with all relevant stakeholders” (pg 599). Therefore, if the people within an institution are not managed effectively, they could potentially cause disruption to the implementation process.
Control

Strategic control should be put in place to ensure that a strategy is being implemented as planned and that the results produced by the strategies are those intended (Schendel & Hofer, 2007). Schreyogg & Steinmann (1987) findings states that strategic implementation control is put in place, to assess the basic direction of the strategy, rather than whether the strategy implementation proceeded as planned.

Resource Allocation

The availability of resources, in terms of staff, to be knowledge, finance and time, is thought to be crucial as part of strategy implementation (Alexander, 1985, Miller 2005). In essence, resource represents the strengths that organization can use to assist with the conception and implementation of strategies (Barney, 1991). Therefore, appropriate allocation of resources is important to the survival and success of an organization.

Communication

Communication process in implementation involves clearly explanation of what new responsibilities, tasks and duties need to be performed by the implementer. It also includes the why behind changed activities and more fundamentally the reasons why the new strategic decision was made firstly Forman and Argenti (2005).

Rapert, Lynch and Suter (1986) found that organizations where employees have easy access to management through open and supportive communication climates tend to out perform those with more restrictive communication environments (cited Rapert, Velliquette and Garretson, 2002).
Velliquette & Garreston (2002) find that communication and shared understandings play an important role in the implementation process. In particular, when vertical communication is frequent strategic consensus is enhanced and an organization’s performance improves.

**Organizational structure**

Organizational structure is one variable which management can adapt to lead the organization to its desired goals and objectives (Heracleos, 2000, Noble, 1999a) pointed out that changes in the competitive environment require adjustments to the organizational structure.

Schaap (2006) suggests that adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy can ensure successful strategy implementation because it shall have to fit the organization activities.

Different strategy types have different requirements regarding an adequate organizational structure (Olson & Slater and Hult, 2005).

**Organizational culture**

Morris (2002) views culture as concepts of behavior, individual values, norms and beliefs. He believed that the matching of an organization’s culture with strategy ensures organizational success (Deal & Kennedy 2008) the management has to identify the effective culture of an organization and use it as a component influencing an organization’s ability to compete and succeed in the long run. Organizations that
are able to understand their culture to support their strategy usually perform more successfully than those whose strategy and culture is not aligned.

(Jones 2008) therefore if the organizational culture does not fit the strategy then implementation process may be affected. Strategic implementation variables may lead to uncertainties in organization both private and state owned and these are: poor academic performance, delinquent behaviors, low quality education and failure in institution strategic initiatives. The author notes that organizations have failed in implementing over 70% of their strategic initiatives in the US. This show how difficult is even for secondary schools to successfully implement their strategies.

This concept is explained in figure 1.1
1.12 Definition of operational terms

Administration: A formal system that controls, supervises, plans and make decisions on various activities of an organization on the basis of established authority.

Effectiveness: -This is the importance of strategic planning in terms of schools improvement in academic performance and physical facilities.

Mission: This is a statement that explains why a school exists and steps it will take to achieve the future dreams.

Organization: A school or any other formal institution.

Planner: -The second organization, administration and stakeholders.

Planning: The action of establishing a strategic plan.

Stake holders:-Board of governors, parents, sponsors, staff, the government and any party involved towards school obligations.

Strategic planning: It is the process where a school defines her future prospects or desires and creates steps to attain the objectives or goals.

Vision: it is a statement developed by a school explaining her preferred future. It refers to a mental picture of what an institution would like to be.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
The goal education for all is now being looked into a fresh by organizations concerned to ensure that not just education but quality education is received (UNESCO, 2004). This chapter dealt with review outlines of literature related to the study. The literature review outlined factors affecting strategic implementation in schools by the administrators.

2.2 Process of Formulating Strategic plan
Writh (2010) states that strategic planning is the process by which the guiding members of an organization envision its future and develop the necessary procedures and operations to achieve that future. He further notes that in the strategic planning process, there is need of a planning consultant whose role as a trainer range from being an outsider expert on planning results to be actively involved with the planning results. Bryson (2008) define strategic planning or a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what a school is, what it does and why it does it. To deliver the best results, strategic planning requires broad yet effective information gathering development and exploration of strategic alternative and an emphasis of future implications of present decision.

Cawelti (2002) on the other hand defines strategic planning as a process deliberately designed to help leaders conceive of the kind of institution they would like to create to serve their students. High quality implementation of strategic plan is one of the greatest determinants of success with school reforms around the world (Cooper &
Factors that influence strategy implementation are; the strategy formulation, the strategy executors, the organizational structure, the communication, the level of commitment for the strategy, the consensus regarding the strategy and the relationships among different units department. (Hambrick, 2006, Allio, 2005, Chimhanzi, 2004).

2.3 Effect of Communication on Strategic Plan Implementation

Alexander (1985) points out that communication is mentioned more frequently than any other single item promoting successful strategy implementation. The content of such communications includes clearly explaining what new responsibilities, tasks and duties need to be performed by the affected employees.

Rapert, Lynch and Suter (1986) find that organizations where employees have easy access to management through open and supportive communication climates tend to outperform those with more restrictive communication environments (cited in Rapert, Velliquette and Garretson, 2002).

Findings of Peng and Litteljohn (2001) show that effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation. Organizational communication plays dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation. In fact, communication is persuasive in every aspects of strategy implementation, as it relates in a complex way to organizing processes, organizational context and implementation objectives which, in turn, have an effect on the process of implementation. The communication issues may be influenced to some extent by the
organizational structure. According to Heide, Gronhaug and Johannessen (2002), they constitute the key barrier to the implementation process. The study of Schaap (2006), reinforces that frequent communication up and down in organization enhances strategic consensus through the fostering of shared attitudes and values.

The corporate communication function is the department or unit whose purpose is facilities strategy implementation through communication (For man and Argenti, 2005) Forman and Argenti (2005) find that the alignment between the corporate communication function and the strategic implementation process was particularly visible in those institutions that were going through fundamental strategic change. It has been argued that manager’s effectiveness is closely related to the organization’s ability to develop and sustain quality strategies for internal communication (Beer & Eisentat, 2000). The organization’s ability to communicate is also a powerful tool to increasing levels of commitment to organization wide strategies by all staff at all levels (Floyd & Wooldridge, 1992b). Communication with employees encourage of view points and provides opportunities for feedback (Sadler with the manner which a manager communicates to his/her staff, it is also about the flow information to all areas of an organization. However, effective communication within organizations takes time and effort (Miller, 2005).

It is something that requires commitment from the managers for it to work successfully. Hence, if there is none or lack of communication, it can lead to misunderstandings or lack of information which will eventually affect the outcome of any implementation initiation. (Porter, 2008) Reiterate the goals and actions of the strategic plan, because everyone will get caught up in day today affairs,
communication about the plan on a regular basis to keep it in the forefront of what personnel do.

The administrator should choose which medium works best to communicate updates, changes and mission. Newsletters are not effective but email blasts are better in communication between teams. If one group of educators is part of a task force to reduce conflict, find a way to share what this team is doing with other teams so everyone builds on each others achievements. Parents want to be involved, but can be hard to rally together. An institution need to appoint facilitators and team leads to charge of communicating with specific groups (Drucker, 2011).

Miniane and Falter 1996 stated that communication stands out as the key success factor when it comes to strategy implementation. It is imperative for an organization to develop a comprehensive communication plan in order to improve the success communication plan in order to improve the success rate of its implementation projects. Communication and commitment are critical elements in strategy implementation to facilitating the achievements of strategic goals and objectives (Drucker, 2011). Because of increased accountability required by external audit and quality control mechanisms, the institution of higher learning has been placed to greater accountability to communicate strategic goals and encourage commitment among the institutional members to achieve those strategic goals (Hambrick, 1987).

Many a times we find that managers who are supposed to be delivering performance to meet the strategic goals of the school do not have a clear idea of what the strategy is all about. They do realize what needs to be done to fulfill the strategic plan. Lack of
proper communication of what is important for the strategy to be delivered may result in having your priorities wrong and the reported levels of returns will never be a reality (Jarzabkowski, 2002). Communication is very important as implementation involves many more people working for seemingly unrelated processes but with the same end goal, structure but the fact is that it is as much as function of voluntary involvement and spirit of the people in the institution.

It is this aspect of strategy deployment that differentiates initiates of two institutions pursuing similar strategy. Communication along with vigorous reviews is the key to efficient execution of strategy (Alegse, 2011). When we are communicating strategy, we are communicating change.

The key for communicating strategy is to be able to align the extent and scope of the change and the approaches of implementation with the values and principles outlined in the related policy document (Jones, 2008). Some schools communicate their strategy really well. They manage to communicate what they want to achieve and how they will go about it. They get teachers motivated and remove the blocks that have prevented the strategy from working in the past; blocks that may be embedded when the culture of the organization. They get teachers, behind the strategy; adding to it and making it work in their part of the institution (Jones, 2008).

2.4 Resource Allocation in Strategic Plan Implementation

The availability of resources in terms of staff, skills, knowledge, finance and time, is thought to be a crucial part of strategy implementation (Alexander, 1985; Miller, 2002). In essence represent the strengths that forms can use to assist with the
conception and implementation strategies (Barney, 1991). Therefore, appropriate allocation of resources is important to use survival and success of an organization. Examples of resource allocation could be the budgeting process, training and development of staff to increase level of skills within the organization and availability of physical resources such as assets for use in the organization (Miller, 2002). Resource allocation must be oriented to objectives achievements. Objectives should be clearly laid down with strategic priorities for resource allocation. Their preferences attract more resources for their pet reports (Chowrasta, 2011).

School leaders and policy makers sometimes also take advantage of a broader resource base than traditional federal state and local tax revenue streams (Miller, 2002). An institution had organizations have four types of resources; financial resources, physical resources, human resources, technological resources (www.ZAINBOOK.com). In strategic planning, a resource allocation decision is a plan for using available resources especially human resources especially in the near team, to achieve goals for the future.

It is the process of allocating resources among the various reports (Joyce and Hambrick, 2006). Resources allocation is a major management activity that allow for strategy execution. Strategic management enables resources to be allocated according to priorities established by annual objectives (Miller, 2005). School committees should be able to demonstrate sufficient flexibility to respond positively and swiftly to changing needs and circumstances. If the goal of the self-managing school is to be realized, then schools should have the capacity to modify their resourcing, arrangements to increase learning opportunities for the student (School Council, 2010).
2.5 Effective Strategic formulation in Strategic Planning

It is clear that a poor or vague strategy can limit implementation efforts dramatically. Good execution cannot overcome the shortcomings of a bad strategy or a poor strategic planning effort (Hambrick, 2006). Several studies mention the fact that the kind of strategy that is developed (Alexander, 1985, Allio, 2005) and the actual process of strategy formulation, namely, how a strategy is developed (Kim & Moubourgne, 1991, 1993; Sinh, 1998) will influence the effect of implementation. Alexander (1985) believes that the need to start with a formulated strategy that involves a good idea or concept is mentioned most often in helping promote successful implementation.

The central conclusion of the research of Kim & Moubourgne (1991) is that the procedural Justice of the strategy formulation process ultimately affects the commitment, trust and social harmony as well as the outcome satisfaction of managers in subsidiaries. Procedural justice provides a potentially useful but unexplored way to mobilize a multinational’s global network of subsidiaries. Commitment and support of the strategic planning must spread from the principal all the way down through the ranks to the like worker in the institution- just importantly; the strategic planning team should be composed of top level managers who are capable of representing the interests, concerns and opinions of all members of the institutions (School council, 2010).

This element of strategy formulation is one of the two continuous processes consistently scanning its surroundings serves the district purpose of allowing an institution to survey a variety of constituents that affect its performances and which
are necessary in order to conduct subsequent pieces of the planning process (Miller, 2005). Porter (2008) pointed out that a well conceived vision consists of two major components: a core ideology and the envisioned future. Formulation of strategies is a creative and analytical process. It is a process because particular functions are performed in a sequence over the period of time. The process involves institutional mission and objectives, environmental analysis, institutional analysis, identification of alternatives and choices if alternative (Hitesh Bhasin, 2012).

Mission is the fundamental unique purpose of an organization that sets its part from other organizations strives to achieve. These together provide the direction for other aspects of the process. (Porter, 2008). The process of environmental analysis includes collection of relevant information from the environment, interpreting its impact on the future organizational working and determining what opportunities and threats positive and negative aspects are offered in the environment (Porter, 2008). Institutional analysis is known as SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunities and Threats) analysis. This analysis identifies the future goals of the organization and their evaluation there factors whether they are contributing in positive way or in negative way. It can be extended to say that better to implement effectively a second grade strategy than to run a first class strategy by ineffective implementation less than 50% of formulated strategies get implemented (Mintzberg, 1994; Miller 2002; Hambbrick and Canella, 1993). Every failure of implementation is a failure of formulation (Hambrick and Snow, 1982).

Corway, (2004) argues that formulation of strategic planning, with its appeal to diverse interests and diffuse distribution of power, increases the likelihood of
community involvement in schools, but it also creates problems with ensuring a coordinated focus and suitable role for expert knowledge. According to (Bryson, 2008) which is applicable to today’s learning institutions and organizational leaders should see these obligations as opportunities, for if they are formulated correctly for and by institutional leaders to their respective constituencies they help by defining what is not explicitly forbidden. If they are not studied carefully, institutional administrators may believe that they are more tightly constrained in their actions that they actually are (Bryson, 2008).

2.6 Organizational structure

Organizational structure is often mentioned in strategic management studies as an important organizational variable (Bourgeois & Brodwin, 1984, Chandler, 1982; Heracleous, 2000) More specifically organizational structure is one variable which management can adapt to lead the organization to its desired goals & objectives (Bourgeois) & Brodwin, 1984) Heracleous, 2000) study of implementation of a new strategy within the organization could possibly mean changes to the organizational structure for the strategy to be successful. It is believed that different levels of management within an organization apply different approaches to implementation (Nutt, 1998). Factors relatively to the organizational structure are the second most important implementation barrier according to Heide & Gronhaug & Johannessen’s (2002) study. Drazine and Howard (1984) see a proper strategy – structure alignment as a necessary precursor to the successful implementation of new business strategies (Noble, 1999b) Schaap (2006) suggests that adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy can ensure successful strategy implementation.
Structures are essential need to be configured as a whole and not treat structural elements as isolated factors (Keats and Neil, 2002 hand book of strategy). In an institution, strategies require a structure that helps the organization reach its objectives.

The structure must fit the strategy (Garry, 2010). As the number, size and diversity of divisions in an organization increases, controlling and evaluating operations become increasingly difficult for strategists (Brenes & Mena & Molina, 2007). Different strategies in an institution have different requirements regarding an adequate organizational structure (e.g. Olson & Slater & Hult, 2005). Organizations function within two types of environment: the general environment consist of the organization set of economic, legal, political cultural and educational surroundings (Frenz, 2012). There is no perfect or ideal organizational structure, once a strategy has been chosen; structure must be modified to fit the strategy (Hambrick, 1987).

Implanting a new strategy often requires new resources and skills for new activities. You cannot afford to mismatch can lead to poor strategy and structure since a mismatch can lead to poor strategy implementation. Just as your organizations strategy needs to change with the changing external environment, so must your structure change for proper strategy implementation (Cook, 2008).

Matching structure to strategy involves making strategy critical activities, the main building blocks in your institutions new resources and skills for new activities (Hambrick, 2006).
Organization structure is the pattern in which the various parts of the organization are interrelated or interconnected. For implementing strategy, the organization structure should be designed according to the needs of the strategy. The relationship between strategy and structure can be thought of in terms of utilizing structure for strategy implementation, because structure is a means to an end that is to provide facilities for implementing strategy (Hitesh, 2012). There are various ways of designing an organization structure. Major issues involved in designing the institutional structure to fit the strategy involve the following questions: What is the appropriate placement and relationship of different units? Effective school components have been consistently used to organize organizational development and strategic planning process and procedures (Knoff, Finch, Carlyon, 2004).

An organization that has been failing to compete effectively will often need to go through an organizational restructuring to changes its focus. It will need to change its organizational structure to move away from tasks that are not switched for (Hitesh, 2012). Structure should be set and have clear, open lines of communication with your employees. A plan owner and regular strategy meetings are the two easiest ways to put structures in place in an institution (Hitesh, 2012).

2.7 Summary of Literature Review

The review literature had shown that there are factors that deter school strategic plan implementation; all over the world. Various sources were reviewed in relation to school strategic plan narrowing down to Kenya.
Extent of implementation of school strategic plan in Kenya is however not well established. It was revealed that in order for schools to improve academic performance, appropriate planning in relation to curriculum, physical and human resources must be embraced. In the review literature the following gaps were evident; Not much had been done on strategic planning in Secondary Schools in Kenya. Most research studies on strategic planning are based on making organization and companies.

The few research studies carried out in public Secondary schools in Kenya focuses on income generation reports as alternative source of funding, with little or no attention paid on strategic planning and the prioritization of the report in an attempt to fill these gaps, this determining implementation of school strategic planning public Secondary school in Homa Bay County.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter illustrated on the methodology applied in data collection. It prepared the research design, target population, study locale, sampling procedure and sample research instrument, piloting, data collection procedure and methods of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design
The researcher used descriptive survey design to investigate the implementation of strategic planning in schools. This technique that seeks to determine present practices or options of a specified population (Orodho, 2005). Descriptive survey research intends to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interests policy makers and educators (Borg and Gall, 1983). A survey involves a sample survey that was designed to gather information from or about a fraction of the population. In survey design the researcher reports the findings. It involves collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample individual (Orodho, 2005). It is a reliable design for collecting information about people's attitude, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social issues (Orodho and Kombo 2002). The descriptive survey was the most appropriate for this study because the researcher collected information on the state of affairs in the schools without manipulating any variables and was to make an analysis of strategic planning in schools.
3.3 Study Locale

The study was carried out in Homa Bay County Kenya. The main economic activities of the area are fishing and small scale businesses. Homa Bay County has thirteen Districts and seventeen Educational zones.

According to Skivington and Daft (1991), the ideal setting for any study is one that is directly related to the researcher’s interest. Due to unsatisfactory educational development the researcher identified the locale among others.

The district has numerous secondary schools where essential services are lacking leading to low academic achievements. The researcher studied on strategic planning implementation in secondary schools so as to improve on the unsatisfactory services given by school administrators.

3.4 Study Population

Borg and Gall (1983) illustrates population as all members of a real set of people, events or objects to which the researcher wishes to generalize the results of the research.

The target population for this study comprised of eight public secondary schools and four divisions in Homa Bay County. All principals, three Girls’ schools, five Boys’ schools formed the target population.

The 12 principles and 28 HODs are the main target population making a total of 40.
3.5 Sampling Techniques

A sample is portion of a target population. Sampling means selecting a given number of subjects from a defined population (Orodho, 2005).

Sample design refers to the way of selecting a sample can either be probability (random) or non-probability (non-random). Salavin (1984) observed that due to some factors such as limited time, funds and other logistics constraints, a study can be carried from a carefully selected sample to represent the entire population.

The researcher based her study on a sample of 8 Schools which comprised 14% of the target population 57 schools in Homa Bay County. The same percentage is used to sample principals and HODs.

Gay (1992) recommended 20% sample for a small population. For each sample school would be the respondents giving to twelve principals and twenty eight HODs resulting to a total of forty two respondents.

3.6 Research Instruments

The research instruments which researcher used in data collection were questionnaires for principals and Head of departments.

Questionnaires

The researchers used questionnaire to collect data from principals and HODs on the challenges facing principals on effective implementation of strategic planning. This method can reach a large number of subjects who know how to read and write independently (Peil, 1995).
Questionnaires were considered ideal for collecting data from principal and teachers because they individually record and interpret these instruments.

**Principals Questionnaire**

The Principal is the professional advisor to the BOM and PTA. He/she is expected to offer professional advice to the entire school management team. He supervises the implementation of the school strategic plans. The questionnaire comprised background information like age, gender, headship experience and duration he has stayed in the current station; school vision, mission, motto and objectives, the role of head teacher in strategy plans, challenges encountered in the implementation for the plans.

**HODs Questionnaire**

The heads of department are appointed by the TSC to head various departments in schools. They play a key role in the school strategic planning process, because they are involved in the implementation of the curriculum since they advise the principal on the departmental needs.

The questionnaire consisted of their background information for example gender, age and experience as HODs. It also consisted of the roles the HODs play in developing strategic plans and different challenges they face in the implementation of the strategic plans.
3.7 **Piloting**

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a pilot study requires a researcher to analyze the few questionnaires and to see if the methods of analysis are appropriate. If resources (time and money) allow and if one is dealing with a large study, it is worthwhile to analyze the few cases because results could yield data which could provide suggestions on how suitable the proposed methods of analysis are. The selected sample for piloting should not be in the sample size. The researcher was able to detect problems in the pre testing for example unclear directions, insufficient space to write the response, cluster questions and wrongly phrased questions. The pilot should reveal if the anticipated analytical techniques are appropriate. The researcher should conduct a pilot study in two selected public secondary schools in Homa Bay District, to measure the validity and reliability of the research instruments. The schools under pilot should not be included in the sample that is used.

3.7.1 **Validity of Research Instruments**

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) validity is the actually represent the phenomenon under study. Wiersma (1995) validity is the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure with the support of the supervisor and the outcome of piloting, the researcher assessed the content of the instrument measures what was intended to measure with the support the supervisor and the outcome of piloting, the researcher would assess the content of the instrument and whether it would measure the concept of under study.
3.7.2 Reliability of the Research Instruments

According to McMillan and Schumacher, 2009, reliability refers to consistence of measurement thus the extent to which the results are similar over different forms of the same instrument or occasions of data collection and the extent to which measures are free from error.

Split half technique of reliability testing is employed, whereby the pilot questionnaires are divided into two equivalent halves and then a spearman's correlation coefficient for the two equivalent values and then a spearman's correlation coefficient for the two halves computed using the formulae given below:

i. \[ S = 1 - \frac{6 \sum (D)^2}{N(N^2 - 1)} \]

Where by:

- \( R \) = Correlation co efficient
- \( N \) = Sample
- \( \sum \) = Summation of scores
- \( D \) = Deviation

ii. \[ SH = \frac{2r}{1+r} \]

Whereby \( SH \) = Split Half

- \( r \) = correlation co efficient

iii. A reliability of 0.75

According to Orodho (2008) a co efficient correlation \( r \) of about 0.75 and above is considered high enough to judge an instrument as reliable. The value of co efficient correlation \( r \) is 0.81 and hence the instruments were considered reliable for data collection.
3.8 **Data collection procedure**

An introductory letter from Kenyatta University will be got and a permit sought from National Council for Science and Technology. An Introductory letter from the District Education Officer (DEO) is given. After this, the researcher booked an appointment with the sample schools through the principals to visit and administered questionnaires. The researcher visited each of the sample schools and administered the questionnaires alone. The respondents were given relevant instructions and assured of confidentiality after which they were given enough time to fill in the questionnaires the researcher collected the filled in questionnaires after two days.

3.9 **Data Analysis Techniques**

Data presentations involved giving data a thorough check, coding it and presentation involves giving accuracy, consistency, uniformity, completeness and identifies illegibility. Editing of the questionnaire was meant to ensure that errors and omissions are corrected so as to achieve data quality standards. The data was tabulated and classified into sub samples according to school strategic planning practices and challenges experienced by schools in implementing the plans. The coded, tabulated and classified data was subjected to both qualitative and qualitative analysis.

Quantitative data was analyzed by arranging them according to the research questions and objectives where necessary data was analyzed through statistical package for social science and data outcomes communicated through pie charts, graphs and bar charts which are effective in displaying normal and ordinal data.

Inferences, conclusions and recommendations were made after the whole data was analyzed.
4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results from research. The findings of the study are presented and discussed in this chapter based on the data collected from the respondents and as per the research objectives.

The purpose of this study was to find out the factors affecting the implementation of strategic plans in secondary schools in Homa Bay County. The sample was targeting principals and HODs of eight secondary schools which comprised 14% of the target population. The findings of the study are discussed based on the research objectives. These includes; establishing the process of formulating strategic plan, assessing the effect of communication on successful implementation of strategies in secondary schools, establishing the influence of resource allocation in implementation of strategies in secondary schools and determining the effect of strategy formation in the implementation of strategic management plans.

4.1 Bio-data

This section covers the respondent’s gender, age distribution as it emerged from the study.

This study found out that 80% of the HODs are male while only 20% are female. This fall short of the current constitution which stipulates that at least a third should be of either gender? This is shown in the table 1.
Table 4.1: Head of Department and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the sampled schools’ 90% that were surveyed were District schools and 10% were County schools. There wasn’t any National school surveyed.

This is indicated in the Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: School Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study found out that all the schools surveyed had a formally constituted BOM.

All the schools have a strategic plan for the school, a clear vision and a well stated mission of statement. These schools also have set strategic objectives. All the schools also admitted that the setting of strategic objectives is done by the BOM. These are illustrated in the table 4.3, table 4.4, table 4.5, table 4.6 and table 4.7.
Table 4:3 Board of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study found that all the schools surveyed had a constituted BOM.

Table 4:4 Schools with Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The surveyed schools had strategic plans for their schools. The surveyed schools have complied with the new government policy and findings have it that they all have strategic plans in their schools. Ombi (2011) as outlined in the literature review revealed that educational policy of formulating strategy plans has been affected in secondary schools for effective implementation in managing secondary school. In Kenya, secondary schools are trying to implement their strategic plans due to the challenges they face today and also because it is a policy by the Government (GoK, 2006)
### Table 4:5 Schools with Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools with Vision</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that all the surveyed schools have a vision for their schools in the strategic plans. Research by Porter (2008) asserts that the process of formulating the strategic plan involves relevant institutional mission, vision and objectives of the institutional plan. These together provide the direction for other aspects of the process. The findings concur with Porter’s studies of 2008.

### Table 4:6 School with Mission statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools with Mission statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The surveyed schools were found to have school’s mission statements in their schools strategic plans. Research by Porter (2008) asserts that the process of formulating the strategic plan involves relevant institutional mission, vision and objectives of the institutional plan. These together provide the direction for other aspects of the process. The findings concur with Porter’s studies of 2008.
The surveyed school had well set strategic objectives in the school’s strategic plan. The school’s BOG and the school’s principals were found to be the organs that are directly involved in the setting up of the school’s strategic objectives. This is shown in table 4.8. It must however be noted as Writh (2010) asserts that the strategic planning process, there is need for a planning consultant whose role as a trainer range from being an outside expert on planning results to be actively involved with the planning results. Contrary to the findings the BOG and the school’s principals were found to be organs that are directly involved in setting up of the school’s strategic objectives.

### Table 4:8 Who is involved in setting objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting Objectives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength, Weakness, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis was being carried out by only 20% of the schools before the formulation of school strategic plan. Whereas 80% of the schools never carried out SWOT analysis. This is elaborated in table 4.9. It is essential for an organization to carry out SWOT analysis. Research
findings also shows that through SWOT analysis the school will be able to determine where the school is today though most organizations do not carry out SWOT analysis Raynor (2007). Raynor’s studies show clearly that SWOT analysis is essential during formulation of strategic plans though majority of the surveys schools do not carry out the analysis.

Table 4:9 School carrying out SWOT analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found out that many schools used other organs to carry out the SWOT analysis, represented by 70% of the schools, while 30% of the schools have their SWOT analysis carried out by the BOG. This is shown in the table 4.10.

Table 4:10 Who carry out SWOT analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BOGs formulate the school’s strategic plans in all the surveyed schools. In 37.5% of the schools it was found that their strategic plans are relevant to the school vision,
mission and strategic objectives, while in most schools represented by 62.5% of the schools having a strategic plan which is not relevant to the school’s vision, mission and strategic objectives. This is shown in the table 4.11.

Table 4:11 Plan with relevant vision, mission and strategic objectives

Relevancy of plans with vision, mission and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School that were surveyed only 37.5% plan relevantly to vision, mission and strategic objectives while 62.5% was found not planning relevantly to the vision, mission or strategic objectives. Porter (2008) asserts that the process of formulating the strategic plan involves relevant institutional mission, vision and objectives of the institutional plan. These together provide the direction for other aspects of the process. The findings do not concur with Porter’s studies because 62.5% were found to have strategic plans with irrelevant vision, mission and objectives of the organizations.

Table 4:12 Effective communication

Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools that were found to be having effective communication were only 42.5% while a whole 57.5% was found not to be having an effective communication system in their schools. As noted in the literature review numerous studies show that effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation, Peng and Littlejohn (2001). These findings are contradicting the findings because only 42.5% have effective communication to the organization for effective implementation. While 57.5% of the surveyed schools do not have effective communication on their strategic plans.

Table 4:13 Communicate how to achieve strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these schools 27.5% do communicate to all the stakeholders on how to achieve the school’s strategic objectives, even though 72.5% of the schools do not. Rapport and Wren (2008), as outlined in the literature review, organizations where employees have easy access to management through open and supportive communication climate tends to out perform those with more restrictive communication environments. Only 27.5% of the managers communicate how to achieve strategies while 72.5% do not communicate on how to achieve strategies. So according to the findings, majority of schools do not communicate on how to achieve strategies and this is an hindrance to implementation as found by Rapert (2002).
The most preferred medium of communication is through meetings which is represented by 52.5%, internal memo is preferred by 20% of the schools, newsletters is preferred by 17.5% of the schools while those schools that prefers E-mail as their medium of communication are only 10%. This is further illustrated in the figure 4.1. Research by Argenti (2005) shows that the administrator should choose which medium works best to communicate update, changes and mission. Newsletters are not effective but e mail blasts are better in communication between teams. From findings, newsletters which are not better in communication was only preferred by 17.5% of the schools and e mail which is best preferred has only 10% and thus may be due to lack of technological skills.

![Figure 4.1 Preferred Medium of Communication](image)

Only 17.5% of the schools discuss the progress of strategic plan implementation with their staff. The others represented by 82.5% do not review their strategic plan implementation with their staff. Research by Alegre (2011) asserts that institutional managers do not communicate along with vigorous reviews which is the key to efficient execution of strategy. These responses are shown in figure 4.14.
Table 4:14 Discuss progress of Strategic Plan Implementation with Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discuss progress of Strategic Plan implementation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most schools do not review their strategic implementation as only 32.5% of the surveyed schools review it three times. The rest represented by 67.5% do not review their strategic plan implementation in a term. This is shown in the table 4.15 below.

The study of Schaap (2006) reinforces that frequent review of strategic plan in organization enhances strategic consensus through fostering of shared attitudes and values. Contrary to Schaap’s study out of 32.5% reviews strategic implementation three times a term while 67.5% do not review strategic plan more than thrice in a term.

Table 4:15 Review of Strategic Implementation in a term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review strategic plan</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most schools were found not to give feedback a chance. This was shown in table 4.16 where only 37.5% of the schools give feedback a chance while 62.5% of the schools do not. According to Floyd and Woodridge (1992a) communication with employees encourages view point and provides opportunities for feedback. Communication
without feedback is not complete. This is contrary to our findings because most schools surveyed do not give feedback chance.

**Table 4:16 Chance of feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most schools do not communicate the vision, mission statement and strategic objectives to everybody, this was represented by 75% and only 25% of the schools do communicate the vision, mission statement and strategic objectives to everybody in the school. This is shown in table 4.17. As noted in the literature review numerous studies show that communicating all that is entailed in strategic plan is the key success to the implementation and most organizational managers fail to communicate. From the findings majority of schools do not communicate the vision, mission and strategic objectives to the implementers.

**Table 4:17 Communicating Vision, Mission and Strategic Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of the schools represented by 90% do not have enough money to implement the school strategic plan, only 10% of the schools admitted to having enough fund to implement their school’s strategic plans. All the schools admitted that their main source of funds is the government. This is shown in table 4.18 and 4.19. Research findings also showed that finance is a great impediment to implementers of strategic plan. According to Alexander (1985). The availability of resources, in terms of staff, finance and time, is thought to be crucial as part of strategy implementation. The findings from the research concurred with Alexander, 1985 findings on how resource allocation is an impediment to implementation of strategic plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds for implementation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the schools surveyed do not have enough funds to implement their strategic plans. This was found out when only 10% of the surveyed schools had enough funds while 90% of the schools did not have enough funds. According to Haes, 2010 school leaders and policy makers sometimes also take advantage of a broader resource base than traditional federal and local tax revenue streams which cannot sustain the laid down programs in institutions.
Table 4:19 Sources of Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of finance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the schools surveyed were not well staffed. This was found out when only 15% of the surveyed schools had their schools well staffed while 85% of the schools were not well staffed. Miller 2005 illustrates that if the goal of self-managing school is to be realized, then schools should have the capacity to modify their teaching staff to increase the learning opportunities for the students and majority of institutions do not have enough teaching staff.

This is illustrated in table 4.20.

Table 4:20 Well staffed school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study found out that many schools conduct budgeting as this was supported by 77.5% of the surveyed schools. Only 22.5% of the schools were found not to conduct budgeting in their schools. In all the schools that budgeting is conducted, they all sighted that the budgeting is conducted by the principal. This is shown in table 4.21 and table 4.22.
Research findings show that resource allocation is budgeting process; training and developing staff increase the level of strategy implementation. The many findings on budgeting goes together with research findings, 77.5% of the surveyed schools conduct budgeting for the success of implementation of strategic plans.

### Table 4:21 Conduct Budgeting in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conducting budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the surveyed schools have 100% response that Principals are involved in budgeting. The involvement of other people is 0%. Research by Chowrasta, (2011) asserts that the resource allocation (budgeting) must be oriented to objectives achievements. Objectives should be clearly laid down with strategic priorities for resource allocation. The principal do not involve other stakeholders in conducting budgeting process.

### Table 4:22 Who is involved in budgeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most schools do not have enough physical structures in their schools; this was represented by 87.5% of the schools confessing not to have enough structures while only 12.5% of the schools had enough physical structures in their schools. This is shown in table 4.23. A majority of schools do not have enough physical resources. This has a high correlation with Barney, 1991, who asserted that majority of organizations fail in implementation stage due to in availability of physical resources such as assets for use in the organization. Appropriate allocation of resources is essential to use survival and success of an organization. Budgetary process and developing of staff to increase level of skills within the organization and availability of physical resources is a major challenge in strategy implementation [Miller 2000].

Table 4.23 Adequate physical structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classrooms are not adequate in most of the schools as only 27.5% had adequate classrooms, 50% said that their classrooms are fairly adequate, while 22.5% admitted that their classrooms are inadequate. Chowrasta, 2011 emphasized that recourses allocation must be oriented to objective achievement. In some schools, there are inadequate classrooms and study areas which interfere with core mandate of the schools.
This is illustrated in table 4.24.

**Table 4:24 Provision of classroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of schools have inadequate library facilities, this represent 62.5% of the schools surveyed, 10% of them have fairly adequate library facilities while only 27% were comfortable with the library facilities in their schools. According to Morgan 2011 emphasized that the physical needs are not met through provision of library facilities, adequate sanitary facilities and sufficient shelter space for cleaning and play. Availability of a physical facility is a major challenge in institutions.

This is shown in table 4.25.

**Table 4:25 Provision of library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laboratories are also inadequate in most of the schools. Those schools with adequate laboratories were only 10% of the surveyed schools, 7.5% thought that their laboratories were fairly adequate while the majority representing 82.5% of the surveyed schools said that they have inadequate laboratory facilities. Research findings by Joyce and Hambrick, 2006 showed how available laboratories in most schools may well be regarded as absolute in terms of quality and quantity thus hindering the learning process.

This is shown in table 4.26.

**Table 4.26 Provision of Laboratories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most schools were found to fall short of dormitories where 17.5% of the schools thought that they have adequate dormitories, 10% thought that their school dormitories were fairly adequate while 72.5% of the schools said that their dormitories were inadequate. This is in figure 4.2.
Of the schools surveyed, 27.5% of them felt that the provision of staffrooms is adequate, 22.5% felt that it is fairly adequate and 50% of the schools felt that the provision of staffrooms in their schools is inadequate. Chowrasta 2011 emphasized that resources allocation must be oriented to objective achievement. In some schools, there are inadequate dormitories, water supply, staffroom, classrooms and enough textbooks in the study areas which interfere with core mandate of the schools.

This is shown in table 4.27.

**Table 4:27 Provision of Staffroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffrooms</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The provision of school land was also not adequate as 40% of the schools felt that, 42.5% of the schools though that it was fairly adequate and 17.5% of the schools felt that they are adequate. The availability of recourses as in terms of land, staff and finance is throughout to be a crucial part of strategy implementation and could hinder the process (Miller, 2002).

This is illustrated in table 4.28.

**Table 4.28 Provision of land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textbooks are poorly provided as only 10% of the schools said that the provision is very adequate, 17.5% said it is adequate, 30% thought that the provision is fairly adequate and 42.5% of the schools thought that the provision of textbooks in their schools was inadequate. This is shown in the figure 4.3.
Washrooms are poorly provided as only 17.5% of the surveyed schools said they have very adequate washroom provision, 52.5% of them said their washroom provision is fairly adequate and 30% of the schools said that their washroom provision is inadequate. Chowrasta 2011 emphasized that recourses allocation must be oriented to objective achievement. In some schools, there are inadequate dormitories, water supply, staffroom, classrooms and enough textbooks in the study areas which interfere with core mandate of the schools.

This is shown in the table 4.29.

**Table 4.29 Provision of Washrooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washrooms</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water supply are inadequate in most of the schools, with 52.5% of the schools agreeing to that, 20% of them saying that their sources of water are fairly adequate, 17.5% of the schools saying the water sources are adequate while only 10% of the surveyed schools admitting that their sources of water in school are very adequate. According to Chowrasta 2011 emphasized that recourses allocation must be oriented to objective achievement. In some schools, there are inadequate dormitories, water supply, staffroom, classrooms and enough textbooks in the study areas which interfere with core mandate of the schools.

This is shown in the figure 4.4

![Figure 4.4 Sources of water](image)

**Figure 4.4 Sources of water**

Most schools do not have a well design organizational structure, where 82.5% of the schools agreed to this, only 17.5% of the schools though that their schools have a well designed organizational structure. Chowrasta 2011 emphasized that recourses allocation must be oriented to objective achievement. In some schools, there are inadequate dormitories, water supply, staffroom, classrooms and enough textbooks in the study areas which interfere with core mandate of the schools.
There is a strong correlation on how departments fail to adjust in order to implement strategic plans in the organization. According to Heracleous 2000, more specifically organizational structure is one variable which management fails to adopt to lead the organization to its designed goals and objectives. Leavitt (1985) believed that organizational performance is based on ensuring a fit between strategy and structure.

Table 4:30 Well designed organizational structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that 30% of the schools have all the departments working together and they also have meetings to review set structures while a whole 70% do not have their department working together and they do not have meetings to review set structures. This is shown in the table 4.31 and table 4.32. According to the findings most schools have frequent meetings reviewing the structure. This does not have a strong correlation with Chandler findings; he believed that organizational performance and structure should be reviewed to ensure that the strategy and structure are comparable. In order to achieve organizational goals meetings must be held frequently to review its structure. The findings showed that a whole 70% of schools do not have meetings to review their structures during implementation of strategic plans.
Most of the surveyed schools representing 90% have three meetings in a term; only 10% of the schools meet more than four times in a term. This is shown in table 4.33. Research by Schaap (2006) suggests that adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy and reviewing the structure can ensure successful strategy implementation. Majority of managers fail to review the structure by calling for meeting. From the findings the outcome concurs with Schaap’s research.

Table 4.33: Frequency of meeting in a term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrice</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than four times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study found out that principals are fully involved in making the structure and the boards of management are not fully involved in restructuring the organizational structure. The BOM and other relevant stakeholders should be involved in restructuring process. Research by Hitesh (2012) shows that organization structure is the pattern in which the various parts of the organization are interrelated or interconnected; and therefore all the stakeholders concerned in the organization should be involved in restructuring.

**Table 4:34 People making the structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making the structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of the study, conclusion and recommendations, which can be made to help in understanding the factors deterring effective implementation of strategic plan in public secondary schools in Homa Bay County.

5.1 Summary of findings

The purpose of this study was to assess the factors affecting implementation of strategic plan in public secondary school in Homa Bay County. The study adopted a descriptive survey design the sampling techniques used was non-probability. The study sampled 14 schools for the study which comprised 14% of the target population and 26 HODs resulting to a total of 40 respondents. The data analysis was largely descriptive by nature. The findings of the study are discussed based on the research objectives which includes; establishing the process of formulating strategic plan, assessing the effect of communication on successful implementation of strategies in secondary schools, establishing the influence of resource allocation in implementation of strategies in secondary schools and determining the effect of strategy formulation in the implementation of strategic management plans.

5.1.1 Processes of formulating strategic plan

From the findings a majority of schools surveyed have strategic plans. This is a requirement from the government but 37.5% of the surveyed schools were found that their strategic plans are relevant to the school vision, mission and strategic objectives,
while 62.5% of the surveyed schools have strategic plans which are not relevant to the schools vision, mission and strategic objectives.

Only 20% of the public secondary schools carry out SWOT analysis before formulating their school strategic plan. Whereas 80% of the schools never carried out SWOT analysis, it was found out that many schools used other organs to carry out the SWOT analysis, represented by 70% of the schools, while 30% of the surveyed schools have their SWOT analysis carried out by the BOM.

In the surveyed schools 37.5% of the schools have strategic plans which are relevant to the school vision, mission and strategic objectives, while 62.5% of the schools have strategic plans which are not relevant to the schools vision, mission and strategic objectives.

### 5.1.2 Effective communication on strategic implementation

From the results of the findings schools that were found to be having effective communication were only 42.5% while a whole 57.7 was found not to be having effective communication systems in their schools. Of those schools 27.5% do communicate to all stakeholders on how to achieve the school strategic objectives, though 72.5% of the schools do not.

The most preferred medium of communication is through meetings which are represented by 52.5% internal memo is preferred by 20% of the schools. Majority of schools preferred communication through meetings.
Most schools do not review their strategic implementation only 31.5% of schools surveyed review it three times and 67.5% do not review their strategic plan implementation in a term.

Most of the surveyed schools do not communicate the vision, mission statement and strategic objectives to everybody. Only 20% of the schools do not communicate the vision, mission statement and strategic objectives to everybody who is concerned with implementation of strategic plan.

5.1.3 Resource Allocation

All schools admitted that their main source of funds is the government. A majority of the schools surveyed registered 90% don’t have enough money to implement the school strategic plan. Only 10% of the schools admitted that they have enough funds to implement the school strategic plans. 85% of the schools surveyed are not well staffed and only 15% of the surveyed schools admitted that they had well staffed schools. The study found out that 77.5% of the schools conduct budgeting. A majority of the surveyed schools were found not to conduct budgeting in their schools. This showed that most schools implement their plans after budgeting.

According to the findings most schools do not have enough physical structures in their schools, 87.5% of the schools do not have enough physical structures in their schools.

The findings showed that 27.5% of the schools had adequate classrooms, 50% have fairly adequate classrooms, while 22.5% admitted that their classrooms are inadequate library facilities.
From the findings the physical structures are an impediment to implementation of strategic plans, in the schools.

Most schools do not have enough physical structures in their schools, 87.5% of the schools do not have enough physical structures in their schools. Only 27.5% of the schools had adequate classrooms, 50% have fairly adequate classrooms, while 22.5% admitted that their classrooms are inadequate library facilities, 10% have fairly adequate library facilities while only 27% were comfortable with the library facilities in their schools.

The schools with adequate laboratories were only 10% of the surveyed schools, 7.5% had fairly adequate library laboratory facilities while 82.5% of the surveyed schools have adequate laboratory facilities. And 40% of the surveyed schools do not have adequate land, 17.5% have fairly adequate water sources are inadequate in most of the schools, with 52.5% of the schools agreeing to that, 20% of them saying that their sources of water are fairly adequate. Only 10% of the schools have very adequate.

5.1.4 Organizational structure

The school should involve the BOM in making the structures which facilitates implementation.

The study found out that 30% of the schools have all departments working together and they have meetings to review set structures while a whole 70% do not have meetings to review the set structures. If the structures are not restricted to fit the strategic plan then the implementation is minimal.
5.2 Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to investigate factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in public secondary schools in Homa Bay County. From the findings, it can be concluded that the implementation of strategic plans in schools is an essential element in the development of a school as it focuses on improving the quality of leaving by putting in place the set objectives and activities. With commitment and application of best planning, implementation practices by the principal’s, BOM, PTA members, staff and involvement of the key stakeholders as a whole can go along with improving the quality of education in our secondary schools.

The school’s BOM and the school principals were found to be the organs that is directly involved in the setting up of the school strategic objectives. All the stakeholders should be involved in setting up of the school’s objectives. Before formulating the school’s strategic plan the stakeholders and the principal should do SWOT analysis so as to identify strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the school.

Most strategic plans formulated in the schools are not relevant to the school’s vision, mission and strategic objectives; and in most schools principals play a great role in school strategic plan formulation. Strategic plans in schools should be formulated by all stakeholders so that they own the document.

Communication of strategic plan to the implementers is essential. Most organizations do not have effective communication systems. The principals do not communicate to
all stakeholders on how to achieve the schools strategic objectives. Most schools do not review the strategic plan and there are no meetings held for feedback purpose.

Organizational structure is one variable which management can adopt to lead the organization to its desired goals and objectives. From the findings most surveyed schools do not have departments working together. These departments do not have regular meetings in order to review set structures. All the stakeholders should be involved in restructuring the organizations so as to fit strategic implementation. The schools should restructure their organizations and departments in order to achieve the set objectives.

Resources are essential in implementation of strategic plans. Most schools do not have enough funds to enable the schools to implement the set objectives. Most schools are understaffed and scarce physical facilities which interfere with the implementation of the strategic plans.

The principals still played an important role in the planning and implementation of the school strategic plan especially initiating the planning process under the direction of BOGs. However, their effectiveness in implementation of school’s plans was limited by lack of resources such as land, staff, laboratories, and inadequate skills in educational management and particularly development planning.
5.3 Recommendations

i) The government should organize through KESI a comprehensive in service training for all principals adjusting it to the challenges of understanding and implementing strategic plan with limited teaching and learning resources. This professional development program should be based on promoting better understanding such as strategic plan formulation, SWOT analysis and implementation process of the plans.

ii) The ministry should formulate school policies regarding strategic development plans which need to have clearly defined framework and strategies to achieve organizational goals.

iii) The school management should seek collaboration with other stakeholders such as the government, civil societies and other development agencies who are good at resource mobilization. This coupled with improved skills in management of funds can help the schools meet their budgeting requirement to fund development plans.

iv) The school principals should implement the organizational strategic plans by applying the skills and knowledge acquired so that the organizational objectives are achieved in a desired manner.
5.4 Recommendations for further research

To understand further the factors affecting implementation of school strategic plan in public secondary schools further research is recommended in the following areas:

i) The study was carried out in one county though could not survey many schools and the county is big. Similar studies should be done on the subject to be able to generalize.

ii) Further study can be conducted on the role of KESI in enhancing educational management skills among the secondary schools principals and BOGs in the county.

iii) Similar study can be conducted in private secondary schools in the county for comparison purposes.
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Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH DATA COLLECTION

I am a Kenyatta university student pursuing a research study for Educational Administration course and will be collecting data on: Factors Influencing Implementation of Strategic Plans in Public Secondary Schools in Homabay County, Kenya. This is an area of great concern to students teachers and the education stakeholders in the country.

The purpose of this letter is to request you to take part in this research study by filling in the questionnaire attached.

I assure you that the information hereby collected will only be used purely for this academic purpose and not for any other purpose whatsoever.

Note that any information given here will be treated with highest confidentiality.

Thanking you in advance

Yours faithfully,

Susan Nyandeje.
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly give information concerning planning and implementation of school strategic plan in your school. Fill the questionnaire by putting a tick (√) within the boxes. Responses to these questions will be treated strictly confidential and only used for academic purposes.

PART A

Background Information

1. Gender
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Level of education
   Masters degree [ ]
   Bachelors' Degree [ ]
   Diploma [ ]
   Others (specify): ........................................................................................................

3. Number of years served as a Principal in the current school ............... years.

4. Category of your school
   National [ ] County [ ] District [ ]

5. When was the school started? ..................................................................................

6. Do you have formally constituted BOG?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
PART B

Strategy Formulation

1. Does your school have a strategic plan?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

2. Does your school have (a) A vision Yes [ ]   No [ ]
   (b) Mission Statement Yes[ ]   No [ ]

3. Does your school have set strategic objectives?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

4. If yes, who are involved in setting strategic objectives?
   (a) The BOM [ ]    (c) The students [ ]    (e) HODs [ ]
   (b) The Principal [ ]    (d) the PTA [ ]
   Other (specify)...................................................................................................................

5. Does your school carry out SWOT analysis or needs assessment before formulating?

6. Strategic plan? Ask about the process and provide options
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

7. If yes, who are involved in carrying out SWOT analysis?
   (a) The BOM [ ]    (c) HODs [ ]
   (b) The Principal [ ]    (d) The PTA [ ]
   (e) The Student Personnel [ ]

8. Who are involved in the formulation of your school strategic plan?
   (a) The BOM [ ]    (c) The PTA [ ]    (b) The Principal [ ]
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9. Is the school strategic plan relevant to the set strategic vision, mission and strategic Objectives?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

B. Communication

1. Do you have effective communication of the school strategy to the strategic implementers?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Do you communicate on how to achieve strategies set to the implementers?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. Which medium of communication do you normally use to communicate the strategic plan?

Newsletters [ ]

Emails [ ]

Meetings [ ]

Internal memorandum [ ]

4. Do you review on strategic implementation with the staff members?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. How many times have you conducted reviews on strategic implementation this term?

Once • [ ] Twice [ ] Thrice [ ] More than 4 times [ ]
6. Do you give chance for feedback?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Is the vision, mission statement and strategic objectives communicated to everybody in the school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

Resource Allocation

1. Do you normally have enough finance to implement your strategic plan?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. What are the sources of finance in your school which facilitates the implementation of Strategic plan?
   Please tick the below list of sources of finance
   - Funds from the government [ ]
   - Funds from school fees [ ]
   - Well-wishers [ ]
   - Income generating activities [ ]
   - Fund raising [ ]

3. Does your school have enough teachers and other staff members to implement strategic plan?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. Indicate the number
   Graduate teachers [ ] Untrained Teachers [ ]
   Support staff [ ] Diploma Teachers [ ]

5. Indicate the enrolment of your school
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6. Indicate the number of streams

7. Do you conduct budgeting in your school before strategic plan is implemented?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

8. If yes, who are the people involved in the budgeting process?
   Principal [ ]  BOM [ ]  PTA [ ]  HODs [ ]

9. Do you have enough physical structures which can facilitate strategic implementation?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

10. How is the provision of physical facilities in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Very adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Fairly adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Organizational Structure

1. Does your school have a well designed organizational structure when the strategy is formulated?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Are the departments working together to obtain its strategic objectives?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. Do you have meetings to review how the set structures working towards achieving strategic objectives?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. If yes, how often do you review meetings in a term?
   Once [ ] Twice [ ] Thrice [ ] More than 4 times [ ]

5. Who are the people who make up the structure?
   The principal [ ] The BOG [ ]
   The Teachers [ ] the student Personnel [ ]
   All the above [ ]

6. In your view what is the significance of strategic plan to your school?
   (Thank you for Participating)
APPENDIX III: HOD’S QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly give information concerning planning and implementation of school strategic plan in your school. Fill the questionnaire by putting a tick (√) within the boxes. Responses to these questions will be treated strictly confidential and only used for academic purposes.

PART A

Background Information

1. Gender

Male [ ]  Female [ ]

2. Level of education

Masters degree [ ]
Bachelors’ Degree [ ]
Diploma [ ]
Others (specify): ...........................................................................................................

3. Number of years served as a HOD in the current school ................ years.

4. Category of your school

National [ ]  County [ ]  District [ ]

5. When was the school started? .................................................................................

6. Do you have formally constituted BOG?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]
PART B

Strategy Formulation

1. Does your school have a strategic plan?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

2. Does your school have
   (a) A vision   Yes [ ]   No [ ]
   (b) Mission Statement   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

3. Does your school have set strategic objectives?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

4. If yes, who are involved in setting strategic objectives?
   (a) The BOG [ ]   (c) The students [ ]   (e) HODs [ ]
   (b) The Principal [ ]   (d) The PTA [ ]
   Other (specify).................................................................................................................................

5. Does your school carry out SWOT analysis or needs assessment before formulating?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

6. Strategic plan? Ask about the process and provide options
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

7. If yes, who are involved in carrying out SWOT analysis?
   (a) The BOM [ ]   (b) The Principal [ ]   (c) HODs [ ]
   (e) The Student Personnel [ ]   (d) The PTA [ ]
8. Who are involved in the formulation of your school strategic plan?

(a) The BOM  [  ]
(b) The Principal  [  ]
(c) The PTA  [  ]
(d) The Student Personnel  [  ]
(e) HODs  [  ]

Other (specify) ........................................................................................................................................

9. Is the school strategic plan relevant to the set strategic vision, mission and strategic objectives? Yes  [  ] No  [  ]

B. Communication

1. Do you have effective communication of the school strategy to the strategic implementers?

   Yes  [  ]  No  [  ]

2. Do you communicate on how to achieve strategies set to the implementers?

   Yes [  ] No [  ]

3. Which medium of communication do you normally use to communicate the strategic plan?

   Newsletters  [  ]
   Emails  [  ]
   Meetings  [  ]
   Internal memorandum  [  ]

4. Do you review on strategic implementation with the staff members?

   Yes  [  ]  No  [  ]
5. How many times have you conducted reviews on strategic implementation this term?
   Once [ ]  Twice [ ]  Thrice [ ]
   More than 4 times [ ]

6. Do you give chance for feedback?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

7. Is the vision, mission statement and strategic objectives communicated to everybody in the School?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

**Resource Allocation**

1. Do you normally have enough finance to implement your strategic plan?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

2. What are the sources of finance in your school which facilitates the implementation of Strategic plan?

3. Please tick the below list of sources of finance
   Funds from the government [ ]
   Funds from school fees [ ]
   Well-wishers [ ]
   Income generating activities [ ]
   Fund raising [ ]

4. Does your school have enough teachers and other staff members to implement strategic Plan?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
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5. Indicate the number

Graduate teachers [ ] Untrained Teachers [ ]
Support staff [ ] Diploma Teachers [ ]

6. Indicate the enrolment of your school .................................................................

7. Indicate the number of streams .................................................................

8. Do you conduct budgeting in your school before strategic plan is implemented?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. If yes, who are the people involved in the budgeting process?
   Principal [ ] BOM [ ] PTA [ ] HODs [ ]

10. Do you have enough physical structures which can facilitate strategic implementation?
    Yes [ ] No [ ]

11. How is the provision of physical facilities in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Very adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Fairly adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Organizational Structure

1. Does your school have a well designed organizational structure when the strategy is formulated?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

2. Are the departments working together to obtain its strategic objectives?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

3. Do you have meetings to review how the set structures working towards achieving strategic Objectives?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

4. If yes, how often do you review meetings in a term?
   - Once [ ]
   - Twice [ ]
   - Thrice [ ]
   - More than 4 times [ ]

5. Who are the people who make up the structure?
   - The principal [ ]
   - The BOM [ ]
   - The Teachers [ ]
   - the student Personnel [ ]
   - All the above [ ]

6. In your view what is the significance of strategic plan to your school?

   Thank you for Participating
## APPENDIX IV: TIME SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Proposal design and compilation</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Proposal presentation/defense</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Proposal approval</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Proposal amendment if any</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Finalization of questionnaires</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Data gathering/field work</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Data entry and analysis</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Report writing and compilation</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Report presentation</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Report bidding of the copies</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX V: BUDGET OF THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (Kshs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Secretarial services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Typing proposal</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Typing final report</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Photocopying questionnaires</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Stationery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Writing materials</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Duplicating papers</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pens</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Travelling expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Pre test questionnaire</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Administration of questionnaires</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Consulting supervisor</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Research clearance fee</strong></td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Binding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Binding proposal</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Binding final report</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Computer expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Computer analyses service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION
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