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### ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWDA</td>
<td>Athi Water Works Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDHS</td>
<td>Kenya Demographic and Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMWASCO</td>
<td>Kiambere-Mwingi Water and Sanitation Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITWASCO</td>
<td>Kitui Water and Sanitation Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPPRA</td>
<td>Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVWSWB</td>
<td>Lake Victoria South Water Services Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOSTI</td>
<td>National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBV</td>
<td>Resource Based View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCOs</td>
<td>Savings and Credit Co-operative Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Packages for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAWSB</td>
<td>TANATHI Water Service Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRIN</td>
<td>Valuable Rare Inimitable Non-Substitutable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRIO</td>
<td>Valuable Rare Inimitable Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASREB</td>
<td>Water Services Regulatory Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Affordability: Refers to something being cheap enough for everyone to buy.

Policy Manual: A physical document that shows the rules, procedures and guidelines of conducting business in an organization.

Organizational factor: Refer to operational attributes, processes or conditions within an organization.

Organizational Culture: The common beliefs, and shared values and assumptions employees hold about the organization.

Organizational Structure: Organizational structure depicts how responsibilities are shared across the organization for achievement of the organizational mission.

Organizational leadership: Refers to a management style in which leaders assist in the establishment of strategic company goals while empowering the individuals involved to effectively accomplish tasks in support of those goals.

Shared Values: Common beliefs and norms that guide the behavior of groups

Span of Control: Refers to the number of people that directly report to one person in an organization.

Strategy: A proposal on how an organization will respond to changes in its environment.

Strategy Implementation: The action phase whereby the strategy is translated into action which is then executed systematically.
ABSTRACT

Successful strategy implementation is key to the survival of organizations. Literature suggests that strategy implementation is usually curtailed by inefficiencies. The study looked into organizational factors influencing implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County, Kenya. The study objectives were: establish organizational leadership effect on implementation of strategies, determine organizational structure effect on implementation of strategies and examine the organizational culture effect on implementation of strategies public water service providers in Kitui County. The research was founded on resource based view, institutional and contingency theories. The two public water service providers in Kitui County, Kitui Water & Sanitation Company and Kiambere-Mwingi & Sanitation Company were the target population for this study. The study adopted descriptive research design, used content validity and Cronbach Alpha Test for reliability. Since the target population was so limited, a census review was done. Questionnaires were employed to collect data. Quantitative data was analyzed using a computer program called Statistical Package for Social Science, version 21. Frequency distribution tables, means, percentages, standard deviation and other descriptive data techniques were used. Analysis of variances test, multiple regression and correlation analysis was done to ascertain variable relationships. The study established that organizational leadership has a significant influence on strategy implementation. The study also established that organizational structure significantly influences strategy implementation in public water service providers in Kitui County. Further, the study established that organizational culture has a substantial impact on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. The study concludes that organizational leadership enables employee toward fulfilling an organization’s mission through creating awareness and holding teams accountable for achieving those objectives within a set timeframe and in accordance with the strategic plan. Organizational structure determines how power is shared and aligned in the organization and organizational culture enables an organization to have aligned goals by focusing on productivity and getting the organization’s primary mission accomplished. The study recommends that the leadership in public water service providers in Kitui County should ensure that they understand their employees better so as to be able to help them improve their personal and professional effectiveness, accountability, and effectively implement strategies formulated by the organization. The public water service providers in Kitui County should have a good organizational structure that provides the right blend of command and control plus employee independence which aid organization in pursuit of its mission and that public water service providers in Kitui County should make strategic vision and goals which are clear and inspirational, translate strategy into a living execution plan that matters to people. The study suggests that further studies should be carried out that focuses other organizational factors. In addition, other studies can be done that focus on different study context apart from public water service providers in Kitui County, Kenya.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Strategy implementation is the summation of requisite preferences and activities for implementation of a strategic plan (Andrew et al., 2011). It involves various management activities that are connected (Cater & Pucko, 2010). Implementation of strategy is curtailed by myriad of forces both internal and external (Brenes, Mena & Mollina, 2008; Van Der Maas, 2008; Mutuvi, 2013) and this makes it a very daunting task for many organizations.

Organizational and environmental variables must be cojoined to the strategic activities being implemented so as to identify and correct obstacles that may appear during implementation (Cater & Pucko, 2010). The contextual variables that could present obstacles to strategy implementation according to Hrebiniak (2005b) include; change management, top leadership, organizational culture and power structure. The four contexts influence each other and should be synchronized for effective strategy implementation.

Li., Gouhui and Eppler (2008) classified organizational factors with respect to implementation of strategies as human (soft), institutional (hard) and mixed factors. Soft factors represent human resource aspects; the hard factors are institutional factors while a combination of people oriented and institutional factors constitutes the mixed factor. Kagumu and Njuguna (2016) identified organizational factors which affect implementation of strategies in organizations as; motivation of employees, change management, leadership, resources, organizational culture and structure.
1.1.1 Strategy Implementation

This is the process of implementing policies, programs and planned actions so as to competitively exploit opportunities in an ever-changing market environment (Harrington, 2006). Kinyua, Njoroge, Wanyoike and Kiiru (2015) define strategy implementation as a process that involves managing forces during action stage, requires special motivation and skills while coordinating many individuals (David, 2013). The other phases of formulation, analysis and choice of strategy cannot ensure success without proper implementation.

The translation and operationalization of strategies during implementation remains a key challenge to managers (Hrebiniak, 2006) and It is therefore imperative that the members involved in strategy formulation are also members of the implementation team for successful implementation (Katsioloudes, 2002). Consistency and proper alignment of functions in the organizational is needed to enhance of efficiency in implementation (Allio, 2005).

Waweru (2011) observes that most managers know how to develop strategy but not much about executing the strategy which leads to no change in performance even after resources are spent in formulation. According to Kavale and Muthoni (2015), as implementation continues, momentum and focus could be lost due to strategy dissipation. The effect of strategy implementation on organizational performance has been tested both in the private and public sectors (Lehner, 2004; Ranasingne, 2010; Waweru, 2011 & Njoroge, 2015).

1.1.2 Organizational Factors

Organizational factors are reflected in numerous influences that impact on organizational performance (Zidane, Hussein & Gudmundsson, 2016). They include; communication, structures, cultures, leadership, process (Scott & Vassey, 2002; McLeod & McDonnell, 2011,
According to the resource based theory, competitiveness and improved performance is attributable to distinctive characteristics of its prized assets and competences which are inimitable (Mills, Platts & Bourne, 2003).

Allocating enough resources is necessary for effective execution of strategies (Tawane & Muathe, 2019) and organizations should ensure that they embrace innovations that their rivals cannot match to remain competitive (Hakala, 2011). The resources available to the organization are; assets, capabilities, processes, knowledge and attributes, which the organization can control for implementation of strategies (Nzulwa & Odanga, 2016).

Organizational structure depicts how responsibilities are shared across the organization for achievement of the organizational mission. Awino (2007) reckoned that the implementation of strategies is premised on the organizational structure and therefore it is one of the elements that require consideration during implementation phase (Bushardt, Glascoff & Doty., 2011; Kinyua et al., 2015). The common beliefs, and shared values and assumptions employees hold about the organization forms its organizational culture. Organizational culture should be changed (through cultural innovation and maintenance) to fit the strategy being pursued by the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 2005).

Leadership can be seen as a way of contributing to the attainment of a common goal by envisioning and appreciating the contribution of others (Mwirigi, Njuki, Okoth, Kinyanjui, Wanjiru, Onditi & Mwangi, 2014). Leadership is therefore regarded as a catalyst for implementation of strategies (Letting, 2009; Tawane & Muathe, 2019). Organizational factors are manifested in communication, structure, leadership, processes and culture (Yazici, 2009; Schein, 2010). In this study, the only organizational factors that will be
considered in relation to implementation of strategies are; leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture.

1.1.3 Water Service Provision

According to Water Act 2002, water service refers to the supply of water and sewerage services. According to the Kenya Constitution of 2010, every Kenyan has a basic right to clean and safe water in appropriate amounts. The culmination of water sector reforms was the Water Act of 2002 that provided ground for a coordinated approach toward water supply and sewerage. The Water Act 2002 separated roles such as supply of water and sewerage services, formulation of policy and the regulation of the water sector.

The Act provided grounds for establishment of Water Services Boards which were established as the asset holding entities for the government. The Water Act of 2016, which succeeded the Water Act 2002, provided formation of a regulatory state agency called Water Services Regulatory Boards. Water Service Boards are mandated to oversee the water service management in their areas of authority. This is done through licensing of the service providers in their areas of operation. One of the reasons for licensing of WSBs is to ensure attainment of universal water access within their areas of jurisdiction. WSBs therefore need to enact proper strategies which can support their mission (WASREB Strategic Plan, 2018-2022).

The National Water Services Strategy (2007-2015) seeks to ensure affordable, efficient, effective, and equitable water provision. To this end the main goal was to increase sustainable access to safe water to 80% by 2015. According to WASREB Strategic Plan (2018-2022), supply of water services is a precursor for the delivery of the four pillars of
National government development agenda, popularly known as the Big Four Agenda. Therefore, the strategies formulated by WASREB must focus on supporting the four pillars. Notably, the supply of water services is a shared responsibility between the national and county governments. Therefore, WASREB anticipates water service provision to be affected by environmental turbulence occasioned by political cycles, technological changes, social-cultural and legal factors.

A collaborative structure between the national and county governments is required for sustainable water resource and sanitation management, according to the Ministry of Water and Sanitation Strategic Plan (2018-2022). County governments are expected to ensure proper implementation of policies, partnerships in implementation of water programs. There are two regulated and controlled public water service companies in Kitui County; Kitui Water and Sanitation Company (KITWASCO) and Kiambere-Mwingi Water and Sanitation Company (KIMWASCO).

Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (2011) report on access to safe water confirms that only 57% of Kenyans have access to safe water despite government’s interventions. A water infrastructure audit in Kitui County by Nyaga (2019) further reveals that only 32% percent of Kitui County population is served by KITWASCO and KIMWASCO. KITWASCO and KIMWASCO are constrained by challenges such as; inefficient operations, inadequate infrastructure and inadequate water resources among others.

A report by UNICEF (2012) links the underperformance in Kitui County to underdeveloped water infrastructure, weak management systems and inadequate financial resources.
Continuous underperformance by water service providers in Kitui County will curtail the achievement of Ministry of Water and Sanitation Strategic Plan (2018-2022). An evaluation of organizational resources affecting strategy implementation in public water service providers will therefore bring further insights and contribute to affordable, efficient, effective, and equitable water provision in Kitui County.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Empirical evidence from past studies has confirmed that implementation of strategy still remains a challenging task even after formulation of very good strategies (Koske, 2003; Ateng, 2007, Khayota, 2014, Kamau, 2015). Unfortunately, most managers are good at drafting strategies but are ignorant on how they could be implemented (Hrebinack, 2006). This explains why organizations achieve only 30% in terms of implementation of new strategies (Miller, 2002). Infact, incompetence in implementation has seen organizations lose 40-60 per cent of the strategy intened value (Mankins & Steele 2005).

Khayota (2014) studied strategy implementation and organizational performance in Lake Victoria South Water Services Board (LVWSWB) in Kisumu and uncovered that implementation of strategic plans is indeed affected by organizational factors like; leadership, involvement of employees, organizational culture and structure. Similar findings were made by Nzulwa and Odanga (2016) who studied implementation of strategic plans by water companies under AWSB. The study identified organizational factors such as communication, organizational resources, culture and leadership styles. They recommended further studies to be done on other companies under different WSBs in Kenya. Kavale and Muthoni (2015) studied strategic plan implementation among water supply firms in
Mombasa County and identified stakeholder involvement, resources, organizational culture and leadership as some contributing factors to successful implementation of strategies.

Cheruiyot (2012) recommended for further studies to be done to understand the concept of strategy implementation under other WSBs after doing a study on water supply companies under TAWSB. The KDHS report of 2014 revealed that access to water is probably the greatest challenge in Kitui County which is highly prone to drought; leading to regular crop failure and food insecurity. Water service providers operate in dynamic environments and face strategy issues (Muganda, Otiso & Muganga, 2016). Past research has shown that implementing strategies is still a big challenge almost for any organization (Rajasekar, 2014; Muganda et al., 2016, Mwirigi et al., 2014). Even with strategy implementation challenges mentioned above and the perennial plight of water shortage being experienced in Kitui County (UNICEF, 2012; KDHS, 2014; KIPPRA, 2019; Nyaga, 2019). It’s important to note that there are strategy implementation challenges in organisations, nevertheless, some factors have a positive contribution which brings success to an organization, they range from organization structure, organization culture and organization leadership. These three factors have not been expansively researched on in my area of study. Based on these factors, this study seeks to better understand these issues affecting successful implementation of strategies while addressing the information gap on organizational factors and implementation of strategies in the public water service providers in, Kitui County.
1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective
To investigate organizational factors influencing implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County, Kenya.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives
i. To establish the effect of organizational leadership on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County
ii. To determine the effect of organizational structure on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County
iii. To examine the organizational culture effect on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County

1.4 Research Questions
i. What effect does organizational leadership have on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County?
ii. What effect does organizational structure have on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County?
iii. What effect does organizational culture have on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County

1.5 Significance of the Study
These study findings are of significant importance to other researchers, scholars, KITWASCO, KMWASCO and the government at large. Access to clean and safe water is a major challenge in Kitui County and major parts of the country. Stakeholders in Kitui County would find the study findings very useful since the study covered pertinent issues on
implementation of strategies. Eventually, Kitui county residents are expected to enjoy the benefits of successful implementation of strategies if the county government will use the findings to address their internal and external organizational challenges and this will enhance their performance and improve on service delivery to the people. It is anticipated that the two public water service providers would utilize the findings to consolidate their strengths and improve on their weaknesses on implementation of strategies.

Both the County and National governments are obligated by the Kenyan Constitution 2010 to ensure that everyone has access to water. The Kenyan Government can use these findings to make strategic choices and formulate proper policies which would help in addressing the perennial water shortage in Kitui County and Kenya at large. This study was built on the existing literature related to implementation of strategies and findings of study will also be advantageous to other scholars. The recommendations of this study would also be useful in informing further research into the wide subject of strategic implementation in water sector.

Finally, this study gives direction to KITWASCO and KIMWASCO on how best to improve strategy implementation in their organizations. From the recommendations proposed this study will improve on the factors which improve implementation of strategy. These factors are effective communication, encouragement of a participative culture, willingness to change, commitment from top management, effective conflict resolution mechanisms and a supportive organization culture.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study only gave consideration to three organizational factors (organizational leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture) in relation to implementation of
strategies. The study focused on the two public water service providers in Kitui County that included; KITWASCO and KIMWASCO. Respondents for this study were the supervisors and technical members of staff. The top management was not involved because they will give a biased results since they are involved in development of strategies. The study considered implementation of strategies in the two public water service providers in Kitui County for the period 2015 to 2021.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

There was concern that respondents could be unwilling to provide the necessary information in case the information could paint a negative image on their institutions. The researcher used the University and NACOSTI introduction letter to prove that the information gathered will be kept private and will only be used for educational reasons. This encouraged the respondents to participate actively and objectively gave out accurate information. It was also anticipated that the researcher’s use of structured questionnaires with close ended questions could limit the responses. The researcher wanted to make sure that the questions were broad enough to gather all of the necessary information.

1.8 Organization of the Study

The research project is organized into five chapters. The first chapter encompasses the study background, statement of the problem, general and specific objectives, significance and scope of the study. The second chapter provides an overview of the anchoring theories and research gaps and the conceptual framework. The third chapter discusses the research design, target population, sampling procedure, data collection and analysis tools. The fourth chapter
consists of research findings and discussions while the fifth chapter comprises of summary of findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO
INTRODUCTION

2.1 Introduction

The chapter gives a summary of past research on implementation of strategy. The chapter contains different sections; theoretical and empirical reviews, summary of research gaps and the conceptual framework.

2.2 Theoretical Review

Different theories were utilized to demonstrate the interrelationships among the study variables. Theories to be reviewed are; Resource Based View, Institutional and Contingency Theories.

2.2.1 Resource Based View Theory

The first concept of this theory was undertaken by Wernerfeltin 1984 who viewed firms as bundles of resources. Notable proponents of the RBV theory were Barney (1991) and Peteraf (1993) who proposed a consolidated resource based framework for competitiveness. The theory postulated that the core foundation and triggers of firm’s competitiveness and better performance in strategic management closely relate to the qualities of the resources which are prohibitively expensive to copy (Mills et al., 2003). The resources must bear four exclusive characteristics; Valuable, Inimitable, Rare and Non-substitutable (VRIN), Werner (2011). The VRIN framework was later revised to VRIO to add the organizational preparedness to use the suitable available resources (Barney, 2012).

Firms should choose strategies that allow use of their competitiveness in an attractive industry (Hitt, Ireland & Hoskisson, 2013). The theory underscored the importance of using
resources within the organization rather than sourcing auxiliary external resources. Competitiveness is therefore sustainable only when a firm executes a strategy that cannot be executed by the competitors and when the competitors cannot copy the benefits of the strategy. The importance of internal resources could not be overemphasized (Kasongo & Misango, 2019). Organizational resources include; organizational structure, financial resources, physical structures, planning and control systems and supporting policies and procedures that hold all the other resources together (Kerzner, 2001). Intangible resources include; organizational culture, brand names and patents, customer relations, reputation and other intangible aspects that can lead to a sustained competitive advantage (Kerzner, 2001). Human resources comprises, among others, top directors who provide the strategic leadership required to satisfy the shareholders.

2.2.2 Institutional Theory

This theory according to North (1990) explains social structure aspects such as formation, adaptation, sharing and adoption by employees of an organization. The foundations of this theory could be traced to between 1977 and 1983 when John Meyer and Brian Rowan integrated and extended Max Webber’s bureaucratic theory and argued that complex relational networks between organizations and societal rules and norms result in diffusion of formal bureaucracy. Structures later become guiding principles for formal and informal rules that governs the social behavior (Amenta, 2005). Although the environment highly influences the formation of the social structures (Johnson, 2002), organizations may sometimes adopt inefficient structural layouts in order to attain organizational survival in the environment (Meyer & Morgan, 1991).
From the environmental perspective, organizations might bow to institutional pressure which leads to homogenous structures. According to DiMaggio and Powell (1991), institutional pressure could take different forms. Coercive pressure comes from other firms that a firm depends on; mimetic pressure is the pressure to copy successful firms while normative pressure is brought by new employees who join the firm. Although organizations in an industry are governed by similar rules and regulations, their application in daily operations differs and this will impact differently on their performance (Shafratiz, 2012).

This theory postulates that due to organizational pressure, organizations strive to achieve homogeneity in structures but the environments influence each organization differently. There is need for ingenious ways to address respective challenges in a unique way. Meyer and Morgan (1991) further argued that management practice is a product of social and economic pressures to conform to industry pressures and adhere to the set guidelines and regulations. These structures need to be flexible to allow change, enhance efficiency and effectiveness. This structure-strategy interrelationship was highlighted by Chandler (1962) and institutional theory views organizational structure as a manifestation of institutional norms. Strategy implementation in every institution is expected to vary depending on the degree to which members conform to the set guidelines in the operationalization and institutionalization of the structure.

2.2.3 Contingency Theory

This theory according to Fielder (1964) puts emphasis on the significance of the leader’s personality and the environment that the leader operates in. This theory is anchored on the premise that, every organization is organized uniquely and therefore no single conventional formula can be applied to manage all organizations (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). This theory
was supported by the contingent perspective and observed that every organization’s need is distinctive according to customer clusters and this necessitates a customized approach to addressing customer needs (Snow & Hrebiniak, 1980; Miller, 1988).

The theory studies organization behavior and explains how the design and operations of the organization are influenced by unanticipated factors. Therefore, there is no single structure that can be applied in all organizations to yield effectiveness in all of them. Similarly, different circumstances require different ways of dealing with them whether in the same organizations or across different organizations. The theory advocates that tasks should not be routine and that every decision should be based on the situation at hand.

According to this theory, managers make discrelional decisions subject to the prevailing conditions and therefore the structures of the organizations differ subject to the conditions at hand. The theory recognizes the vital role played by the environment and top leadership in an organization (Wheelen & Hunger, 2007; Kibera et al, 2014). Each organization is required to analyze and respond to their circumstances in order to achieve their objectives. This study conceptualizes a strategic fit that should exist between organizational factors (which are contingent in nature) and implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County.

2.3 Empirical Literature Review

This section gives an overview of experiential research to determine whether there are research gaps on strategy implementation in public water services providers. The study reviewed studies which have been done on internal factors, pertinent to this study, and implementation of strategy.
2.3.1 Organizational Leadership and Implementation of Strategy

Leadership in an organizational perspective can be viewed as the art of influencing the attainment of a common goal by envisioning and appreciating the contribution of others (Mwirigi, et al., 2014). Making stakeholders accept change, remain committed and be involved in implementation presents a challenge to organizations. Leadership therefore becomes a key change instrument in the organization (Ogara, Osodo & Githinji, 2018).

Empowerment of employees which can be achieved through authority delegation is paramount in nurturing leadership within the organization. Leaders must show commitment to the strategies being implemented as this commitment from the leadership sets the organization on the success path by ensuring that necessary actions are in place for strategy formulation and implementation (Abbas, Munga & Were, 2017; Mutuku & Misango, 2020). Leadership should therefore strive to attach a meaning to the strategy, ensure adequate resource allocation and manage change by outlining benefits of the new strategies to the employees (Nyong’a & Maina, 2019). Line managers and supervisors are integral to this consensus since they work alongside the employees on daily basis. They must be convinced that the strategy being implemented will protect their interests since they can sabotage the implementation through delays and redirection of effort (Sofijanova & Chatleska, 2013; Rotich & Odero, 2016).

Mbogo, Machogu and Juma (2020) did a study on organizational leadership and strategic plan implementation by SACCOs in Murang’a Town. Through comparative research this specific study established that commitment and support from organization’s leadership impacts positively on strategic plan implementation in SACCOs. Through a descriptive research design, a studies by Nzulwa and Odanga (2016) established that organizational
leadership influences strategic plan implementation by water companies affiliated to AWDA. A study by Areri and Anyieni (2016), through descriptive research design, showed that implementation of strategic plans and leadership are correlated.

### 2.3.2 Organizational Structure and Implementation of Strategy

A survey research on service industry in Oman by Rajasekar (2014) established that strategy implementation cannot be done in isolation without giving due consideration to organizational structure. Similarly, organizational structure was said to contribute towards implementation of strategies in NGOs in Kenya (Abok, Gakure & Ogutu, 2013). The study involved NGOs in Kenya but the current study was centered on the Public Water Service Providers in Kitui County, Kenya.

Warui et al. (2015) used a descriptive survey design and studied Kenyan rural mission hospitals. The study confirmed a correlation between organizational structure and adoption of strategic planning. Kirui (2013) studied local authorities in Migori County. Using descriptive research design, the study discovered that implementation of strategies and organizational structures are positively interrelated. However, the study context was local authorities in Migori County but the current study focused on the Public Water Service Providers in Kitui County, Kenya.

Dahiye and Gekara (2019) investigated determinants of strategy implementation in state corporations in Kenya. The study used a census design and highlighted that organization structure has a significant influence on strategy implementation in state corporations in Kenya. A similar study was conducted by Ben, Oyugi and Iravo (2020) on the influence of organizational structure on strategy implementation among SACCOs in Kakamega County.
The study used a descriptive research design and discovered that organizational structure explains 15% variance in strategy implementation.

### 2.3.3 Organizational Culture and Implementation of Strategy

Culture from an organizational perspective can be viewed as the common beliefs, and shared values and assumptions employees hold about the organization (Mehta & Krishnan, 2004). An evaluation of determinants of strategy implementation in insurance firms in Kenya by Kibicho (2015) highlighted organizational culture as a determinant to successful implementation. It was observed that the common beliefs, shared values and assumptions within the organization should be oriented to the strategy being implemented. Further, strong internal focus and stability consciousness could derail dynamism which is vital in pursuing change initiatives (Friedman et al., 2014).

Strategy implementation could lead to disruption of status quo and therefore organizational culture should be given careful consideration as a major driver to the strategy implementation. Kagumu (2018) empirically showed that implementation of strategies and the culture of the organization are interrelated in County governments in Kenya. Cultures that are flexible significantly contribute to successful strategy implementation process.

A study by Kavale and Muthoni (2015) on water companies in Kenya established that supportive cultures enhance the process of implementing strategies in organizations. The study adopted descriptive research design. Mwirigi et al., (2014) did a survey on registered NGOs within Imenti North in Kenya and uncovered that the organizational culture has a role in the successful implementation of the strategy. The study used a survey research design
on. Khayota (2014) did a descriptive study in Lake Victoria South Water Services Board and established that organizational culture influences strategy implementation.

2.4 Research Summary Gaps

This subsection gives a summary of what other scholars have done on strategy implementation with the view of identifying knowledge gaps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/years</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Research Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirui V. (2013)</td>
<td>The study confirmed interrelation between implementation of strategies and resource allocation, organizational culture and structure</td>
<td>The study covered strategic plan implementation in local authorities within Migori County.</td>
<td>Contextual Gap: The current study focuses on public water service provision in Kitui County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abok et al.,(2013)</td>
<td>The study's main finding is that, effective strategic plan implementation is affected by organizational resources, involvement of stakeholders and styles of management.</td>
<td>The study was only conducted on 5 sampled NGOs in Nairobi and covered only the strategy implementation aspect of strategic planning</td>
<td>Contextual Gap: The current study focuses on public water service provision in Kitui County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khayota O.M. (2014)</td>
<td>The researcher discovered that; strategic plan in LVWSWB is significantly affected by leadership, employee involvement, organizational structure and culture</td>
<td>This was a case study of one Water Services Board (LV SWSB) in Kisumu County. The focus of the study was strategic plan implementation and organizational performance.</td>
<td>Contextual Gap; whereas, the study was conducted during the era of National Water Services Strategy (2007-2015), the current study will be conducted under the WASREB Strategic Plan (2018-2022) guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warui et al., (2015)</td>
<td>The researchers concluded that; Organizational</td>
<td>The study focused on the organizational</td>
<td>Conceptual Gap; The current study is about strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure, leadership, culture, organizational policy and resource allocation influence adoption of strategic planning</td>
<td>Factors and strategic plan adoption in Kenyan rural mission hospitals</td>
<td>Implementation in public water service providers in Kitui County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mumbua and Mingaine (2015)</strong></td>
<td>The researchers found out that organizational resources should be aligned to the strategic plans if they are to be successfully implemented</td>
<td>The study was conducted in the Municipal Council of Machakos and focused only human resource factor</td>
<td>Methodological and Geographic Gap; The focus of this research is on implementation of strategies, organizational factors and will cover public service providers in Kitui County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mwirigi et al., (2016)</strong></td>
<td>The researchers found out that strategic plan implementation is influenced by; top leadership, organizational culture and structures.</td>
<td>The research was conducted in Imenti North District of Meru County. The study focused on strategic plan implementation in NGOs and influencing factors</td>
<td>Geographic/Contextual Gaps: Current research focuses implementation of strategies in public water providers within Kitui County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mbogo, Machogu and Juma (2020)</strong></td>
<td>The researchers found out that strategic plan implementation is driven by the top leadership</td>
<td>The study focused on leadership, strategic plan implementation and only covered SACCOs located in Murang’a Town</td>
<td>Contextual Gap: The current study focuses on public water service provision in Kitui County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Conceptual Framework

A model for the study as shown in Figure 2.1 below was derived from the reviewed literature on implementation of strategy. For this study, strategy implementation is the dependent variable while organizational leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture are the independent variables.

**Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Leadership</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Top- down communication</td>
<td>Strategy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict resolution</td>
<td>• Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employee involvement</td>
<td>• Customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management commitment</td>
<td>• Complaint resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Task allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decentralization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Span of control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexible structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Policy manuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responsiveness to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participate culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework**

Source: Researcher (2021)
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The chapter outlines the description of research methodology and includes: research design, target population, sampling design and sample size, data collection instruments, pilot study, data collection procedures, data analysis and presentation and ethical issues.

3.2 Research Design

Research design is the projection of what will be done so as to respond to questions about the study problem (Creswell, 2013). A descriptive research design was utilized by the study. Descriptive research studies are devised to derive information on the state of an event at that particular time. It applies for research whereby the problem is defined and where only certain facts about the problem are being investigated (Kothari, 2012). Information concerning strategy implementation was obtained without manipulation and description of the current state of the variables and conditions was obtained from answers to critical questions of (what, why, when, how and why).

3.3 Target Population

Target population is referred to as the pool of items wherein the study's sample is derived (Kothari, 2012). Target population for the study was KITWASCO and KIMWASCO. The researcher chose this location because it’s nearer to his place of residence. The study focused on the supervisors and technical members of staff who were directly involved in strategy implementation. Top level managers were excluded from the study since their views on implementation could be biased due to their involvement in formulation stages. The study
targeted 15 supervisors and together with technical staff members from KITWASCO and KIMWASCO as tabulated below;

**Table 3.1: Target Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KITWASCO</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMWASCO</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Sampling Size and Procedure

This is a collection of units derived from a pool for the purpose of representation (Kothari, 2012). Due to a relatively small population, a census of 120 respondents comprising of 8 supervisors, 67 technical staff from KITWASCO and 7 supervisors and 38 technical staff from KIMWASCO was adopted by the current study.

### 3.5 Data Collection Instruments

Research questionnaire was utilized to obtain data from respondents. The questionnaire had six subdivisions. Semi-structured questionnaires were employed in the study. The researched approached the human resource personnel from both KIMWASCO & KITWASCO for permission to collect data. The questionnaires were given out to each respondent by way of picking and dropping administered by the researcher. This way the respondent would fill the questionnaire without any influence from the researcher. The questionnaire comprised of 5 sections which included; Section A: collected data on respondents’ demographic data, section B: collected data on implementation of strategy, section C: collected data on
organizational leadership variable, section D: collected data on organisational structure variable and section E: collected data on organisational culture. The responders were requested to score the questions on a likert scale based on how much they agreed with them.

3.5.1 Pilot Test
Research questionnaires were pre-tested in order to allow for necessary adjustments before the study. A pilot study of two respondents (1 supervisor and 1 technical staff) from KITWASCO and two respondents (1 supervisor and 1 technical staff) from KIMWASCO was conducted. The selection was to avoid respondent contamination, the members who were used for the trial study were not part of the principal study.

3.5.2 Validity
Validity measures the extent to which a test actually examines what it was meant to examine and how the results represent the event being examined (Kothari, 2004; Zickmund, 2010; Kaliappen & Hillman, 2013). There were five different types of validity according to Cooper and Schindler (2014); convergent, face, criterion, content and discriminant validity. Content validity was utilized in this study through adopting appropriate measures and indicators as informed by the empirical review and modifying some questions from past research.

3.5.3 Reliability
Reliability deals with the perfection and clarity of a measurement procedure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It's determined through a series of tests that look for sturdiness and consistency (Sekaran & Bougie, 2014). Consistency refers to the capacity of all items on a scale to assess the same thing, whereas stability refers to how a measurement differs from one user to the next (Drost, 2011). According to Kaliappen and Hillman (2013), a Cronbach Alpha test is a popular test in social sciences which checks the consistency and reliability a
data collection tool. The study therefore used Cronbach alpha test in reliability analysis where a Cronbach alpha coefficient of over 0.5 was acceptable for less than five variables as recommended by Kaliappen and Hillman (2013). Table 3.2 summarizes the findings of the reliability test.

Table 3.2: Results of Reliability Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leadership</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy implementation</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.787</strong></td>
<td><strong>Acceptable</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pilot Study (2021)

The results in Table 3.2 shows that organizational leadership, organizational structure, organizational culture and strategy implementation Cronbach alpha values as 0.726, 0.815, 0.796 and 0.811 respectively. This demonstrates that the average alpha coefficient for each individual variable was much over 0.7, confirming Mugenda & Mugenda's (2003) advice that an alpha coefficient score of more than 0.7 implies that the equipment is exceptionally reliable.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

Questionnaires were employed to collect data from the target demographic, and they were well-designed to obtain the information needed. The researcher dropped the questionnaires alongside the university introduction letter and data collection permit from NACOSTI to assure confidentiality of the respondents’ feedback and also helped in boosting the response
rate. The respondents were granted two weeks to respond to the questionnaires. The researcher then collected the questionnaires from the respondents and thanked them for participating in the study.

3.7 Data Analysis and Presentation

The study used quantitative statistical techniques in data analysis. The obtained data was examined to relate variables. Data analysis was done with the assistance of a computer program called Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 21. Frequency distribution tables, means, percentages, standard deviation, coefficient of variance and other descriptive data were employed to come up with variations in responses and graphs, charts, and tables were used to display the findings. Further, inferential statistics on the other hand was conducted in order to establish whether there are interrelationships among variables.

Correlation analysis, which gives the size and trajectory of variable interrelationships and is expressed as Pearson R Coefficient, was utilized by the study. The fraction of variation in the dependent variables that was clarified by the independent variable was determined by the coefficient of determination while a multiple regression analysis was used establish the existence of causal relationships between the dependent and independent variables. F and ANOVA tests determined whether the independent variable can correctly predict the dependent variable and whether regression model is significant respectively.

To describe the relationship between the organizational factors and strategy implementation the following model was as used:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon \]

Where:
\[ Y = \text{Strategy Implementation} \]

\[ \beta_1 = \text{Coefficient for the Organizational Leadership} \]

\[ \beta_2 = \text{Coefficient for the Organizational Structure} \]

\[ \beta_3 = \text{Coefficient for the Organizational Culture} \]

\[ X_1 = \text{Organizational Leadership} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{Organizational Structure} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{Organizational Culture} \]

\[ \varepsilon = \text{the error term.} \]

**3.8 Ethical Consideration**

Ethical considerations safeguard respondents’ privileges and also enhance research integrity (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The researcher obtained introductory letter from the graduate school, Kenyatta University and data collection permit from NACOSTI. Permission was also sought from the Managing Directors of KITWASCO and KIMWASCO before issuing the questionnaires. The researcher also made certain that, the information shared by the respondents was confidentially used and no coercion or inducement techniques were used on the respondents. Anonymity of the respondents was also assured by the researcher to reduce the risk of damage due to respondent’s involvement in the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analysis of data acquired on the field which is founded on response rate, background information of the respondents, descriptive analysis and inferential statistics. The following is a list of tables and figures that are used to display the findings:

4.2 Response Rate

The target population was 120 comprising of supervisors and technical staff from KITWASCO and KIMWASCO. Table 4.1 displays their response rate.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Administered</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KITWASCO</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMWASCO</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The findings, as shown in Table 4.1, reveal that KITWASCO had a majority response rate at 94.7% while the response rate from KIMWASCO was at 86.7%. The combined response rate was at 91.7%. Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), claims that a response rate of 50% is appropriate for analysis and reporting, 60% is good, and 70% and above is excellent. Consequently, the response rate reached in this study was deemed enough for data analysis, conclusion, and recommendations.
4.3 Respondents’ General Information

Table 4.1 illustrates the distribution of the responders by department, gender, length of service, highest academic qualification, mission statement, written strategic plan document and accessibility of strategic plan.

**Table 4.2: Respondents’ General Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of service</strong></td>
<td>Below1 year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 4 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For more than a decade,</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest academic qualification</strong></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission statement</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written strategic plan document</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic plan accessibility</strong></td>
<td>Easily accessible</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately accessible</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not accessible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data (2021)*
Based on the results as illustrated in Table 4.2, majority 97(88.2%) of the respondents were drawn from the technical department while 13(11.8%) from the administration department. This implies that a large number of employees from the two organizations are technical staff. Most 59(53.6%) of the respondents were male while 51(46.4%) of the respondents was composed of female respondents. This demonstrates that both male and female were well represented in the study, indicating that gender bias was not prevalent. Majority 59(53.6%) of the responders had served for the organization for a period of over a decade, 30(27.3%) between 5 to 10 years, 11(10.0%) less than 1 year and 10(9.1%) between 1 to 5 years. This infers that the responders were cognizant of the organizational factors determining the implementation of strategy in Kitui County's public water service providers.

The findings as exhibited in Table 4.2 additionally demonstrate that majority 46(41.8%) of the responders had their highest academic qualification as bachelor’s degree, 26(23.6%) diploma, 25(22.7%) certificate, 12(10.9%) master’s degree and 1(0.9%) Doctoral degree. According to the statistics provided, the majority of the responders were well educated, and it was presumed that they were well aware about the study's goal. It was discovered that all of the responders agreed that the organization has a mission statement that is displayed in all offices and that the organization had a written strategic plan document. Majority 101(91.8%) of the respondents agreed that the organization strategic plan was easily accessible to members of staff, 7(6.4%) moderately accessible, 2(1.8%) not accessible.

**4.4 Implementation of Strategies**

The study aimed to establish the implementation of the organizational strategies. Table 4.3 exhibited the findings.
Table 4.3: Implementation of Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan formulation</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&gt;and&lt;3 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of current strategies</td>
<td>Strongly disagrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagrees</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agrees</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agrees</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee involvement on</td>
<td>Strongly disagrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of strategies</td>
<td>Disagrees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agrees</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agrees</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors affecting strategic</td>
<td>Inadequate resources</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>Responsiveness to change</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top management support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overwhelming/overambitious plans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level managers role to play in strategy implementation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/sections on implementation of strategies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2021)

From the results as presented in Table 4.3, majority 75(68.2%) of the responders indicated that the current strategic plan was formulated between 1 to 3 years, 21(19.1%) indicated after
1 year and 14(12.7%) after 3 years. This is an indicator that strategies of the organization were regularly formulated. According to Sveiby (2015) strategic formulation allows the firm to plan its capital budgeting. According to Adobor's (2019) research, organizations can benefit by widening their strategy building process to involve a variety of external and internal stakeholders.

Majority 57(51.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the organization has implemented the current strategies, 29(26.4%) agreed, 20(18.6%) disagreed and 4(3.6%) were neutral. According to Atkinson (2016), strategy implementation identifies and clarifies the project vision, guiding principles, goals and objectives, proposition of worth, and success indicators, laying the framework for cross-functional decision-making. It also guarantees that executives and functional teams are on the same page. In a research conducted by Nabwire (2018) on variables impacting strategy implementation at Barclays Bank of Kenya, it was discovered that supervisory employees must be empowered in order to achieve adequate coordination of operations.

Most 65(55.5%) of the responders agreed that the organization always involves employees in implementation of strategies, 31(28.2%) strongly disagreed, 9(8.2%) disagreed and others were neutral respectively. According to Alexander (2015), strategic implementation methods necessitate the time and effort of personnel and managers at all levels of a firm, specifically when the changes happen in a small business context. This is in accordance with Nwachukwu, Chladkova, and Olatunji's (2018), findings in their study which looked at the relationship between employees' dedication to strategy implementation and employee satisfaction and found that Staff contentment is positively correlated with employee devotion to strategy implementation.
The majority of responders 29 (26.4 percent) said that their organization's responsiveness to change was the most important element determining plan execution as compared to inadequate resources 21(19.1%), communication 18(16.4%), accountability 15(13.6%), top management support 13(11.8%), empowerment 9(8.2%) and 5(4.5%) overwhelming/overambitious. This finding concur with Bonyo (2018) study that investigated factors affecting strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors and established employee resistance to change and communication were important factors that influenced strategy implementation at corporate organizations. Furthermore, according to Damawan and Azizah's (2020) research, there are individual characteristics such as low motivation and environmental aspects such as greater work stability.

According to the findings of the survey, all responders agreed that lower-level employees in your firm had a role to play in strategy execution. In addition, majority 105(95.5%) of the responders agreed that departments/sections in their organization are allowed to devise ways of implementing strategies while 5(4.5%) were of the contrary. This conclusion is consistent with Embertson's (2016) study, which found that middle managers are the ones that must transform high-level strategies into decisions and actions that effect customers and workers on a daily basis.

4.5 Descriptive Analysis Results

The descriptive analysis was presented as per the study objective in terms of mean, standard deviation, frequencies and percentages as follows:
4.5.1 Organizational Leadership

The goal of the research was to ascertain the effect of organizational leadership on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. The findings are exhibited in the following tables and figures.

Table 4.4: Organizational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std.Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top- down communication</td>
<td>40(36.4)</td>
<td>61(55.5)</td>
<td>9(8.2)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>44(40.0)</td>
<td>32(29.1)</td>
<td>34(30.9)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s involvement</td>
<td>60(54.5)</td>
<td>49(49.5)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>1(0.9)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management commitment</td>
<td>62(56.4)</td>
<td>40(36.4)</td>
<td>8(7.3)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2021)

As exhibited in Table 4.4, majority of the responders strongly agreed on the statement that employee involvement influences implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as represented by a mean score of 4.53 and standard deviation of 0.47. This statement was strongly agreed by 60(54.5%), 49(49.5%) agreed and 1(0.9%) disagreed. The low standard deviation (0.66) implies a less variation in the data set from the mean. This conclusion is consistent with Mutune's (2016) study, which looked at the impact of employee participation in strategic management procedures on the performance of Kenyan microfinance firms and established that staff involvement in strategy implementation is significant and the microfinance institutions in Kenya significantly involve their staff in strategy implementation.

Table 4.4 also exhibits that the responders strongly agreed on the on the statement that management commitment influences implementation of strategies in public water service
providers in Kitui County as represented by a mean score of 4.49 and standard deviation of 0.51. This statement was strongly agreed by 62(56.4%), 40(36.4%) agreed and 8(7.3%). This is supported by Salum's (2017) research, which looked into the impact of top management and organizational resources on the implementation of strategic plans in the public sector and discovered that top management and organizational resources have a positive impact on the implementation of strategic plans in the government sector, with the goal of improving service quality.

The goal of the research was ascertaining from the respondents how decisions on strategy were communicated in their organization and the findings are exhibited in Figure 4.1.

![Bar Chart: Communication of strategies](chart)

**Figure 4.1: Communication of strategies**

**Source: Survey Data (2021)**

As presented in Figure 4.1, circulars were found to be the most used way in communicating decisions made by the organizations as indicated by 81.8%, this was followed by staff meetings (41.8%), corporate emails (30.0%) and management meetings (20.0%). Khetarpal (2018) came to the same conclusion that circulars are a very successful approach to interact with employees or consumers. Many businesses utilize circulars as business announcements to enforce dress rules and policies, or to invite employees to meetings or luncheons. The
findings support Finan's (2017) research, which demonstrated that conducting frequent staff meetings with workers in the workplace considerably improves the communication efforts that are the core of every workgroup.

The study further sought to establish how the respondents felt about managerial/supervisory commitment on implementation of strategy. The findings are exhibited in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5: Managerial/supervisory commitment on strategy implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std.Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Commitment influences implementation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>40(36.4)</td>
<td>61(55.5)</td>
<td>9(8.2)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of employees affects strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>44(40.0)</td>
<td>32(29.1)</td>
<td>34(30.9)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data (2021)*

As presented in Table 4.5, the responders strongly agreed on the statement that management commitment influences implementation of strategies as proven by mean score of 4.62 and a standard deviation of 0.38. This statement was strongly agreed by 40(36.4%) of the respondents, 61(55.5%) agreed and 9(8.2%) were neutral. This is corroborated by a research by Syaifullah (2017), which indicated that top management commitment and organizational culture have a major impact on the deployment of management accounting information systems at the same time. The low standard deviation (0.82) implies a less variation in the data set from the mean.

The study also sought to find out how opinions from employees in their organization were obtained. The findings are exhibited in Figure 4.2.
Figure 4.2: Expression of employee opinion

Source: Survey Data (2021)

As presented by Figure 4.2, majority (67.3%) of the responders indicated that direct emails were the most way in which their opinions were obtained, this was followed by departmental heads (16.4%), suggestion boxes (10.0%) and group representatives (6.4%). This is in line with Campbell, Maglio, Cozzi, and Dom's (2018) findings, which state that direct mail is an excellent means of communication because it delivers an intimate, one-on-one dialogue that commands attention by leveraging a person's habit of reading and reacting to mail.

4.5.2 Organizational Structure

The goal of the research was to ascertain the effect of organizational structure on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. The findings are exhibited in the following tables and figures.
Table 4.6: Organizational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std.Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task allocation</td>
<td>34(30.9)</td>
<td>19(17.3)</td>
<td>24(21.3)</td>
<td>11(10.0)</td>
<td>22(20.0)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized authority</td>
<td>70(63.6)</td>
<td>32(29.1)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>8(7.3)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of control</td>
<td>55(50.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>9(8.2)</td>
<td>35(31.8)</td>
<td>20(18.2)</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible structure</td>
<td>40(36.4)</td>
<td>40(36.4)</td>
<td>11(10.0)</td>
<td>19(17.3)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2021)

As presented in Table 4.6, decentralized authority was found to have the most influence on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as evidenced by mean score of 4.59 and standard deviation of 0.41. This was strongly agreed by 70(63.6%), 32(29.1%) agreed and 8(7.3%) disagreed. This conclusion is in line with Regmi, Naidoo, Greer, and Pilkington (2019), who found that decentralization boosts job satisfaction and staff morale, particularly among lower-level managers.

The results also in Table 4.6 show that span of control was found span of control influenced the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as evidenced by mean score of 4.32 and standard deviation of 0.68. This was strongly agreed by 55(50.0%), 9(8.2%) neutral, 35(31.8%) disagreed and 20(18.2%). This conclusion is consistent with Davison's (2019) research, which found that span of control had a direct impact on managers' ability to engage with and oversee subordinates. The study further observes that the consequence of span of control and its principles are linked to workplace efficiency, which determines the number of employees who fall under each particular management. The low standard deviation (0.72) implies a less variation in the data set from the mean.
The responders were asked to describe the organizational structure in relation to strategy implementation in their organization. The findings are exhibited in Figure 4.3.

Figure 4.3: Organizational structure and strategy implementation

Source: Survey Data (2021)

As exhibited in Figure 4.3, the study established that majority 99(90.0%) of the responders indicated that their organizational structure in relation to strategy implementation in their organization was supportive to strategy while 11(10.0%) indicated that it was not supportive to the strategy. This finding is consistent with Moinkett's (2015) research, which looked at the relationship between organizational structure and strategy implementation at Kenya's Geothermal Development Company and discovered that the company had an organic organizational structure that was adaptable enough to allow for changes during strategy implementation. The study further observed that all the departments/sections were aware of the key performance indicators in organization and the timelines were sufficiently given for the execution of the strategy.
4.5.3 Organizational Culture

The goal of the research was to ascertain the organizational culture effect on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. The findings are exhibited in the following tables and figures.

Table 4.7: Organizational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std.Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of policy manuals</td>
<td>2(1.8)</td>
<td>106(96.4)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>2(1.8)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to change</td>
<td>86(78.2)</td>
<td>4(3.6)</td>
<td>9(8.2)</td>
<td>1(1.8)</td>
<td>9(8.2)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared values</td>
<td>91(82.7)</td>
<td>19(17.3)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative culture</td>
<td>85(77.3)</td>
<td>1(0.9)</td>
<td>11(10.0)</td>
<td>24(21.8)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2021)

As exhibited in Table 4.7, shared values had a greater influence on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as exhibited by mean score of 4.63 and a standard deviation of 0.37. This was strongly agreed by 91(82.7%) of the respondents and 19(17.3%) agreed. According to Posner, Kouzes and Schmidt (2015) shared values brings about increased advocacy, retention and productivity amongst employees and resistance to business challenges from the outside.

The results in Table 4.7 also shows that responsiveness to change also influenced the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County to a greater extent as exhibited by mean score of 4.11 and a standard deviation of 0.89. This research supports Fenton O'Creevy's (2018) observation that employees' reactivity to change educates them about how the change would benefit them individually. According to the author,
employees may be more accepting of change if they grasp the benefits and how they relate to their work. The low standard deviation (0.88) implies a less variation in the data set from the mean.

The responders were requested to describe the organizational culture as pertains to strategy implementation in their organization. The findings are exhibited in Figure 4.4.

**Figure 4.4: Organizational culture and strategy implementation**

*Source: Survey Data (2021)*

As exhibited in Figure 4.4, the study established that majority 103(93.6%) of the responders stated that their organizational culture in relation to strategy implementation in their organization was supportive to strategy while 7(6.4%) indicated that it was not supportive to the strategy. This finding concurs with Maika (2020) study that investigated the effects of organizational culture on strategy implementation in water boards in Kenya. The outcomes of the study revealed that the general organizational culture impacts 73% of the change in strategy implementation in the water boards in Kenya.
4.5.4 Strategy Implementation

The goal of the research was to ascertain the extent to which strategies were implemented at public water service providers in Kitui County. The findings are exhibited in Table 4.7.

Table 4.8: Strategy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std.Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leads to affordable water services</td>
<td>61(55.5)</td>
<td>31(28.2)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>18(16.4)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves sustainability of water supply</td>
<td>24(21.8)</td>
<td>32(37.3)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>11(10.0)</td>
<td>34(30.9)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances reliability in water supply</td>
<td>32(29.1)</td>
<td>44(40.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>34(30.9)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to quick complaint resolution</td>
<td>40(36.4)</td>
<td>40(36.4)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>30(27.3)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.77</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2021)

As presented in Table 4.8, the statement that organizational factors studied lead to quick complaint resolution had a highest mean score at 4.59 and standard deviation of 0.41. This was strongly agreed and agreed respectively by majority 40(36.4%) of the responders and 30(27.3%) disagreed. The mean score of 4.34 indicated that there was improved sustainability of water supply with a standard deviation of 0.66. This was strongly agreed by 24(21.8%) of the respondents, 32(37.3%) agreed, 11(10.0%) disagreed and 34(30.9%) strongly disagreed. This finding is consistent with Kagumu and Njuguna (2016), who discovered that resource accessibility and distribution is the most important factor influencing strategy implementation in the Anglican Church of Kenya, Kirinyaga Diocese, accounting for 75% of the time, in comparison to other characteristics like leadership,
structure, and culture. The low standard deviation (0.77) implies a less variation in the data set from the mean.

4.6 Inferential Statistics Results

4.6.1 Correlation Analysis

The relationship between the independent and dependent variables was quantified using correlation analysis. The findings are exhibited in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational leadership</th>
<th>Organizational structure</th>
<th>Organizational culture</th>
<th>Strategy implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.703**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy implementation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>.644**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The results in Table 4.9 show that organizational leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture had a strong relationship with the strategic implementation with a
Pearson’s r value of 0.572, 0.518 and 0.644 respectively. This is line with Mbogo, Machogu and Juma (2020) who established that commitment and support from organization’s leadership impacts positively on strategic plan implementation in SACCOs. Kirui (2013) study on strategy management at the Kenya Red Cross Society found that implementation of strategies and organizational structures are positively interrelated. A study by Kavale and Muthoni (2015) on water companies in Kenya established that supportive cultures enhance the process of implementing strategies in organizations and study established that organizational culture influences strategy implementation.

4.6.2 Regression Analysis Results

Table 4.10: Regression Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.554(^a)</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Change Statistics} = \text{F Change} / df_1 / df_2 \]

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The adjusted R square is a coefficient of determination that shows how changes in the independent variable affect the dependent variable. Based on the findings in Table 4.10 the value of adjusted r squared was 0.687(68.7%) a suggestion that there was variation of 68.7% on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County was due to changes in organizational leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture at 95% confidence interval. As a result, factors not examined in this study account for 0.322 (32.2 percent) of strategies implementation.
Table 4.11: Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>23.634</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.878</td>
<td>15.622</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>53.456</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.091</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The significance value is 0.000b <0.05 thus the model is statistically significance when it comes to anticipating how organizational leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture influenced strategy implementation. The F critical at 5% level of significance was 7.878. Since F calculated > F critical (value = 15.622), this demonstrates the significance of the whole model. The relationship (p< 0.05) demonstrated a linear relationship between the variables under investigation, indicating that there was a 95% possibility that the relationship was not attributable to chance.

The coefficient of determination was carried out to assess how well a model can comprehend and forecast future events. The findings are exhibited in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leadership</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>2.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>2.523</td>
<td>4.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>1.453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Survey Data (2021)

As per the results in Table 12, the equation:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon \]

becomes: \[ Y = 0.865 + 0.745 X_1 + 0.528 X_3 + 0.701 X_3 \]

Where

\( X_1 = \) Organizational leadership
\( X_2 = \) Organizational structure
\( X_3 = \) Organizational culture

As per the regression equation formulated, taking all the independent variables into constant, implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County will be at a factor of 0.865 (86.5%). In addition, a unit increase in organizational leadership leads to a factor of 0.745 increase among strategy implementation in public water service providers in Kitui County. A unit increase in organizational structure will result in a rise in implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County at a factor of 0.528. A unit increase in organizational culture will result in a rise in implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County at a factor of 0.701. The study established that organizational leadership had a substantial and beneficial impact on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as shown by beta values \((\beta = 1.195, p < 0.05)\). This finding concur with Nyong’a and Maina (2019) study that investigated the influence of strategic leadership on strategy implementation at Kenya Revenue Authority, southern region in Kenya and found that strategic leadership has a substantial and favorable relationship with strategy implementation.

According to the findings, organizational structure had a substantial and beneficial impact on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as
shown by beta values ($\beta = 2.523$, $p < 0.05$). This finding concurs with Muoki and Okibo (2016) study that assessed the role of organizational structure on strategy Implementation of public universities in Kenya: A case study of Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of science and technology and the findings show that formal orientation programs, as a communication element, have a significant role in strategy implementation.

The study established that organizational culture had a positive and significant effect on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as shown by beta values ($\beta = 1.052$, $p < 0.05$). This result corresponds to Kopar's (2015) observations that explored the influence of organizational culture on strategy implementation at the University of Nairobi and the study found that culture at the university is indoctrinated from personnel recruiting to deployment.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter contains the study's summary, results, recommendations, and ideas for further research.

5.2 Summary
The study sought to investigate organizational factors influencing implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County, Kenya. The specific objectives guiding the study were to ascertain the effect of organizational leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. Questionnaires were employed to obtain data which was analyzed via descriptive analysis and inferential statistics. The following is a summary of the findings:

The research also sought to ascertain the effect of organizational leadership on implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. The study established that organizational leadership had a substantial and beneficial impact on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as shown by beta values ($\beta= 1.195$, $p < 0.05$). Employee involvement and management commitment influences implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. Circulars and staff meetings were found to be the most common way in communicating decisions made by the organizations. Management commitment influences implementation of strategies. Direct emails and departmental heads was the most way in which their opinions were obtained.
The study established that organizational structure had a substantial and beneficial impact on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as shown by beta values (β= 2.523, p < 0.05). Decentralized authority and span of control were found to have the most influence on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. The vast majority of responders stated that their organizational structure in relation to strategy implementation in their organization was supportive to strategy and departments/sections were aware of the key performance indicators in organization and the timelines were sufficiently given for the execution of the strategy.

The study also established that organizational culture had a substantial and beneficial impact on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County as shown by beta values (β= 1.052, p < 0.05). Shared values had a greater influence on the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County. Responsiveness to change also influenced the implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County to a greater extent. The research also confirmed that majority 103(93.6%) of the responders stated that their organizational culture in relation to strategy implementation in their organization was supportive to strategy.

5.3 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the research, the study concludes that organizational leadership assists employees in achieving an organization's mission by ensuring that they understand the mission in light of their strengths, developing a strategic plan in line with that mission, establishing goals, and holding teams accountable for achieving those goals within a set timeline and in accordance with the strategic plan. Organizational leadership is crucial because it encourages employees, provides for problem-solving and decision-making
mindsets, fosters communication, ethics, inclusiveness, and respect, and helps organizational leaders to remain focused on their goals.

The study also concludes that organizational structure is frequently vital in establishing consensus for a plan as it determines who must be settled in management and how authority is positioned. An organization's suitable structure motivates members to work together toward common objectives. As a result, serves as a facilitator in achieving corporate objectives. The study also concludes that organizational structures define what activities are possible and most optimum, because successful strategy requires a company to consider its external stakeholders as well as its internal organizational structure.

Finally, the study concludes that organizational culture allows for aligned goals by concentrating on productivity and accomplishing the organization's fundamental aim. The study also concludes that cultivating an open-to-change corporate culture starts with a senior leadership team that successfully communicates the organization's strategic goals.

5.4 Recommendations

The study made the following recommendations;

5.4.1 Organizational Leadership and Performance

The study recommends that the leadership in public water service providers in Kitui County should ensure that they understand their employees better so as to be able to help them improve their personal, professional effectiveness, accountability, and most of all effectively implement strategies formulated by the organization. The study also recommends that the organizational leaders should foster a culture of accountability, professional presence, work results and communication effectiveness are the hallmark of effective implementation of
strategies. The study further recommends that leadership should embrace top-down communication enables direct communication with employees as it encourages employee involvement in formulation and implementation of strategies. The study also recommends conflict resolution as the best approach in addressing problem and challenges faced in strategy implementation since it prevents adverse effects in the future. The study also recommends management commitment as and effective tool in implementation of strategy because if the management is committed to success of the company in achieving its objectives then they will dedicate the right resources in implementation of strategy.

5.4.2 Organizational Structure and Performance

The study recommends that public water service providers in Kitui County should have a good organizational structure that provides the right blend of command and control with clear task allocations. It should also ensure employee autonomy without animosity, which would obstruct the organization's objective. In order to increase the interaction between persons and tasks, the organization should adopt a better structure that fosters cultural values, cultivates assimilation, and harmonization. A good and efficient structure demonstrates how authority and information flows within the organization. The study also recommends that organizations adopts a higher span of control which will have fewer layers of management and a flat organizational structure; this will lead to fewer levels of approval in the organization and the management is able to respond quickly to any issues that require their attention.
5.4.3 Organizational Culture and Performance

The study recommends that public water service providers in Kitui County should make strategic vision and goals clear and inspirational, decipher strategy into a living execution plan that is important to individuals, take use of favorable habits that already exist, and alter unwanted or outmoded habits as required, as well as adapt organizational procedures to reinforce preferred behaviors over time and enable alignment with an organization's culture. The study also recommends that for a strategy within public water service providers in Kitui County to be effectively conceived and implemented, it must be completely consistent with the organizational culture. Thus, objectives and goals must be set in order to build and nurture an organizational culture that, over time, embraces the organization’s strategy. The study also recommends organizations to embrace a participative culture because it makes staff participate in the decision-making process. and this inclusivity of the employees in management of an organization has been found to be effective in implementation of strategy.

5.5 Contribution of the Study to Knowledge

The current study contributes to knowledge by assisting the management of the public water service providers in embracing leadership styles, organizational structure and organizational culture which is effective for successful strategy implementation. The focus on organizational factors and strategy implementation was fairly explored by this study. This will therefore offer logical foundation for the analysis and interpretation of the variables which were covered by the study. The findings of the study will also go a long way in providing empirical information which could be tested to verify theories.
5.6 Suggestions for Further Studies

The current study sought to investigate organizational factors influencing implementation of strategies in public water service providers in Kitui County, Kenya. Organizational factors evaluated included organizational leadership, organizational structure and organizational culture. As a result, the study recommends that more research be conducted into other organizational aspects. Aside from public water service providers in Kitui County, Kenya, various studies that focus on distinct study contexts may well be conducted.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: INTRODUCTION LETTER

Antony Maiyuku Mutua,
Kenyatta University,
P.O Box 43844.
Nairobi, Kenya.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: INTRODUCTION LETTER

I’m a postgraduate student at Kenyatta University doing study on organizational factors and implementation of strategy in public water service providers in Kitui County. This is in partial fulfillment for the award of a Master’s Degree in Business Administration at the University.

I respectfully want your aid in completing the questionnaire as a respondent to the study. Your participation and cooperation is paramount to my study and therefore I humbly request you to fill in the questionnaires. Kindly be informed that all contributions will be kept completely secret and used solely for research reasons.

Thank you,

Antony Maiyuku Mutua
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

This study is for academic purposes only. You are kindly urged to answer the questions as truthfully and precisely as possible. The answers to these questions will be kept private. Please mark [✓] if applicable or fill in the blanks with the needed information.

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1) kindly indicate department
   Administration [ ]
   Technical [ ]

2) Kindly indicate your gender:
   Female [ ]
   Male [ ]

3) Length of service in the organization?
   Less than 1 year [ ]
   1<5 years [ ]
   5<10 years [ ]
   Over 10 years [ ]

4) Highest academic qualification?
   Doctoral [ ]
   Masters Degree [ ]
   Bachelor’s Degree [ ]
   Diploma [ ]
   Certificate [ ]

5) The organization has a mission statement that is displayed in all offices
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

6) The organization has a written strategic plan document
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]
   Don’t know [ ]

7) If yes in (6), how accessible is the strategic plan to members of staff?
   Easily accessible [ ]
   Moderately accessible [ ]
SECTION B: IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES

8) How long ago was the current strategic plan formulated?
   < 1 year [ ]
   1 > and < 3 years [ ]
   > 3 years [ ]

9) The organization has implemented the current strategies?
   Strongly disagrees [ ]
   Disagrees [ ]
   Neutral [ ]
   Agrees [ ]
   Strongly agrees [ ]

10) The organization always involves employees in implementation of strategies?
    Strongly disagrees [ ]
    Disagrees [ ]
    Neutral [ ]
    Agrees [ ]
    Strongly disagrees [ ]

11) What factor(s) affect strategy implementation in your organization?
    Inadequate resources [ ]
    Responsiveness to change[ ]
    Top management support[ ]
    Communication [ ]
    Empowerment [ ]
    Accountability [ ]
    Overwhelming/overambitious plans [ ]

12) Do you think lower-level members of staff have a role to play in strategy implementation in your organization?
    Yes [ ]
    No [ ]
    Don’t Know [ ]

13) Are departments/sections in your organization allowed to devise ways of implementing strategies?
    Yes [ ]
No

[ ]

SECTION C: ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

14) On a scale of 1-5, do you think the following elements of organizational leadership influence implementation of strategy? Whereby: 1=Strongly disagrees, 2=Disagrees, 3=Neutral, 4=Agrees and 5=Strongly agrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences implementation of strategies</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top- down communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) Communication efficiency is very important if strategy implementation is to be achieved. How are decisions on strategy communicated in your organization?

- Through circulars
- Through staff meetings
- Through corporate emails
- Through management meetings
- Others ……..

16) In a scale of 1-5, do you feel that managerial/supervisory commitment influences implementation of strategy? Whereby: 1=Strongly disagrees, 2=Disagrees, 3=Neutral, 4=Agrees and 5=Strongly agrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Commitment influences implementation of strategies</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involvement of employee is required for smooth planning and implementation of strategies. In your own opinion, and in a scale of 1-5, are employees are in involved in strategy decisions in your organization? Whereby: 1=Strongly disagrees, 2=Disagrees, 3=Neutral, 4=Agrees and 5=Strongly agrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement of employees affects strategy implementation</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) How are the opinions from employees in your organization obtained?

- Through suggestion boxes
- Through direct mails
- Through group representatives
- Through departmental heads
- Others………..
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SECTION D: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

18) There are several aspects of organizational structure which affect strategy implementation. In a scale of 1-5, state your opinion on the following assertions; Whereby: 1=Strongly disagrees, 2=Disagrees, 3=Neutral, 4=Agrees and 5=Strongly agrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences implementation of strategies</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) How can you describe the organizational structure in relation to strategy implementation your organization?
   Supportive to strategy [ ]  
   Not supportive to the strategy [ ]

20) Are the departments/sections aware of the key performance indicators in your organization?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

21) If your answer in (21) above is yes, are the timelines given for the execution of the strategy sufficient?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

SECTION E: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

22) In a scale of 1-5, state your opinion on the following statements about implementation of strategies and attributes of organizational culture; Whereby: 1=Strongly disagrees, 2=Disagrees, 3=Neutral, 4=Agrees and 5=Strongly agrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences implementation of strategies</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of policy manuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23) How can you describe the organizational culture in relation to strategy implementation your organization?

Supportive to strategy [ ]
Not supportive to the strategy [ ]

SECTION F: INDICATORS OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

24) Implementation of the Ministry of Water and Sanitization Strategies is expected to help the country to achieve universal access to water as defined in the Sustainable Development Goal No. 6. Indicate how implementation of strategy will contribute to the following aspects in water, sanitation and sewerage services provision in a scale of 1-5. Whereby: 1=Strongly disagrees, 2=Disagrees, 3=Neutral, 4=Agrees and 5=Strongly agrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful strategy implementation will;</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead to affordable water services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve sustainability of water supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance reliability in water supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve customer service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to quick complaint resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU