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ABSTRACT

Strategy formulation and implementation is a continuous and systematic process for making decision about the organization future developing the necessary procedures and operations to achieve that future and determine how success is to be measured. Concerning the competitive environment dominating on various government sectors, requirement of strategy formulation has been increasingly apparent. Yet the main problem of managers in these corporations is implementation of strategies. Previous studies and researches show that most government corporations have had problems in implementing their strategies and in some occasions were failed in that. Regarding this situation, the importance and necessity of this research is identified. This study investigated on how leadership, organization structure, staff commitment and communication affect strategy implementation. The study research design was a descriptive one since it provided data from the population on the universe being studied; the researcher had no control over the research variables. Descriptive research design describes data and characteristics about the population or phenomenon being studied. Sampling was based on stratified random sampling. The questionnaire was used as the information gathering device with a target population of one thousand people and a sample population of one hundred people. Data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The study found that leadership commitment affected strategy implementation. Organizations are structured in a variety of ways, dependent on their objectives and culture. The shared understanding of middle management and those at the operational level to the top management team’s strategic goals is of critical importance to effective implementation. There was relationship between communication and organization structure during strategy implementation. The study concludes that there was effect of top management on strategy implementation. Adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy can ensure successful strategy implementation. The study concludes that line-level employees may use delay or prevent attempts toward change that they find particularly threatening or disagreeable. Effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation. The study recommends top managers to demonstrate their willingness to give energy and loyalty to the implementation process. Managers of the organization should consider the strength and weakness of the organization before formulating and implementing strategies. The study recommends organization to have vision, mission, and values statements that provide a broad sense of purpose for all employees. Middle and lower level managers and key subordinates should be permitted to be involved with the detailed implementation planning. Strategies should be clearly communicated to all employees.
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DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Communication:** Communication therefore may be aptly described as the life blood of business, every organizations has culture on how they communicate.

**Training:** training involves an expert working with learners to transfer to them certain areas of knowledge or skills to improve in their current jobs.

**Quality:** - They are set standards that a product should acquire to make fit for Consumption
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, and significance of the study, scope and limitations of the study.

1.1 Background of the study

For a firm to survive and prosper a strategy is important. Strategy helps a firm create a fit between the organization and its environment in an effort to enable the organization adapt to its turbulent environment. How the strategy is planned formulated and implemented is therefore important. Strategy formulation and implementation is a continuous and systematic process for making decisions about the organization future, developing the necessary procedures and operations to achieve that future and determine how success is to be measured. It is a systematic process through which an organization argues on and builds on commitment among stakeholders to priorities which are essential to its vision and mission and to be responsive to the ever-changing operating environment (Barley, 2003).

Strategy implementation involves organization of the firm's resources and motivation of the staff to achieve objectives (Barry & Elmes, 2007). The strategy implementation process is usually the most complicated and time consuming part of strategic management (Rowe, Dickel & Dickel, 2004). Most managers know a lot more about strategy formulation than implementation. Although intricately linked strategy implementation is fundamentally different from strategy formulation, strategy implementation is difficult and worthy of managements alienation across all levels of an organization.

In recent years organisations have sought to create greater organisational flexibility in responding to environmental turbulence by moving away from hierarchical structures to more modular forms (Pearce & Robinson, 2010). Responsibility, resources and power in
firms has been the subject of decentralization and delayering. Given an intensifying competitive environment, it is regularly asserted that the critical determinant in the success and, doubtlessly, the survival of the firm is the successful implementation of marketing strategies (Hunger & Wheelen, 2008). The role and tasks of those employees charged with strategy implementation duties, the mid-level managers, in these new restructured organisations is under scrutiny.

As Mc Carthy and Cowan (2009) also states that Strategy implementation involves organization of the firm's resources and motivation of the staff to achieve objective. Today's global competitive environment is complex, dynamic, and largely unpredictable. To deal with this unprecedented level of change, a lot of thinking has gone into the issue of how strategies are best formulated (Mc Carthy et al. 2009). The strategy implementation process is easily the most complicated and time consuming part of strategic management (Nzuve, 2009). Most managers know a lot more about strategy formulation than implementation. Although intricately linked strategy implementation is fundamentally different from strategy formulation.

Historically, numerous researchers in strategic management bestowed great significance to the strategic formulation process and considered strategy implementation as a mere by-product or invariable consequence of planning (Quinn, Mintzberg,& James, 2008). Fortunately, insights in this area have been made recently which temper our knowledge of developing strategy with the reality of executing that which is crafted (Olson et al., 2005). However, as strategy implementation is both a multifaceted and complex organisational process, it is only by taking a broad view that a wide span of potentially valuable insights is generated.

Difficulties in strategy implementation are occasioned by obstacles or impediments to the implementation process. Hunger and Wheelen (2008) observes that then difficulties often include longer timeframes needed for execution; the need for involvement of many people in the implementation process; poor or vague strategy; conflicts with organizational power structure; poor or inadequate sharing of information; lack of understanding of organizational structure, including information sharing and coordination.
methods; unclear responsibility and accountability in the implementation process; and inability to manage change; including cultural changes.

Today's businesses have become sophisticated. The environment in which businesses are operating is becoming continuously complex, competitive dynamic and extremely turbulent. Senior manager are at the same time under pressure to perform, ensure profitability and overall success of the organization. Success in this generally dynamic environment that business operate in is a serious challenge more so in view of the various internal and external factors that are often than not hamper achievement of the desired success (Noble, 2009). This has brought about the need for complex decision making process. The success or failure of business is attributable to how strategic the decision making process made to be. Senior executives have therefore resorted to employing strategic management as a means of ensuring organizational success. In order to survive, this would require sound strategic management process which not only address the formulation but also has inbuilt sound implementation program (Noble, 2009).

1.1.2 The Kenya Bureau of Standards

Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS) was established July 1974 by the enhancement of the CAP 496 of the laws of Kenya. KEBS is run by a Board of Directors known as the National Standards Council (NSC). It is the policy-making body for supervising and controlling the administration and financial management of Bureau. The managing Director is the Chief Executive responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Bureau within the guideline formulated by the NSC.

Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS) is the government principal body that is mandated to facilitate and/or guide the development of appropriate standardization and conformity assessments mechanism for goods and services in the country. Over the last three decades, the scope of KEBS activities has expanded from development of standards and provision of standardization of a few commodities and code of practice to cover Metrology Standardization Testing Quality Assurance (MSTQ) testing for commodities and cover in all sectors of the economy not only in Kenya but also East African Community Region (EAC).
KEBS developed its first strategic plan in 2003 and signed the first performance contract with the government in 2005. Most of the plans laid out in the strategic plan have not been met due to serious challenges in implementation.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Crafting and implementing a strategy for the business are at the core of management functions. Among all things that managers do, few affect organizational performance more lasting than how well the management team handles the task of charting the organization’s long term direction, developing effective strategic moves and approaches, and executing the strategy in ways that produce the intended results (Thompson, and Strickland, 2003).

KEBS operating environment and SQMT requirement in the world has greatly changed since 1974 when it was established. This propelled KEBS to embrace strategic planning as management tool from 2003 when the first plan was crafted. Its implementation led to restructuring and rationalization within KEBS to make its operation more efficient but the plan did not achieve the desired success. The most striking thing about the strategic plan it’s more of gospel truth that never changes. It’s hardly revised to fit in the ever changing environment and this affects the implementation process. In addition, KEBS second strategic plan was developed 2007 to run for five years. Some of the targets set for 2008 – 2009 are yet to be achieved, others are farfetched dreams yet strategic plan is well crafted with objectives and indicators and strategic activities outlined. The question still stands; what could be wrong with the process of formulation and implementation, what are the challenges and how is KEBS addressing them. The most probable reasons are lack of involvement, failure to revise the strategy to fit the ever changing environment, motivation and ownership of the strategic plan. Success in strategy formulation and implementation requires people in the organization to have a shared vision and shared value, Waruhiu (2004) and this could be one of the ingredients lacking in KEBS.

Of the studies done in the area of strategic management in general or on strategy implementation, none has focused on strategy implementation challenges at the Kenya Bureau of Standards. For instance, studies on strategy implementation are numerous and
include Koske (2003) who did strategy implementation and its challenges in public corporation at Telkom Kenya Ltd. On the other hand, Ochanda (2005) did a study on challenges of strategy implementation at Kenya Industrial Estates Limited. Gakenia (2008) did a study on strategy implementation in Kenya Commercial Bank. Githui (2006) did a study on challenges for strategy implementation in Barclays Bank Kenya Limited. As can be seen from the above studies, there is a gap in literature as far as a study on Kenya Bureau of Standards is concerned. This is the gap the present study seeks to bridge by answering the following question: what challenges does KEBS face in implementing strategies formulated?

1.3 Overall Objective

To establish various factors that influenced strategy implementation and explored the best approaches that could be adopted to facilitate effective implementation of strategy in the Government corporations in Kenya

1.3.1 Specific Objectives

i. To establish the effect of leadership on strategy implementation

ii. To establish the effect of organizational structure on strategy implementation

iii. To establish the effect of staff commitment on strategy implementation

iv. To establish the effect of communication on strategy implementation

1.5 Research Questions

i. How does leadership affect effective strategy implementation?

ii. How does organizational structure affect effective strategy implementation?

iii. How does staff commitment affect effective strategy implementation?

iv. How does communication affect effective strategy implementation?
1.6 Significance of the study

This study would be useful to various groups: It would help management realize where they go wrong in the process of strategy implementation and in dealing with the challenges. The management would use the recommendation to effectively implement strategies.

The study would add to the existing body of knowledge and provide researcher with an opportunity to enhance analytical, evaluative, and writing skills. Government would be able to know the challenges that the parastatal face and therefore come up with policies to enhance successful strategy formulation and implementation. It would also be of significance to the stakeholders, the respondents, customers, the employees and other parastatal.

1.7 Scope of the study

The study was a case of the Kenya bureau of standards; it emphasized on the factors affecting effective implementation of strategies at KEBS as one of the government corporations in Kenya. The findings contributed towards the achievement of the main objective of this study.

1.8 Limitations

Due to the busy nature of the personnel in KEBS, coupled with fear of victimization, the respondents may not be willing to give all the information. Thus the researcher acquired a formal permit that defined the mission of the research as purely academic so as to build the confidence of the respondents in terms of how the information given was consumed in future.

Since this study was directed by only four factors considered to be key to effective implementation of strategies, it failed to include other challenges hence deny the coverage of a broad perspective and exploration of more challenges affecting strategy implementation in organizations. This suggests further research to be conducted so as to identify more challenges affecting strategy implementation in organizations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, literature was reviewed under the raised challenges on study objectives. It relied on earlier work which was obtained from published reference materials such as books, magazines and journals. This provided an overview of major past activities that had earlier been undertaken on the challenges affecting strategy implementation in organizations. The review which focuses on past studies and theoretical framework of the study is explained. Also, critical analysis is made and research gaps established.

2.2 Theoretical framework

2.2.1 Strategy Implementation in Organizations

Strategy implementation is the next logical step after strategy formulation. It implies translation of the chosen strategy into action. Strategy implementation requires a good strategic architecture of the organization and should therefore take into account how various parts of the organization work together in a manner that optimizes resource utilization (Ansoff & MC Donnel, 2010).

Strategy implementation is a stage of strategic management that involves the use of managerial and organizational tools, direct resources towards achieving strategic outcomes. Successful competitors not only have superior market position, they execute effectively within these market positions overtime. Without effective execution, a strategy is just an idea waiting to happen. Sometimes a firm’s strategy emerges as events unfold, but ultimately execution requires ongoing, deliberate action to achieve the firm’s economic targets. Strategy execution is about building the resources and capabilities that lead to competitive advantage through critical value and cost drivers (Davis, 2007).

Martin (2003) observes that understanding the strategic position of organization and considering the strategic choices open to it are of little value unless the strategies
manager wish to follow can be turned into organizational action plans. Although strategy implementation is seen as an integral part of strategic management process little has been written or researched on implementation challenges (Doyle, 2008).

2.2.2 McKinsey’s 7-S Model

McKinsey’s (1982) 7-S model describes the seven factors critical for effective strategy execution. The 7-S model identifies the seven factors as strategy, structure, systems, staff, skills, style/culture, and shared values. Strategy is the plan of action an organization prepares in response to, or anticipation of, changes in its external environment. Strategy is differentiated by tactics or operational actions by its nature of being premeditated, well thought through and often practically rehearsed. It deals with essentially three questions, (1) where the organization is at this moment in time, (2) where the organization wants to be in a particular length of time and (3) how to get there. Thus, strategy is designed to transform the firm from the present position to the new position described by objectives, subject to constraints of the capabilities or the potential (Kaplan, 2005).

Structure refers to the way in which tasks and people are specialized and divided, and authority is distributed; how activities and reporting relationships are grouped; the mechanisms by which activities in the organization are coordinated (Kaplan, 2005). Organisations are structured in a variety of ways, dependent on their objectives and culture. The structure of the company often dictates the way it operates and performs (Waterman et al., 1980). Traditionally, the businesses have been structured in a hierarchical way with several divisions and departments, each responsible for a specific task such as human resources management, production or marketing. Many layers of management controlled the operations, with each answerable to the upper layer of management. Although this is still the most widely used organisational structure, the recent trend is increasingly towards a flat structure where the work is done in teams of specialists rather than fixed departments. The idea is to make the organization more flexible and devolve the power by empowering the employees and eliminate the middle management layers (Boyle, 2007).
Systems refer to the formal and informal procedures used to manage the organization, including management control systems, performance measurement and reward systems, planning, budgeting and resource allocation systems, and management information systems (Kaplan, 2005). Every organization has some systems or internal processes to support and implement the strategy and run day-to-day affairs. These processes are normally strictly followed and are designed to achieve maximum effectiveness. Traditionally organisations have been following a bureaucratic-style process model where most decisions are taken at the higher management level and there are various and sometimes unnecessary requirements for a specific decision (e.g. procurement of daily use goods) to be taken. Increasingly, organisations are simplifying and modernizing their process by innovation and use of new organizational structure to make the decision-making process quicker. Special emphasis is on the customers with the intention to make the processes that involve customers as user friendly as possible (Lynch, 2005).

Staff refers to the people, their backgrounds and competencies; how the organization recruits, selects, trains, socializes, manages the careers, and promotes employees (Kaplan, 2005). Organisations are made up of humans and it's the people who make the real difference to the success of the organization in the increasingly knowledge-based society. The importance of human resources has thus got the central position in the strategy of the organization, away from the traditional model of capital and land. All leading organisations such as IBM, Microsoft, Cisco, etc put extraordinary emphasis on hiring the best staff, providing them with rigorous training and mentoring support, and pushing their staff to limits in achieving professional excellence, and this forms the basis of these organizations strategy and competitive advantage over their competitors. It is also important for the organization to instill confidence among the employees about their future in the organization and future career growth as an incentive for hard work (Purcell and Boxal, 2003).

Skills refer to the distinctive competencies of the organization; what it does best along dimensions such as people, management practices, processes, systems, organizational structure, and customer relationships (Kaplan, 2005). Style/culture refers to the leadership style of managers – how they spend their time, what they focus attention on,
what questions they ask of employees, how they make decisions; also the organizational
culture (the dominant values and beliefs, the norms, the conscious and unconscious
symbolic acts taken by leaders (job titles, dress codes, executive dining rooms, corporate
jets, informal meetings with employees) (Kaplan, 2005). All organisations have their own
distinct culture and management style. It includes the dominant values, beliefs and norms
which develop over time and become relatively enduring features of the organisational
life. It also entails the way managers interact with the employees and the way they spend
their time. Businesses have traditionally been influenced by the military style of
management and culture where strict adherence to the upper management and procedures
was expected from the lower-rank employees. However, there have been extensive
efforts in the past couple of decades to change the culture to a more open, innovative and
friendly environment with fewer hierarchies and smaller chain of command. Culture
remains an important consideration in the implementation of any strategy in the
organization (Martins and Terblanche, 2003).

Lastly, shared values refer to the core or fundamental set of values that are widely shared
in the organization and serve as guiding principles of what is important; vision, mission,
and values statements that provide a broad sense of purpose for all employees (Kaplan,
2005). All members of the organization share some common fundamental ideas or
guiding concepts around which the business is built. This may be to make money or to
achieve excellence in a particular field. These values and common goals keep the
employees working towards a common destination as a coherent team and are important
to keep the team spirit alive. The organisations with weak values and common goals
often find their employees following their own personal goals that may be different or
even in conflict with those of the organization or their fellow colleagues (Martins and
Terblanche, 2003).

The 7-S model posits that organizations are successful when they achieve an integrated
harmony among three “hard” “S's” of strategy, structure, and systems, and four “soft”
“S's” of skills, staff, style, and super-ordinate goals (now referred to as shared values)
(Kaplan, 2005). The hard components are the strategy, structure and systems which are
normally feasible and easy to identify in an organization as they are normally well
documented and seen in the form of tangible objects or reports such as strategy statements, corporate plans, organisational charts and other documents. The remaining four Ss, however, are more difficult to comprehend. The capabilities, values and elements of corporate culture, for example, are continuously developing and are altered by the people at work in the organization. It is therefore only possible to understand these aspects by studying the organization very closely, normally through observations and/or through conducting interviews. Some linkages, however, can be made between the hard and soft components. For example, it is seen that a rigid, hierarchical organisational structure normally leads to a bureaucratic organisational culture where the power is centralized at the higher management level (Waterman et al., 1980).

2.2.3 Strategy Implementation Challenges

McKinsey 7s framework is a tool that can be used to understand the strategy implementation challenges. The framework suggest the manager should focus on six components to ensure effective implementation, notably structure, system, shared values (culture) skills, style and staff. These six components can be classified into four basic elements which manager can implement stage. These include structure, leadership, culture and system for rewarding performance as well as monitoring and controlling organizational action.

Strategy implementation is quite critical since even the best strategy can fail if not well implemented. These are many organizations characteristics, which act to impede strategy execution (1996). Commitment of top management, involve middle manager’s valuable knowledge, need for communication, integrative point of view, clear assignment of responsibilities, preventive measures against change barriers, emphasize teamwork activities respect for individuals different characters, take advantage of supportive implementation instruments and calculate offer time for unexpected incidents.

According to Hrebiniak (2005), part of the difficulty of execution is due to the obstacles or impediments to it. These include the longer time frames needed for execution: the need for involvement of many people in the execution process; poor or inadequate sharing of information; lack of understanding of organizational structure, including information
sharing and coordination methods; unclear responsibility and accountability in the execution process; and an inability to manage change, including cultural change.

One of major problem experience in strategy implementation is lack of sufficient communication. Aaltonen and Ikavaloko (2001) state that the amount of strategic communication in most of the organizations is large, both written and oral communication issued, mostly in form of top down communications. However a great amount of information does not guarantee understanding and there is still much to be done on the field of communicating strategies. According to Wang (2000), communication should be a two way so that it can provide information to improve understanding and responsibility, and motivate staff. Also they argue that communication should not be seen as a once off activity focusing on announcing the strategy. It should be an on-going activity throughout the implementation process. In many cases it is not so and therefore communication still remains a challenge to strategy implementation process.

Rap (2005) points out that the most important thing when implementing a strategy is the top most management commitment to strategic direction itself. Therefore, top managers must demonstrate their willingness to give energy and loyalty to the implementation process. This demonstrable commitment becomes a positive signal for all the affected organization members.

Clear understanding of strategy is a prerequisite in strategy implementation. Clear understanding of a strategy gives purpose to the activities of each employee and allows them to link whatever task is at hand to the overall organizational direction (Byans et al, 1996). Lack of understanding of a strategy is one of the obstacles of strategy implementation (Aaltonen and Ikava, 2001). They point out that many organizational members typically recognize strategic issues as important and also understand their context in generic terms. However problem, in understanding arise when it comes to applying the strategic issues in the day-day decision making.

Cultural impact underestimation is yet another challenge to strategy implementation. The implementation of a strategy often encounter rough going because of deep-rooted cultural
biases. It causes resistance to implementation of new strategies especially in organizations with defender cultures. This is because they see culture as threatening and tend to favor continuity and security (Wang, 2002). It is the strategy maker's responsibility to choose a strategy that is compatible with the "sacred or unchangeable parts of the prevailing corporate culture (Thomson and Strickland, 1989). This offers a strong challenge to strategy implementer's administrative leadership abilities. Aosa (1992) revealed that lack of compatibility between strategy and culture can lead to high organizational resistance to change and demotivation which can in turn frustrate the strategy implementation. Culture may be factors that drive the strategy rather than the other way round (Karmi, 2002). If the existing culture is antagonistic to a proposed strategy, then it should be identified and changed to be supportive changing a firms culture to fit new strategy is usually more effective than changing a strategy to fit existing culture (David, 1997).

Resource insufficiency is another common strategy implementation challenge. David (2003) argues that allocating resources to particular divisions and department does not mean that strategies will be successful implemented. This is because a number of factors commonly prohibit effective resource allocation. These include, overprotection of resources, too great emphasis on short run financial criteria organizational policies, vague strategy targets, reluctant to take risks, and lack of sufficient knowledge (David 1997). All organization at least have four types of resource which include physical resources, financial resources, human resources and technological resource Thompson, (1990).

Organizations often find it difficult to carry out their strategies because they have executive compensation system that measure and reward performance in a way that ignores or even frustrates strategic thinking, planning and actions MC Carthy et al, 1996). If strategy accomplishment is to be really top priority, then the reward structure must be linked explicitly and tightly to actual strategic performance (Thompson and Strickland, 1998). Bryson (1995) assets that people must be adequately competent for their work. MC Carthy et al, (1996) argue that in many companies, much effort has been put in both strategy formulation and resource strategy formulation and resource allocation process as a way to improve implementation and unfortunately, effort have not been unfortunately,
effort have not been wholly effective because the necessary measurement and rewards systems that completes they cycle is lacking.

Organizational politics unavoidable aspects, remain another key challenge in strategy implementation organization politics are tactics that strategic managers engage in to obtain and use power to influence organizational goods and change strategy and structure to further their own interest (Hill and Jones, 1999). Wang (2000) states that, it is important to overcome the resistance of powerful groups because they may regard the change caused by strategy as a threat to their own power. Top level managers constantly come into conflict over what the correct policy decisions would be, and power struggles and coalition building is a major part of strategic decision making. According to them, the challenge organization face is that the internal structure of power always lags behind changes in the environment changes faster than the organization can respond.

2.2.4 Leadership Commitment

Top management refers to senior-level leaders including presidents, owners, and other high ranking executives (CEO, CFO, COO etc.) and senior-level managers. Several researchers have emphasized the effect of top management on strategy implementation (Lynch, 2007.). Most of them point out the important figurehead role of top management in the process of strategy implementation. Christen (Sept. 2010), for example, take the board as one of the key subjects of strategy implementation and discuss how to assess board effectiveness in guiding strategy execution. Grobner (2008) found that the process of interaction and participation among the top management team typically leads to greater commitment to the firm’s goals and strategies. This, in turn, serves to ensure the successful implementation of the firms chosen strategy.

Bryman (2009) believe that top managers play a critical role in the implementation – not just the formulation of strategy. These studies tend to have a somewhat weak empirical (case) base for their prescriptive advice. Mc Carthy and Cowan (2009) had carried out an empirical study and has tested the following hypotheses: effective senior-level leadership behaviors will be directly related to successful strategy implementation. This hypothesis, however, has resulted in mixed support; those senior-level leaders who have been trained
in or studied strategic planning and implementation are more likely to meet the performance targets set for the company. This hypothesis also resulted in a weak confirmation. More empirical research is needed to clarify the role of top management for strategy implementation.

We can divide the viewpoints and approaches regarding middle management’s effect on strategy implementation into three categories: The first one emphasizes the match of strategy and middle managers leadership style (Nzuve, 2009). This viewpoint assumes that personality is the primary determinant of strategy implementation actions. The second perspective considers the effect of context on behavior. The third one analyzes the impact of relationships between top management and middle management on strategy implementation (Hunger & Wheelen, 2008). Below, we briefly summarize the findings of these studies. Pearce and Robinson (2010) point out that the greater the marketing and sales experience of middle managers, the greater their willingness to take risk, and the greater their tolerance for ambiguity.

Mc Carthy et al. (2009) considers a more comprehensive set of managerial background and personality variables than (Nzuve, 2009). They analyzed the individual managerial characteristics (e.g., functional background, industry familiarity, locus of control, problem-solving style) and competitive strategy and finds that greater R&D experience and greater internal locus of control on the part of the SBU general manager contribute to implementation effectiveness in the case of a differentiation strategy followed by an SBUs, but hamper it for a low-cost strategy SBUs; general managers who have manufacturing experience and who are feeling types contribute to performance in the case of low-cost SBUs, but hamper performance for differentiation-strategy SBUs; experience in general management and industry familiarity are beneficial in a universalistic sense; experience in finance and accounting (surprisingly) has a negative effect on performance.

Pearce and Robinson (2010) found that the level of effort that an individual manager will apply to the implementation of a particular strategy depends on his perception of his and the organization’s potential to perform, and his perception of the likelihood that
successful performance will lead to an outcome that he desires. Managers who believe their self-interest is being compromised can redirect a strategy, delay its implementation, reduce the quality of its implementation, or sabotage the effort by what Pearce and Robinson (2010) call “upward intervention”. Upward intervention, in their conception, may include subversive behaviors such as verbal arguments, objecting memos, coalition formation, the deliberate creation of barriers to implementation, and even sabotage.

Passive intervention can take the form of giving a strategy a low priority or taking too much time implementing strategic decisions, both of which can result in unnecessary delays and inhibit the implementation effort. Doyle (2008) set up a conceptual model of implementation effort by middle managers in a multinational context. He refined Pearce and Robinson (2010) insights by identifying the relative importance of the three determinants of implementation effort: perceived ability, perceived probability of success, and perceived consistency between personal goals and the strategic change goals. As a further extension of this theory, He found that the personal characteristics of the middle managers influence their perceptions. He also found that national culture characteristics influence the perceptions of middle managers.

Doyle (2008) also found that if middle management do not think the strategy is the right one, or do not feel that they have the requisite skills to implement it, then they are likely to sabotage its implementation. He refers to groups within the organization who will inevitably disagree with the strategy. These groups may sabotage strategy implementation by deliberate actions or inactions, if implementing the strategy may reduce their power and influence. Thus, Doyle (2008) sees the perceived ability and perceived consistency between personal goals and the strategic change goals as the decisive “soft” factor. Martin (2003) believes that the approach of matching strategy and managers’ style ignores the causal role of the organizational context or the interaction of personality and context on implementation actions. It is widely accepted that different strategies need to be implemented in different ways. Their study demonstrates, at least in a laboratory setting, that strategy plays a significant role in shaping managers’ intentions. Managers can alter their behaviors to suit different strategy situation.
2.2.5 Organizational Structure

Factors relating to the organizational structure are the second most important implementation barrier according to Quinn (2008) study. Grobbler et al. (2008) see a proper strategy-structure alignment as a necessary precursor to the successful implementation of new business strategies. They point out that changes in the competitive environment require adjustments to the organizational structure. If a firm lags in making this realignment, it may exhibit poor performance and be at a serious competitive disadvantage.

Rowe, Dickel, and Dickel (2004) examines the relationships between SBUs strategies, aspects of the corporate-SBU relationship, and implementation and finds that structures that are more decentralized produce higher levels of SBU effectiveness, regardless of the strategic context. Pearce and Robinson (2010) also suggest that adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy can ensure successful strategy implementation. Different strategy types have different requirements regarding an adequate organizational structure (Mc Carthy & Cowan, 2009).

Lynch (2007.) points out that the fit between business unit strategy and the internal organization of multi-business companies does have an effect on business unit performance. Specifically, business units with pure cost strategies experience higher ROI when they have low autonomy. Pure differentiation strategies benefit, in terms of sales growth, from strong functional coordination (with responsibility for key functions unified under the business unit manager). Similarly, the ROI of cost strategies is, on average, higher when some functional responsibilities are shared.

Hunger and Wheelen (2008) identify a taxonomy comprised of four different combinations of structure/behavior types, which they label as: management dominant, customer-centric innovators, customer-centric cost controllers and middle ground. These alternative structure/behavior types are then matched with specific business strategies (i.e., Prospectors, Analyzers, Low Cost Defenders, Differentiated Defenders) in order to
identify which combination(s) of structures and behaviors best serve to facilitate the process of implementing a specific strategy.

The implementation of strategy typically impacts every part of the organization structure, from the biggest organizational unit to the smallest frontline work group (Esipisu, 2006). All managers therefore become strategic implementers in their area of authority and responsibility. Bryman (2009) argue that transforming strategies into action is a far more complex and difficult task. Implementation of strategy does not therefore automatically follow strategy formulation; if not managed well can invalidate the planning efforts (Aosa, 2007). Structure refers to the way in which tasks and people are specialized and divided, and authority is distributed; how activities and reporting relationships are grouped; the mechanisms by which activities in the organization are coordinated (Doyle, 2008).

Organizations are structured in a variety of ways, dependent on their objectives and culture. The structure of the company often dictates the way it operates and performs (Martin, 2003). Traditionally, the businesses have been structured in a hierarchical way with several divisions and departments, each responsible for a specific task such as human resources management, production or marketing. Many layers of management controlled the operations, with each answerable to the upper layer of management. Although this is still the most widely used organizational structure, the recent trend is increasingly towards a flat structure where the work is done in teams of specialists rather than fixed departments. The idea is to make the organization more flexible and devolve the power by empowering the employees and eliminate the middle management layers (Christen, 2010).

2.2.6 Staff Commitment

Hunger and Wheelen (2008) suggests that there are many problems which over half of the corporations experienced frequently, such as the involved employees have insufficient capabilities to perform their jobs, lower-level employees are inadequately trained, and departmental managers provide inadequate leadership and direction. These three are the most frequent strategy implementation problems in relation to human
resource. Line-level employees may use delay or prevent attempts toward change that they find particularly threatening or disagreeable. Martin (2003) suggests that managerial tactics and leadership style can play a crucial role in overcoming the lower-level obstructionism that is prevalent (to some degree) in many implementation efforts.

Strategic decisions are nevertheless formulated by senior-level managers of the firm and then administratively imposed on lower-level management and non-management employees with little consideration of the resulting functional-level perceptions (McCarthy & Cowan, 2009). If lower-level management and non-management personnel are not aware of the same information, or if information must pass through several (management) layers in the organization, consensus regarding that information may never come about. Thus, the lack of shared knowledge with lower-level management and non-management employees creates a barrier to successful strategy implementation.

Nzuve (2009) think that the shared understanding of middle management and those at the operational level to the top management team’s strategic goals is of critical importance to effective implementation. Strategy implementation efforts may fail if the strategy does not enjoy support and commitment by the majority of employees and middle management. This may be the case if they were not consulted during the development phase.

Pearce and Robinson (2010), thinks that obtaining employee commitment and involvement can promote successful strategy implementation (on the basis of telephone interviews with CEOs). Some CEOs believe that one way to accomplish this is to involve employees and managers right from the start in the strategy formulation process. Involvement and commitment should also be developed and maintained throughout the implementation process. If middle and lower level managers and key subordinates are permitted to be involved with the detailed implementation planning, their commitment will be likely to increase.

Quinn, Mintzberg, and James (2008) suggest that there are three fundamentally different sources of low to negative individual manager commitment to implementing a particular strategy: low perceived ability to perform successfully in implementing that strategy; low
perceived probability that the proposed outcomes will result, even if individual performance is successful; low capacity of the outcome to satisfy individual goals/needs. Middle managers with low or negative commitment to the strategies formulated by senior management create significant obstacles to effective implementation.

Davis et al. (2007) put forward three dimensions of commitment that emerged as central factors which directly influence strategic outcomes: organizational commitment, strategy commitment and role commitment. Organizational commitment is defined as the extent to which a person identifies with and works toward organization-related goals and values (McCarthy & Cowan, 2009). Strategy commitment is defined as the extent to which a manager comprehends and supports the goals and objectives of a marketing strategy.

Role commitment is defined as the extent to which a manager is determined to perform his individual implementation responsibilities well, regardless of his beliefs about the overall strategy. The primary dependent variable in Quinn, Mintzberg, and James (2008) study is implementation success, which they define as the extent to which an implementation effort is considered successful by the organization. At the individual level, role performance is a critical outcome which they define as the degree to which a manager achieves the goals and objectives of a particular role and facilitates the overall success of the implementation effort. Quinn et al. (2008) findings suggest that an individual manager’s implementation role performance will influence the overall success of the implementation effort. Both, strategy commitment and role commitment, were shown to influence role performance. However, the most commonly studied dimension, organizational commitment, showed no relationship to role performance in either of their samples.

Their results highlight the complexity of functions unified under the business unit manager). Similarly, the ROI of cost strategies is, on average, higher when some functional responsibilities are shared. Olson, Slater, and Hult (2005) identify a taxonomy comprised of four different combinations of structure/behavior types, which they label as: management dominant, customer-centric innovators, customer-centric cost controllers and middle ground. These alternative structure/behavior types are then matched with
specific business strategies (i.e., Prospectors, Analyzers, Low Cost Defenders, Differentiated Defenders) in order to identify which combination(s) of structures and behaviors best serve to facilitate the process of implementing a specific strategy.

2.2.7 Communication

Communication may be aptly described as the life blood of business, every organizations has culture on how they communicate. No business can develop in the absence of effective communication since favorable dealings with outside company contacts and effective relationships within an organization depend upon communication without timely communication of accurate information, management cannot effectively conduct its function of organizing, directing, controlling and coordinating the activities of an enterprises nor can it maintain its external agreement that the main purpose of all communication in the organization is the general welfare of the organization. Thus effective communication is needed at all stages in order to cultivate good corporate image for a company and to build mutual long term relationship with outside publics. Administrative communication is a process which involves the transmission and accurate replication of ideas ensured by feedback for purpose of eliciting actions which accomplish organization goals (Lynch, 2007)

Lynch (2007.) rightly notes that, “although an entire discipline is devoted to the study of organizational strategy, including strategy implementation; little attention has been given to the links between communication and strategy.” But he also note that business communication researchers have become increasingly interested in the contribution of corporate communication to a company’s ability to create and disseminate its strategy in the last decade. However, very few authors have investigated the link between corporate communication and strategy, and – when they have – their focus has primarily been on how corporate communication affects the firm’s relationship with its various stakeholders.

At least, numerous researchers have already emphasized the importance of communication for the process of strategy implementation (Martin, 2003). That research in this area is needed is emphasized by an older finding by Martin (2003). Based on
interviews with 21 presidents and 25 governmental agency heads, he pointed out that communication is mentioned more frequently than any other single item promoting successful strategy implementation. The content of such communications includes clearly explaining what new responsibilities, tasks, and duties need to be performed by the affected employees. It also includes the why behind changed job activities, and more fundamentally the reasons why the new strategic decision was made firstly.

Mc Carthy and Cowan (2009) found that organizations where employees have easy access to management through open and supportive communication climates tend to outperform those with more restrictive communication environments. Also the findings of Peng and Litteljohn (2001) show that effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation. Organizational communication plays an important role in training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation. In fact, communication is pervasive in every aspect of strategy implementation, as it relates in a complex way to organizing processes, organizational context and implementation objectives which, in turn, have an effect on the process of implementation.

Communication barriers are reported more frequently than any other type of barriers, such as organizational structure barriers, learning barriers, personnel management barriers, or cultural barriers. Heide, Grønhaug, and Johannessen (2002), for example, indicate that there are various types of communication problems (without specifying what they are). These communication issues may be influenced to some extent by the organizational structure.

According to Mc Carthy and Cowan (2009), they constitute the key barrier to the implementation of planned strategic activities. Rapert, Velliquette and Garretson (2002) state that communication and shared understandings play an important role in the implementation process. In particular, when vertical communication is frequent, strategic consensus (shared understanding about strategic priorities) is enhanced and an organization's performance improves. They explore vertical communication linkages as a means by which strategic consensus and performance can be enhanced. The study of
Schaap (2006), which was conducted in the casino industry within the state of Nevada, shows that over 38 percent of the senior-level leaders do not communicate the company’s direction and business strategy to all of their subordinates. This study also reinforces findings that frequent communication up and down in organization enhances strategic consensus through the fostering of shared attitudes and values. The corporate communication function is the department or unit whose purpose is to facilitate strategy implementation through communication. This department can also serve as the “antenna of an organization, receiving reactions from key constituencies to the strategy of the firm. Davis et al. (2007) found that the alignment between the corporate communication function and the strategic implementation process was particularly visible in those companies that were going through fundamental strategic change: “All of the firms studied were involved in significant efforts in internal communications and felt that IT was central to the success of the function, particularly in terms of implementing strategy and building reputation.

2.3 Critical Review of major issues

The problem with strategy implementation is the de facto success rate of intended strategies. In research studies it is as low at 10 percent (Nzuve, 2009). Despite this abysmal record, strategy implementation does not seem to be a popular topic at all. In fact, some managers mistake implementation as a strategic afterthought and a pure top-down-approach. Instead, management spends most of its attention on strategy formulation. Research emphasizing strategy implementation is classified by Pearce and Robinson (2010) as part of a first wave of studies proposing structural views as important facilitators for strategy implementation success. Beyond the preoccupation of many authors with firm structure, a second wave of investigations advocated interpersonal processes and issues as crucial to any marketing strategy implementation effort (Noble, 2009). Conflicting empirical results founded upon contrasting theoretical premises indicate that strategy implementation is a complex phenomenon. In response, generalizations have been advanced in the form of encouraging: early involvement in the strategy process by firm members (Martin, 2003)); fluid processes for adaptation and
adjustment (Pearce & Robinson 2010); and, leadership style and structure (McCarthy & Cowan, 2009).

There are also studies that have examined the ambiguous relationships between top management and middle management in the context of strategy implementation: On the one hand, middle managers expect direction and support from their top management. If they receive this guidance, then they will provide support for the strategy in return. One of the key factors determining their level of support is their demographic situation (such as age, gender, educational background, and business experience). On the other hand, top management should expect middle-level managers to question strategic decisions (Rowe, Dickel & Dickel, 2004).

Middle managers expect top management direction, but frequently feel that they are in a better position to start and evaluate alternative courses of action. Esipisu (2006), consequently classify middle management involvement in strategy into four types: championing alternatives, synthesizing information, facilitating adaptability and implementing deliberate strategy. The first two represent upward forms of involvement, while the last two are downward forms. Esipisu (2006) also investigated the relationships between middle managers’ formal position, their strategic influence and organizational performance.

Their findings suggest that managers with formal positions in boundary-spanning sub-units report higher levels of strategic influence activities than others; firm performance is associated with more uniform levels of downward strategic influence, and more varied levels of upward influence among middle management cohorts; middle managers’ strategic influence arises from their ability to mediate between internal and external environments. In addition, positive effects on organizational performance appear to depend on whether the overall pattern of upward influence is conducive to shifts in the network centrality of individual managers, and whether the pattern of downward influence is consistent with an appropriate balance between the organization’s need for control and flexibility.
Lynch (2007.) found out that the process of communication involves the communication of ideas. The ideas should be accurately replicated (reproduced) in the receiver’s mind that is the receiver should get exactly the same ideas as were transmitted. The transmitter is assured of the accurate replication of the ideas by feedback. The response of communication is to elicit action. The purposes of communication are. Establish and disseminate the purpose of an enterprise. Develop plans for their achievements. Organize human and other resources in the most effective and efficient way. Select, develop and apprise members of the organization. Lead, direct, motivate and create a climate in which people want to contribute.

2.4 Critique of the Review

The past studies explained in theoretical review demonstrated an effort towards identifying the challenges affecting strategy implementation in organizations. Though this was conducted by different researchers with different views an effective conclusion was not arrived at, their studies involved suggestions and assumptions which could not be relied upon in times of identifying the challenges affecting strategy implementation in organizations. All the past researchers focused on the service delivery in general but they failed to clearly identify the exact factors, the information obtained failed to cover much of the areas under concern.

2.5 Research Gaps

There are many challenges affecting strategy implementation in organizations, some of these factors have been explored by past researchers and were explained in the empirical review of the study. However, the major challenges that are addressed by the study objectives have not been adequately explored and this leaves some major gaps that need to be filled by further research undertakings.

2.6 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework is defined as the result of when a researcher conceptualizes the relationship between variables in the study and shows the relationship graphically or diagrammatically (Kothari, 2006). The conceptual framework allows the quantitative
conceptualization; operationalization, data collection and measurement of the variables identified (Kuul, 2004). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), conceptual framework also presents the various variables in the study. This study is based on the examination of the relationship between the independent variables (Leadership, organization structure, staff commitment and communication) and the dependent variable (effective implementation of strategies at KEBS).

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership commitment</td>
<td>Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Introduction

This chapter elaborates the research methodology of the study. A design was used to give structure of the research to clearly show how the major parts of research data were compiled and all the methods used in data collection and analysis. This chapter will therefore focus on research design, target population, sample selected and sampling methods.

3.2 Research Design

This was the overall plan of conducting the study in order to answer the research questions and achieve the objective of the study. The study research design was a descriptive one since it provided data from the population on the universe being studied; the researcher had no control over the research variables. Descriptive research design describes data and characteristics about the population or phenomenon being studied. Descriptive research answers the questions who, what, where, when and how. The descriptive research design was appropriate in this type of research because the objective was to provide a systematic description that was as factual and accurate as possible. It provided the number of times something occurred or frequency; the researcher had no control over the variables, only controlled the existing happenings or what has happened (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999).

3.3 Population

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) refers to population as a totality of all elements, subjects, or members that possess a specific set of one or more common characters that define it. The target population was obtained from Kenya Bureau of Standards head office Nairobi central business district. Kenya Bureau of Standards has about 1000 employees. The study targeted a sample population of 100 respondents working at the head office.
Employees are divided into three categories which are Top level management staff, Mid level management staff and junior staff as tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top level Management Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-level Management Staff</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Sample Design

A sampling technique refers to the procedures used to select a representative sample from the target population (Kothari, 2004). This involved the procedures applied to get the representative sample from the target population. A sampling technique refers to the procedures used to select a representative sample from the target population. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select respondents. Stratified random sampling was appropriate for this study because the population is composed of different categories of staff, right from top management to subordinate staff.

Through simple random sampling, 100 respondents were drawn from the target population of 1000 respondents from Kenya Bureau of Standards human resource department. The study will select staff members working at the Kenya Bureau of Standards offices. These methods enabled the researcher to select respondents who provided reliable information on the factors affecting effective strategy implementation.

To enable generalization of the research findings and to increase the validity of the gathered data, the sample size selected should not have less than 10% of the accessible population for descriptive research (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).
Table 3.2: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/ Department</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>% Of Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level management staff</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Data collection instruments

The study aims at making use of both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected using questionnaires. Questionnaires was developed and divided into sections and each section addressed each specific objective and research questions of the study. A questionnaire consisting of a number of questions in parts printed in a defined order on a given form was given to all employees to fill spaces as specified. Both open and close ended questions were used.

Questionnaires are written statements designed to gather both qualitative and quantitative data. They were distributed through e-mail and hand delivery to the target respondents.

Qualitative and Quantitative techniques were employed. Qualitative research is exploratory in nature and results in depth non numerical information. It deals with less tangible and measurable topics and allows for close examination of motives, perceptions, beliefs and attitudes. Good qualitative research can lead to valuable insights being gained regarding people’s subjective perceptions; their deep rooted beliefs and feelings. As such it is a very valuable tool in understanding people’s motivations and attitudes.

Quantitative research is used to measure how many people feel, think or act in a particular way. Structured questionnaires are usually used incorporating mainly closed
questions - questions with set responses. This methodology generates numerical data, provides uniformity in data-collection, eliminates variations in the way questions are asked, and offers a standard format for recording answers. The data collected is tabulated and can be further analyzed using statistical techniques such as SPSS. One key advantage of quantitative research is that with careful sampling, the findings can be projected to the whole universe.

3.6 Pilot Study

The purpose of pre-testing the instruments is to ensure that the items in the instruments are stated clearly and have the same meaning to all respondents. Questionnaires were pilot tested in the three categories of the target population which was randomly selected (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

3.7 Data Processing and Analysis

According to Kothari (2004), data analysis procedure includes the process of packaging the collected information putting in order and structuring its main components in a way that the findings can be easily and effectively communicated. Data was analysed using qualitative analysis. Qualitative data analysis seeks to make general statements on how categories or themes of data are related (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The qualitative analysis was done using content analysis. Content analysis is the systematic qualitative description of the composition of the objects or materials of the study (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). It involves observation and detailed description of objects, items or things that comprise the object of study.

The themes (variables) that was used in the analysis was broadly classified into two: strategy implementation process and factors influencing strategy implementation. The McKinsey’s 7-S model was used as a guide on the themes of analysis as concerns the strategy implementation challenges.

Data was coded using MAXQDA, a qualitative analysis tool that can be used to code interviews for qualitative analysis. The analysis was performed with the aid of SPSS based on the objectives the study sought to attain. Where possible, factor analysis was
performed to ascertain the challenges of strategy implementation at Kenya Bureau of standards.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the interpretation and presentation of the findings. This chapter presents analysis of the data on the analysis on various factors that influence strategy implementation and explore the best approaches that could be adopted to facilitate effective implementation of strategy in the Government corporations in Kenya. The chapter also provides the major findings and results of the case study and discusses those findings and results against the literature review chapter.

4.1.1 Response Rate

The study targeted a total of 100 respondents. However, only 72 respondents responded and returned their questionnaires contributing to 72% response rate. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is excellent; therefore, this response rate is adequate for analysis and reporting. The researcher made use of frequency tables, graphs and charts to present data.

4.1.2 Reliability Analysis

The researcher carried out a pilot study to pretest the validity and reliability of data collected using the questionnaire before the actual study. The pilot study allowed for pretesting of the research instrument.
Table 4.1: Reliability Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership commitment</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization structure</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff commitment</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability of the questionnaire was evaluated through Cronbach’s Alpha which measures the internal consistency. The Alpha measures internal consistency by establishing if certain item measures the same construct. Cronbach’s Alpha was established for every objective in order to determine if each scale (objective) would produce consistent results should the research be done later on. Table 4.1 shows that all the scales were significant, having an Alpha above the prescribed threshold of 0.6. Staff commitment had an Alpha of 0.926, communication had an alpha of 0.73 leadership commitment had an alpha of 0.792 and organization structure had an Alpha of 0.695. The findings of the pilot study shows that all the four scales were reliable as their reliability values exceeded the prescribed threshold of 0.7 (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

4.2 General Information

Figure 4.1: Gender of the respondents
The study sought to find out the gender of the respondents. According to the findings, 53% of the respondents were male while 47% were female.

Table 4.2: Age of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 30 yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 51 yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out the age of the respondents. From the findings, 38.89% of the respondents were aged 41 to 50 years, 33.33% of the respondents were aged 31 to 40 years, 19.44% of the respondents were aged above 51 years and 8.33% of the respondents were aged 18 to 30 years.

Table 4.3: Highest education level of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate/Diploma</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out the highest education level of the respondents. According to the findings, 52.78% of the respondents had a Certificate/Diploma, 25.00% of the respondents had a Degree, 13.89% of the respondents had a KCSE certificate and 8.33% of the respondents had a Post Graduate.

Table 4.4: Working experience of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34
11 to 20 years | 8 | 11.11
21 years and above | 4 | 5.56
Total | 72 | 100.00

The study sought to find out the working experience of the respondents. From the findings, 58.33% of the respondents had worked for 6 to 10 years, 25.00% of the respondents had worked for 1 to 5 years, 11.11% of the respondents had worked for 11 to 20 years and 5.56% of the respondents had worked for 21 years and above.

4.3 Leadership Commitment

Figure 4.2: If leadership commitment affected strategy implementation

The study sought to find out if leadership commitment affected strategy implementation. According to the findings, 89% of the respondents indicated that leadership commitment affected strategy implementation while 11% of the respondents indicated that leadership commitment did not affect strategy implementation. Doyle (2008) also found that if middle management do not think the strategy is the right one, or do not feel that they have the requisite skills to implement it, then they are likely to sabotage its implementation.

The study sought to find out how leadership commitment affected implementation of strategies. From the findings, the respondents indicated that the process of interaction and participation among the top management team typically leads to greater commitment to
the firm's goals and strategies. This, in turn, serves to ensure the successful implementation of the firm's chosen strategy. Several researchers have emphasized the effect of top management on strategy implementation (Lynch, 2007.). Most of them point out the important figurehead role of top management in the process of strategy implementation. The greater the marketing and sales experience of middle managers, the greater their willingness to take risk, and the greater their tolerance for ambiguity. Managers who believe their self-interest is being compromised can redirect a strategy, delay its implementation, reduce the quality of its implementation, or sabotage the effort.

Table 4.5: Leadership style that were in the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out the leadership style that was in the organization. From the findings, 58.33% of the respondents indicated that the organization used autocratic leadership style, 37.50% of the respondents indicated that the organization used laissez-faire leadership style and 4.17% of the respondents indicated that the organization used democratic leadership style.

Figure 4.3: Whether leadership styles influenced strategy implementation
The study sought to find out whether leadership styles influenced strategy implementation. According to the findings, 83% of the respondents indicated that leadership styles influenced strategy implementation while 17% of the respondents indicated that leadership styles did not influence strategy implementation. Martin (2003) believes that the approach of matching strategy and managers’ style ignores the causal role of the organizational context or the interaction of personality and context on implementation actions. It is widely accepted that different strategies need to be implemented in different ways.

4.4 Organization structure

Table 4.6: If organization structure affected strategy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out if organization structure affected strategy implementation. From the findings, 83.33% of the respondents indicated that organization structure affected strategy implementation and 16.67% of the respondents indicated that organization structure did not affect strategy implementation. Pearce and Robinson (2010) also suggest that adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy can ensure successful strategy implementation. Different strategy types have different requirements regarding an adequate organizational structure (Mc Carthy & Cowan, 2009).

The study sought to find out how organization structure affected strategy implementation. According to the findings, the respondents indicated that this was through objectives and culture of the organizations. Organizations are structured in a variety of ways, dependent on their objectives and culture. The structure of the company often dictates the way it operates and performs (Martin, 2003).
The study sought to find out whether the respondents encountered problems with the current organization structure during strategy implementation. According to the findings, 81% of the respondents indicated that they encountered problems with the current organization structure during strategy implementation while 19% of the respondents indicated that they did not encounter problems with the current organization structure during strategy implementation. Lynch (2007,) points out that the fit between business unit strategy and the internal organization of multi-business companies does have an effect on business unit performance. The implementation of strategy typically impacts every part of the organization structure, form the biggest organizational unit to the smallest frontline work group (Esipisu, 2006).

The study sought to find out the measures to counter the problem. From the findings, the respondents indicated that transforming strategies into action is a far more complex and difficult task. Implementation of strategy does not automatically follow strategy formulation; if not managed well can invalidate the planning efforts.
4.5 Staff Commitment

Table 4.7: If staff commitment affected strategy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out if staff commitment affected strategy implementation. From the findings, 94.44% of the respondents indicated that staff commitment affected strategy implementation while 5.56% of the respondents indicated that staff commitment did not affect strategy implementation. Pearce and Robinson (2010), thinks that obtaining employee commitment and involvement can promote successful strategy implementation (on the basis of telephone interviews with CEOs).

The study sought to find out how staff commitment affected strategy implementation. According to the findings, the respondents indicated that lack of shared knowledge with lower-level management and non-management employees creates a barrier to successful strategy implementation. The shared understanding of middle management and those at the operational level to the top management team's strategic goals is of critical importance to effective implementation. Strategy implementation efforts may fail if the strategy does not enjoy support and commitment by the majority of employees and middle management. This may be the case if they were not consulted during the development phase.
The study sought to find out whether management style played any role in staff commitment. According to the findings, 90% of the respondents indicated that management style played role in staff commitment while 10% of the respondents indicated that management style did not play any role in staff commitment. Martin (2003) suggests that managerial tactics and leadership style can play a crucial role in overcoming the lower-level obstructionism that is prevalent (to some degree) in many implementation efforts.

Table 4. 8: If lower level staff played any role in implementation of the strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out if lower level staff played any role in implementation of the strategy. From the findings, 69.44% of the respondents indicated that lower level staff played role in implementation of the strategy while 30.56% of the respondents indicated that lower level staff did not play any role in implementation of the strategy. Strategic decisions are nevertheless formulated by senior-level managers of the firm and then administratively imposed on lower-level management and non-management employees with little consideration of the resulting functional-level perceptions (Mc Carthy & Cowan, 2009). If lower-level management and non-management personnel are not aware
of the same information, or if information must pass through several (management) layers in the organization, consensus regarding that information may never come about.

4.6 Communication

**Figure 4.6: If communication affected strategy implementation**

The study sought to find out if communication affected strategy implementation. According to the findings, 97% of the respondents indicated that communication affected strategy implementation and 3% of the respondents indicated that communication did not affect strategy implementation. Numerous researchers have already emphasized the importance of communication for the process of strategy implementation (Martin, 2003). Also the findings of Peng and Litteljohn (2001) show that effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation.

The study sought to find out how communication affected strategy implementation. According to the findings, the respondents indicated that effective communication is needed at all stages in order to cultivate good corporate image for a company and to build mutual long term relationship with outside publics. Organizational communication plays an important role in training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation. In fact, communication is pervasive in every aspect of strategy implementation, as it relates in a complex way to organizing processes, organizational context and implementation objectives which, in turn, have an effect on the process of implementation (Peng & Litteljohn, 2001).
Table 4.9: Whether effective communication resulted to effective strategy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out whether effective communication resulted to effective strategy implementation. From the findings, 94.44% of the respondents indicated that effective communication resulted to effective strategy implementation while 5.56% of the respondents indicated that effective communication did not result to effective strategy implementation. Communication is mentioned more frequently than any other single item promoting successful strategy implementation (Martin, 2003).

Table 4.10: Whether there is relationship between communication and organization structure during strategy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out whether there is relationship between communication and organization structure during strategy implementation. According to the findings, 88.89% of the respondents indicated that there was relationship between communication and organization structure during strategy implementation while 11.11% of the respondents indicated that there was no relationship between communication and organization structure during strategy implementation. Mc Carthy and Cowan (2009) found that organizations where employees have easy access to management through open and supportive communication climates tend to outperform those with more restrictive communication environments.
4.7 Other Factors

Figure 4. 7: If there are other factor that facilitates or impedes effective strategy implementation at KEBS

The study sought to find out if there are other factors that facilitates or impedes effective strategy implementation at KEBS. From the findings, 62% of the respondents indicated that other factors facilitated or impeded effective strategy implementation at KEBS while 38% of the respondents indicated that other factors did not facilitate or impede effective strategy implementation at KEBS. McKinsey’s (1982) 7-S model describes the seven factors critical for effective strategy execution. The 7-S model identifies the seven factors as strategy, structure, systems, staff, skills, style/culture, and shared values.

4.8 Regression analysis

In this study, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the influence among predictor variables. The research used statistical package for social sciences (SPSS V 17.0) to code, enter and compute the measurements of the multiple regressions.

Table 4.11: Results of multiple regression between effective strategy implementation (dependent variable) and the combined effect of the selected predictors

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.0614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R-Square (coefficient of determination) is a commonly used statistic to evaluate model fit. R-square is 1 minus the ratio of residual variability. The adjusted \( R^2 \), also called the coefficient of multiple determinations, is the percent of the variance in the dependent explained uniquely or jointly by the independent variables. 70.3% of the changes in the effective strategy implementation variables could be attributed to the combined effect of the predictor variables.

Table 4.12: ANOVA results of the regression analysis between effective strategy implementation and predictor variables

<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</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>4.1023</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: Staff commitment, Leadership commitment, Organizational structure, Communication.

b. Dependent Variable: Performances of businesses run by women.

The probability value of 0.0002 indicates that the regression relationship was highly significant in predicting how staff commitment, leadership commitment, organizational structure, communication influenced effective strategy implementation. The F critical at 5% level of significance was 4.1023 since F calculated is greater than the F critical (value = 2.830), this shows that the overall model was significant.

Table 4.13: Regression coefficients of the relationship between effective strategy implementation and the four predictive variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The regression equation above has established that taking all factors into account (staff commitment, leadership commitment, mobile banking services, and communication) constant at zero effective strategy implementation will be 2.781. The findings presented also show that taking all other independent variables at zero, a unit increase in staff commitment would lead to a 0.834 increase in the effective strategy implementation. Further, the findings show that a unit increase in communication would lead to a 0.705 increase in effective strategy implementation. In addition, the findings show that a unit increase in leadership commitment would lead to a 0.681 increase in effective strategy implementation. The study also found that a unit increase in the scores of mobile banking services would lead to a 0.484 increase in effective strategy implementation. Overall, organizational structure services had the least effect on effective strategy implementation and staff commitment had the highest effect.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The chapter provides the summary of the findings from chapter four, and it also gives the conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the objectives of the study. The objectives of this study were to investigate the factors that influence strategy implementation in the Government corporations in Kenya.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The study aimed at establishing the effect of leadership on strategy implementation, to establish the effect of organizational structure on strategy implementation, to establish the effect of staff commitment on strategy implementation and to establish the effect of communication on strategy implementation.

5.2.1 Leadership Commitment

The study found that leadership commitment affected strategy implementation. The process of interaction and participation among the top management team typically leads to greater commitment to the firm’s goals and strategies. The organization used autocratic leadership style. Leadership styles influenced strategy implementation.

5.2.2 Organization structure

The study found that organization structure affected strategy implementation. This is through objectives and culture of the organizations. Organizations are structured in a variety of ways, dependent on their objectives and culture. They encountered problems with the current organization structure during strategy implementation. Transforming strategies into action is a far more complex and difficult task. Implementation of strategy does not automatically follow strategy formulation; if not managed well can invalidate the planning efforts.

5.2.3 Staff commitment

The study found that staff commitment affected strategy implementation. Lack of shared knowledge with lower-level management and non-management employees creates a barrier to successful strategy implementation. The shared understanding of middle management and those at the operational level to the top management team’s strategic goals is of critical importance to effective implementation. Strategy implementation efforts may fail if the strategy does not enjoy support and commitment by the majority of employees and middle management. Management style played role in staff commitment. Lower level staff played role in implementation of the strategy.
5.2.4 Communication

The study found that communication affected strategy implementation. Effective communication is needed at all stages in order to cultivate good corporate image for a company and to build mutual long term relationship with outside publics. Organizational communication plays an important role in training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation. Effective communication resulted to effective strategy implementation. There was relationship between communication and organization structure during strategy implementation. Other factors facilitated or impeded effective strategy implementation at KEBS.

5.3 Conclusions

The study concludes that there was effect of top management on strategy implementation. The process of interaction and participation among the top management team typically leads to greater commitment to the firm’s goals and strategies. Top managers play a critical role in the implementation and formulation of strategy. The level of effort that an individual manager will apply to the implementation of a particular strategy depends on his perception of his and the organization’s potential to perform, and his perception of the likelihood that successful performance will lead to an outcome that he desires.

The study concludes that organization structure affected strategy implementation. Proper strategy-structure alignment is a necessary precursor to the successful implementation of new business strategies. Adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy can ensure successful strategy implementation. The implementation of strategy typically impacts every part of the organization structure, form the biggest organizational unit to the smallest frontline work group.

The study concludes that line-level employees may use delay or prevent attempts toward change that they find particularly threatening or disagreeable. Managerial tactics and leadership style can play a crucial role in overcoming the lower-level obstructionism that is prevalent (to some degree) in many implementation efforts. Lack of shared knowledge with lower-level management and non-management employees creates a barrier to successful strategy implementation.

The study concludes that communication affected strategy implementation. Effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation. Organizational communication plays an important role in training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation.

5.4 Recommendations

The study recommends top managers to demonstrate their willingness to give energy and loyalty to the implementation process. Sufficient resources should be provided for strategy implementation. Top management team should be encouraged to interact to ensure greater commitment to the firm’s goals and strategies.

Managers of the organization should consider the strength and weakness of the organization before formulating and implementing strategies. Strategy implementation requires a good strategic architecture of the organization thus managers should therefore take into account how various parts of the organization work together in a manner that
optimizes resource utilization before strategy implementation. Organizations need to be structured depending on their objectives and culture. The study recommends organization to have vision, mission, and values statements that provide a broad sense of purpose for all employees. Organizational structure should be adjusted according to perfect strategy. The study recommends employees to be included in decision making. Involvement and commitment should be developed and maintained throughout the implementation process. Middle and lower level managers and key subordinates should be permitted to be involved with the detailed implementation planning. The study recommends managers to encourage and promote effective communication at all stages in order to cultivate good corporate image for a company and to build mutual long term relationship with outside publics. Strategies should be clearly communicated to all employees.

5.5 Recommendations for further research

A similar study could be carried out in other organizations to find out whether the same results will be obtained. The study focused on government corporate thus a comparison study should be carried out comparing the strategy implementation in government corporate and private companies.
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APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1: INSTRUCTIONS

Please tick the most appropriate response to questions that give possible answers and write down your answers in the spaces provide open ended questions. Your response to the questions will be held with utmost confidentiality and will not be revealed to anyone. For that reason you do not need to write your name in this questionnaire.

PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of your Department ..................................................

2. Job Title ........................................................................

Tick as appropriate

1. Gender:

   Male [  ]

   Female [  ]

2. Indicate age bracket:
18 to 30 yrs [ ]
31 to 40 yrs [ ]
41 to 50 yrs [ ]
Above 51 yrs [ ]

3. Highest Education Level

KCSE [ ]
Certificate/Diploma [ ]
Degree [ ]
Post Graduate [ ]
Any other please specify

4. Working experience

☐ Below 1 year
☐ 1 to 5 years
☐ 6 to 10 years
☐ 11 to 20 years
☐ 21 years and above

PART B: Leadership Commitment

Does leadership commitment affect strategy implementation?

(a) Yes [ ]
(b) No [ ]
If yes, how does it affect implementation of strategies? (Explain)
What Leadership style do you have in your organization?

(a) Democratic [ ]
(b) Autocratic [ ]
(c) Laissez-faire [ ]

Do you think the leadership styles influence strategy implementation?

(a) Yes [ ]
(b) No [ ]

PART C: Organization structure

Does organization structure affect strategy implementation?

(a) Yes [ ]
(b) No [ ]

If Yes, how does organization structure affect strategy implementation?

Does you encounter problems with the current organization structure during strategy implementation?
If Yes, what measures are there to counter the problem?

PART D: Staff Commitment

Does staff commitment affect strategy implementation?

(a) Yes  [  ]

(b) No  [  ]

If yes, how does staff commitment affect strategy implementation? (Explain)

Does management style play any role in staff commitment?

(a) Yes  [  ]

(b) No  [  ]

Do you think lower level staff plays any role in implementation of the strategy? (Explain)

(a) Yes  [  ]

(b) No  [  ]

PART E: Communication

Does communication affect strategy implementation?

(a) Yes  [  ]
If Yes, how does communication affect strategy implementation? (Explain)

Does effective communication result to effective strategy implementation?
(a) Yes [  ]
(b) No [  ]

Is there relationship between communication and organization structure during strategy implementation?
(a) Yes [  ]
(b) No [  ]

PART F: Other Factors
Is there any other factor that facilitates or impedes effective strategy implementation at KEBS?
(a) Yes [  ]
(b) No [  ]

If Yes, please mention below.

..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................