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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the critical success factors that influence strategy implementation at USIU. The study addressed the following objectives; to identify leadership, organization resource allocation factors, and effects of organization culture on strategy implementation at USIU.

This study adopted a descriptive research design, and a sample of seventy respondents was selected. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected, where Simple random sampling and purposive sampling were used to administer data collection instruments for the varying groups. The study used questionnaires and one on one interview sessions as data collection instruments. The questionnaire data was analysed using descriptive statistics. Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) was used to conduct analysis of the data.

The findings of the study revealed that there is clear communication from top management regarding matters of strategy implementation. The responses also revealed that the leadership is involved in the process and in turn inspired and supported employee’s commitment towards attaining objectives of USIU. The study also revealed that the university structure adequately supports strategy implementation thorough its ability to allocate resources, formulate functional objectives and plan for operational effectiveness. However a considerable number of respondents felt that there was a challenge with allocation of adequate resources to uphold the implementation process.

A culture-strategy fit was also established. The new leadership demonstrated a clear understanding of the strategy process while exhibiting openness to organization culture. More so, the university showed preparedness towards embracing the change in the business environment to promote the strategy implementation process.

The study recommends that leadership should endorse reward systems that will influence team members to own the process. Talent of individuals should also be identified and developed to surge inner capabilities for successful implementation of strategy. USIU should also consider creative ideas for sourcing of additional funds and resources to support the strategy implementation process.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Managing activities internal to the firm is only part of the modern executive’s responsibilities. The modern executive also must respond to the challenges posed by the
firm’s immediate and remote external environments. The immediate external environment includes competitors, suppliers, increasingly scarce resources, government agencies and their ever numerous regulations and customers whose preferences often shift inexplicably. The remote external environment comprises economic and social conditions, political priorities, and technological developments, all of which must be anticipated, monitored, assessed and incorporated into the executive’s decision making. However, the executive is compelled to subordinate the demands of the firm’s internal activities and external environment to the multiple and often inconsistent requirements of its stakeholders; owners, top managers, employees, communities, customers, and country. To deal effectively with everything that affects growth and profitability of a firm, executives employ management processes that will position it optimally in its competitive environment by maximizing anticipation of environmental changes and of unexpected internal and competitive demands (Pearce and Robinson, 2005). This all-encompassing approach calls for strategic management.

A Strategy is viewed as a means of deliberately choosing a different set of activities to deliver a unique mix of value. Strategy is about; competitive position, differentiating ‘yourself’ in the eyes of the customer, and adding value through a mix of activities different from those used by competitors (Porter, 1996).

Strategic management is defined as a set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation, implementation, and control of plans designed to achieve an organization’s vision, mission, strategy, and strategic objectives within the business environment in which the organization operates (Pearce and Robinson, 2005). In a broader view, strategic management is a term used to describe the practice of developing plans, organizing operations, directing employees, controlling outcomes, and coordinating work processes to achieve desired results. Strategic implementation as a component of strategic management process is viewed as a process that turns formulated strategy into actions which ensure that the vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives of the organization are attained as laid out in the strategy (Hill and Jones, 2008).

The environmental conditions facing many firms have changed rapidly. 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 strategy formulation. Strategic management is about managing the future, and effective strategy formulation is crucial, as
it directs the attention and actions of an organization. The assessment of strategy formulation processes becomes crucial for practitioners and researchers alike in order to conduct and evaluate different formulation processes (Olson et al. 2005).

Implementation of strategy remains one of the most difficult areas of management. Success depends both on the selection of an appropriate strategy and converting that strategy into action. If either of these is deficient, the strategy may fail or be less effective than it should be, but often it is difficult to know which aspect went wrong (Hussey, 1996). Most change fails. Over 70 per cent of the projects that are designed to create change either fail or completely deliver significantly less than was promised. Strategic projects are change too—they are in danger of suffering the same fate (Lake, 2002).

The notion of strategic implementation might at first seem quite straight forward: the Strategy is formulated then implemented. It would be perceived as allocating resources and changing organizations structure. However, transforming strategies in action is far more complex and difficult (Rao, Rao and Sivaramakrishna, 2009).

Most companies have strategies, but far fewer achieve them. Various studies support this view, for example: A Fortune Magazine study suggested that 70% of 10 CEOs who fail do so not because of bad strategy, but because of bad execution (Charan and Colvin, 1999).

In another study of 200 companies in the Times 1000, 80% of directors said they had the right strategies but only 14% thought they were implementing them well, no doubt linked to the finding that despite 97% of directors having a 'strategic vision', only 33% reported achieving 'significant strategic success'(Andersen, Cobbold and Lawrie, 2001).

Organizations seem to have difficulties in implementing their strategies. Researchers have revealed a number of problems in strategy implementation: e.g. weak management roles in implementation, a lack of effective communication, lack of commitment to the strategy, unawareness or misunderstanding of the strategy, unaligned organizational systems and resources, poor coordination and sharing of responsibilities, inadequate capabilities, competing activities, uncontrollable environmental factors, long implementation, resources taken away, and lack of training for management and employees (Alexander, 1991; Giles, 1991; Galpin, 1998; Lares-Mankki, 1994; Beer and Eisenstat, 2000; Cunningham and Harney, 2012).
Successful implementation of strategies is vital to any organization whether public or private. However, transforming strategies into action is a far more complex and difficult task which has been a daunting task to most management and has led to high rate of failure of up to 90% of new strategy implementation as revealed by various studies. Hoag and Cooper (2006) observe that fewer than 10% of organizations are capable of developing and implementing strategies that work.

To successfully execute an organization’s strategy, it must be the focus of every person in that organization. It is up to the leaders to create, monitor, and reward that focus as it is expressed. Similarly, to provide the leadership required towards implementing strategies in a way that allows them to come to life in each corner of an organization. Leaders need to pay attention to the three Cs of strategy; Clarifying strategy, Communicating strategy, and Cascading strategy (Edinger, 2015).

In 2000, the four major U.S.-based foundations—Ford, MacArthur, Rockefeller Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation of New York—announced a U.S. $100 million initiative for revitalizing higher education in Africa. Under the banner of the “Partnership for Higher Education in Africa,” the initiative has supported selected African institutions by strengthening teaching and research capacities, building infrastructure, and undertaking strategic planning. Endowing African universities through both external and internal funding sources may appear to be an audacious initiative. It may look futile to contemplate such long-term strategies for institutions that struggle just to make it through each day. Nevertheless, the strategy to mobilize development partners to invest in sustainable initiatives of institution building through this endeavour needs to be championed and endorsed promptly while the agenda of higher education development in Africa remains in the limelight (Teferra, 2015).

Private Universities are universities established in accordance with the Universities Act 1985 (CAP 210B) and the Universities Rules, 1989 (Establishment of Universities, Standardization, Accreditation and Supervision). Private universities in Kenya operate under a full charter or an interim charter as they await full charter whilst the Commission of Higher Education (CHE) is mandated with responsibility of ensuring that private Universities adhere to the standards of a university (Oketch, 2003).
Similarly, private universities in Kenya just like other private organizations have adopted strategic management practices as a measure to adhere to the regulations stipulated by the Commission of Higher Education (CHE).

Higher education institutions have many stakeholders who must be involved in the Strategic management process. Apart from administrators, faculty, staff, and students, the institutions also need to account for the interests of students' parents, government agencies, benefactors, alumni, the community, and accreditation agencies. Each of these stakeholders makes demands upon the institution and the strategic management must bring these stakeholders into the strategic management process to maximize "client satisfaction." The development of universities’ strategic plan by the Ministry of Education (2006) to be followed by all universities and colleges in Kenya in their strategic planning processes is a welcome move.

United States International University (USIU) was founded by William C. Rust and registered under the Companies Act (Cap 486) on 18th September, 1969. Since its establishment as a university in 1970, USIU has had four Vice Chancellors at its helm. They are William C. Rust; Director of the Nairobi campus, Dr. Dee Aker, 1981-1984; Director of the Nairobi campus Dr. Lillian K. Beam, 1984-1994; and Professor Freida Brown was the Director of the Nairobi campus from 1994-1999 and has been Vice Chancellor since 1999-2015. In 1999, USIU received its accreditation from the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) in Kenya. In 2008, USIU received accreditation as an independent university from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in the United States.

The institution acquired a new Vice Chancellor in 2016, in the midst of a strategic plan that covers the period from 2015 – 2020. The new development charts a path for the university towards contributing to their agenda of transforming into a leading world class university.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Strategies are frequently created, possibly not in an ivory tower, but often at a pleasant resort or conference facility, with the participation of a small group of people who have been well selected to steer the process. Those strategies are typically stunning, and displayed particularly well in PowerPoint. Strategies rarely fail in the boardroom, unfortunately, most leaders fail. They do not fail in the formulation of strategy, but in its implementation (Edinger, 2015).
According to Edinger (2015), when you ask most organizational leaders about their areas of focus, you will hear that strategy is among their highest priorities. Very often leaders pour their energy and resources into formulating strategy and spend too little time figuring out how to implement that strategy throughout the organization.

On the other hand, strategy implementation research has not attracted much attention. Studies have been done on strategies and strategy implementation in organizations in Kenya; Karimi (2015) carried out a study to determine influence of organization culture on strategy implementation at Technical University of Mombasa and Pwani University. The study focused mainly on influence on behaviour norms on strategy implementation. It did not cover the critical success factors in the implementation phase. Nyaga (2012) on the other hand did a study on Strategy implementation as a key success factor in mobile telecommunications in Kenya. This study focused on a different context and concept from what the current study seeks to cover. Muchai (2011) studied the impact of corporate culture in strategy implementation. His study mainly captured the extent to which East African Breweries culture influences their strategy and its implementation. There is no empirical evidence of the known local studies conducted on critical success factors for strategy implementations in private universities desirous of creating a world class institution of higher learning. The study therefore, sought to fill the gap by carrying out a research on relevant success factors for implementing strategy, to point out possible restraints that may confine implementation and offer solutions from past experience.

1.3 General Objective
The objective of this study was to carry out an analysis to establish critical success factors that influence strategy implementation in private universities (United States International University-Africa)

1.4 Specific Objectives
The study specifically sought:

1.4.1 To identify Leadership factors that contribute to successful strategy implementation at United States International University-Africa (USIU-A)

1.4.2 To determine the Effect of Organization Resource Allocation on strategy implementation at United States International University-Africa (USIU-A)
1.4.3 To establish effect of Organization Culture on strategy implementation at United States International University-Africa (USIU-A)

1.5 **Significance of the Study**
It was anticipated that the study will be of important to the following groups;

1.5.1 **USIU Africa Researchers and Scholars**
The research results will contribute new knowledge in the field and may be used as a point of reference and source of secondary data on strategy implementation. It may also inspire future research in the area of implementation of strategic plans.

1.5.2 **Private universities**
The study will provide insights on how higher learning institutions can attain sustainable competitive advantage through successful strategy implementation. These concepts may also be translated to other organizations in the education sector.

1.5.3 **Management,**
The study will benefit management of USIU on how to best implement their strategy within the university. They will acquire insights on how to develop their capabilities and use the resources available for sustainable competitive advantage.

1.5.4 **Staff**
Staff will gain an understanding on what role they play in strategy implementation to ensure USIU is able to persist the competitive environment

1.5.5 **Students**
The students will gain insights on their role towards the strategy implementation process to ensure the university continues to grow, and meet their specific needs as customers

1.6 **Scope of the study**
The study was limited to United States International University-Africa (USIU-A). The research was conducted at the university premises along Thika road, Nairobi Kenya between May and June 2016. To achieve the objectives, the study took a descriptive research design in which data was collected from a population sample consisting of management, heads of
department, faculty, staff and students. Questionnaires and interviews were used as a data collection instruments.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Implementation
Implementation is the carrying out, execution, or practice of a plan, method, or any development for doing something. As such, implementation is the action that must follow any preliminary thinking in order for something to actually happen (Pearce and Robinson, 2005).

1.7.2 Strategy Implementation
The set of decisions and actions that result in formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve company’s objectives (John et al., 2007).

1.7.3 Key Success factors
Also known as “Critical Success Factors” can be defined as any of the factors of a business that are identified as vital for successful targets to be reached and maintained. Critical Success Factors are normally identified in such areas production processes, employee and organization skills, functions, techniques, and technologies (Knoll, 2006)

1.7.4 Organizational factors
Organizational factors could be categorized as activities, connections, pathways, and improvement activities, which form the four rules of organization success (Sobek and Jimmerson, 2003).

1.7.5 Resource Allocation
Resource allocation is involved with balancing competing needs and priorities to determine the most effective course of action in order to maximize the effective use of limited resources (Olsen and Jorgensen, 2015).

1.8 Chapter Summary
Chapter one introduces the problem and purpose of study. It comprises of a review of the strategic management process with emphasis on strategy implementation. The chapter introduces the critical success factors of strategy implementation in universities in Kenya: a case of USIU-A. It further discusses the purpose and objectives of the study, the scope, and finally defines terminologies used. The next chapter will cover literature review relevant to the study objectives, whereas chapter three will highlight the research methodology. The fourth chapter will focus on research findings and the final chapter will give a summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations from the study.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents literature based on the purpose of the study. The chapter is structured according to the specific objectives to ensure relevance of the research problem. The literature identifies leadership factors that contribute to successful strategy implementation, examines the influence of organization resource allocation towards successful strategy implementation, and the effect of organization culture on strategy implementation processes.

2.2 Leadership factors in strategy implementation
Strategic leadership is defined as “the leader’s ability to anticipate, envision, and maintain flexibility and to empower others to create strategic change as necessary” (Hitt, Ireland, & Hoskisson2007). Strategic leadership is multifunctional, involves managing through others,
and helps organisations cope with change that seems to be increasing exponentially in today's globalised business environment (Huey 1994). Strategic leadership requires the ability to accommodate and integrate both the internal and external business environment of the organisation, and to manage and engage in complex information processing.

The successful transition from strategy formulation to the implementation of strategy ultimately depends on the strategic leaders of the organisation; reluctance or incompetence in crafting the process for implementing strategic change is the single most reliable predictor of its failure (Freedman and Tregoe 2003); and it is only through effective strategic leadership that organisations are able to implement strategy effectively (Hitt et al. 2007).

The role of strategic planners is in effective leadership; designed in such a way that leads the organization to use growth opportunities. In fact they contribute an important role in growing inner capabilities and promoting entrepreneurship. Therefore motivating people and developing key employees' skills are their priorities (Karami, 2005). The notion of firm leadership orientation at the micro level is purported by Quigley (2000), who suggests that effective leaders within organizations are guided by holistic understanding of their entities, which is accomplished by keeping one’s eye on the future, reviewing and monitoring the commitment to purpose and direction, and ensuring this purpose is shared through effective communication. Thus, the notion that the success of leaders within an organization is an outcome of how well they are able to align the localized goals within the various functions of the organization with that of the overall orientation of the firm holds good (Quigley, 2000).

Leadership according to McKinsey framework plays a central role in strategy implementation and if not properly managed poses challenges. Since organizations need people to bring about the necessary changes strategy implementation therefore requires the assembling of a capable team with the right skills (Pearce and Robinson, 2003).

Strategic leadership requires the ability to accommodate and integrate both the internal and external business environment of the organisation, and to manage and engage in complex information processing. Leaders must therefore be able to create a vision of how to effect positive changes that fit organizational goals (Cranford and Glover, 2007).

Several identifiable actions characterise strategic leadership that positively contributes to effective strategy implementation; namely:
2.2.1 Communicating the Strategic Direction

Strategic implementation begins with setting goals and communicating them to workers. The leader should prioritize objectives, explain the processes and, transmit the vision to the team. Communicating well means the listeners comprehend your words and are able to put them into action. For example, when describing how to implement a new software program, use layman's terms when talking to those who are not computer specialists. Give the information in small, digestible chunks and test understanding before moving on (Mooney, 2014). Communication should determine the strategic direction.

Efficient communication should be able to give compressive explanation of new duties, responsibilities and obligations which are to be carried in a given organization. Effective communication is a key requirement for effective strategy implementation (Mazzola and Kellermanns, 2010). Chimanzi and Morgan’s (2005), study showed that organizations that focused on marketing and participation of all staff considerable realized high portions of strategy implementation. Strategies need to be communicated, understood and properly coordinated with stakeholders inside and outside the organization (Henry, 2008). The formulated strategy in the world will amount to nothing if it is poorly communicated thought out the organizations (Henry, 2008). An organization must first persuade its employees about the importance of strategy before turning to its customers. The lack of shred knowledge with lower management and non-management employees creates barriers for successful strategy implementation (Mozzola and Kellermanns, 2010).

Li, Guohui and Eppler (2008) found out that those employees in restrictive communication environment performed poorly compared to those working in supportive and open communication climates. The barriers to communication include such barriers as learning barriers, organizational structure, personnel management barriers, and cultural barriers. Forman and Argenti (2005) established that alignment between the strategic implementation process and corporate communication function was visible in those firms that were experiencing fundamental strategic change. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2006) discussed the connection between communications and strategy coming to the conclusion that a company can establish through managing communication.
Forman and Argenti (2005) observed that measures linking implementation of strategies with communication rationales of companies were apparent in that the companies were experiencing observable and very significant strategic transformations. They observed that organizations which they gave considerations had taken part in making sure that their communication systems were good. Successful implementers ensured information technology was the focal point in ensuring strategy implementation and making of the organizations reputation (Brown, 2012).

Effective communications can construct the leader’s credibility and increase employees commitment and loyalty to the leader and the organization (Choan, 2003). Therefore, every communication opportunity should be treated as an opportunity to sell the leader’s vision and to enhance relationship with employees. More significantly, leaders need to be able to sell their vision to employees by effectively communicating with employees, getting employees’ buy-in, and influencing employees to work toward the vision (Cranford and Glover, 2007).

2.2.2 Leadership Involvement

Strategic implementation of any kind of new company policy or program requires participation from all of the departments that will be affected. Company leadership needs to identify what those departments are and create an implementation team that consists of representatives from each affected group. Management needs to create a structure that identifies various group leaders, the responsibilities of those group leaders and an accountability system that insures that the implementation team meets its timetable for getting the new program or policy in place (Root, 2015).

Proper delegation helps guarantee a smooth implementation of business strategy. The manager charged with strategic implementation must be able to pick out the people and teams best able to move the project forward. Leading the implementation requires taking pains to discover and test the abilities gifts of her staff. The leader should establish minileaders over various segments of the process who understand the scope of the implementation. These people will report directly to the overall manager and will be responsible for guiding their own groups. Enthusiastic, imaginative and people-oriented employees will be successful for these roles (Mooney, 2014).
Participate in all avenues of the strategic implementation. Ask questions while observing what your employees do in order to understand all the processes involved. Ask your group leaders for weekly progress updates. Keep abreast of the problems that arise and handle them expeditiously. Document the process carefully so you and others can refer to the literature for future ventures. Be flexible. If something does not work well in the way you have designed it, find other avenues until you find something that works better. Always take care not to micromanage your employees as you monitor the processes but instead be an involved leader who joins in the work to make it better (Mooney, 2014).

2.2.3 Leadership in Turbulent Business Environments

The environmental conditions facing many firms today have changed rapidly. Today's global competitive environment is complex, dynamic, and largely unpredictable (Olson et al. 2005). Every business environment is faced with turbulent circumstances that result from uncontrollable factors. These are world events or circumstances which significantly affect investment values and business conditions. Leaders that make change must also grapple with such unexpected forces both inside and outside the organization. Shift in government regulations, union activism, competitive assaults, mergers and acquisitions, and political and international crises are all a reality of corporate life today (Barnat, 1996). Barnat further explains that the list of corporate disasters is virtually unending. It includes executives kidnapping; hijackings, both in the air and at sea; hostile takeovers; and such acts of terrorism as the bombings. However, while the situation is grave, it is far from hopeless for management, researchers, and consultants who are prepared to confront the problem directly.

Since a leaders’ job functions and responsibilities are more complex and difficult than before, a future-oriented and flexible leadership style is required. Organizations need specific leadership development approaches for effective leadership and organizational performance (Amagoh, 2009). To keep pace with the rapidly changing environment, leaders need more interpersonal skills to meet current and future challenges. They also need to be able to identify opportunities swiftly and be capable of turning challenges into opportunities. Most importantly, global leadership is about initiative, trustworthiness, integrity, and enthusiasm of performance (Flaum, 2002).
2.2.4 Motivation

Motivation is the psychological force that determines the force that determines the direction of a person’s behaviour, the person level of effort towards that behaviour and the person’s level of persistence in the face of obstacles (Lauby, 2005). In order to realize strategy implementation the human resource factor plays a big role in the process. Speculand (2009) reiterates that leaders need to create the right conditions in their organization in order to realize good employee behaviour.

Strategy implementation involves dealing with people with varying levels of motivation, commitment and dedication. These differences often result in interpersonal conflicts that if left unresolved can significantly affect implementation efforts and performance (Lussier and Achua, 2009).

According to Mooney (2014), your attitude will prove contagious for the staff. If you are energetic and willing to give your best to the company, others will follow suit. When encouraging your staff you need to be a consistent role model who stays on tasks, works to solve problems and keeps to a schedule. You want your employees to emulate your behaviour without having to lecture them on what how to act and perform in the workplace.

For example, if you are always on time and get to work quickly on the implementation process, your staff will understand the need to do so as well. Create a culture of encouragement by praising hard work, passionate exhibitions and creativity in individual efforts. Your staff will appreciate the recognition.

Favourable working conditions are essential for strategy implementation; these conditions should take care of motivation for all employees in the different levels in the organization. Hence, rewards and other forms of compensation must be aligned with the goals that employees are seeking to accomplish (Lussier and Achua, 2009).

Creating appropriate motivational techniques such as reward and recognition can encourage employees’ performance and increase their feelings of appreciation and belonging (Swanson and Holton, 2009). When one uses reward as a motivational technique, the reward must be fair, announced, and changed periodically to ensure employees will not lose interest in striving for a reward (Ventricz, 2003). Moreover, leaders could also motivate employees by promoting multiple cultural backgrounds and values (Frost & Walker, 2007). This would
entail showing empathy for others and giving appreciation of different beliefs, values and experiences; this can motivate employees and retain the best employees.

2.3 Effect of Organization Resource Allocation on strategy implementation

The stream of literature dealing with the resource allocation process looks at the process of resource allocation as a proxy for implementation of strategy (Bower 1970). The resource based view of competition draws upon the capabilities and resources that reside within an organization or that which an organization might want to develop in order to achieve sustainable competitive advantage (Henry, 2008).

Organizational capabilities are equated to the collective skills and abilities within an organization to organize, manage, and coordinate and control specific activities. Resource has been defined as assets tied semi-permanently to firms and includes tangibles and intangibles (Wernerfelt, 1984). Resources can be categorized as physical resources, human resource and financial resources (Henry, 2008).

2.3.1 Resource Alignment

According to Eikelenboom (2009) resources are considered the ultimate source of sustainable value creation. Effective management plays a major role to ensure proper utilization at the right time and setting. While resources are important their existence per se do not confer any benefit to the organization (Henry, 2008). Competences are the attributes that a company requires to be competitive in a highly turbulent and hyper competitive environment. Implementation of strategy tests the ability to allocate resources, design structures and systems, formulate functional objectives and plan for operational effectiveness (Kachru, 2005).

Finding correlations between strategies and business processes are a key component in resource alignment (Rosemann, 2010). Strategic Management should build on the foundations of business process alignment to ensure that there is alignment between processes and strategies. This process by extension is interested in optimizing the use of process to the given strategies to ensure optimal resource allocation (Koliadis and Ghose, 2008).
Strategic alignment aims at energy focusing, elimination of redundancy and conflicts of work and defines the capabilities and competencies which develop competitive advantage to an organization (Herbert, Heneman and Anthony, 2011). Contribution to project coordination, such as redundancy elimination in outcomes, project conflict avoidance, and project outcome quality assurance are some of the other benefits of resource alignment (Collins, Ericksen and Alen, 2005). Most conflicts, redundancy and coordination problems experienced in many organizations arise due to lack of alignment in the business itself and rarely due to mismanagement (Herbert et al., 2011).

2.3.2 Structure and Strategy Alignment

An organizational structure is the formal definition of working relationships between people and departments in an organization (Gopinath and Siciliano, 2009).

Chandler (1962) substantiated the thesis that structure follows strategy based on a four case study of American conglomerates that had dominance in their industries. Institutional needs vary therefore different structures are required to implement different strategies. Typically, structures are changed when they no longer provide the coordination and control necessary to implement strategies successfully. Proper strategy-structure alignment is a necessary precursor to successful implementation of new strategies (Mazzolla and Kellermanns, 2010).

Organization structure can be seen as the environment where all actions of employees take place. Managers can create this organizational structure to their perception and which fits, in their opinion, the business environment the organization is operating in best. Environmental changes and increased uncertainty makes it necessary for firms to realign their structures in order to have a competitive advantage.

2.3.3 Human Resource

Human resource is concerned with the people factor in the organization which is the most critical resource for an organization. The idea of the importance of human resource is mainly founded on the idea that management is indispensable on the basis of competitive advantage. A greater part of the latest studies has the same opinion that Human Resource operates as an aspect in recognizing the performance of the organization (Brenes, Mena & Molina, 2007). Traditionally strategic planning was a mechanist chain of actions, people in this view were pushed to the periphery. However in recent times, strategy implementation and
planning has undergone changes to accommodate the human resource factor (Schmigt and Brauer, 2006). Strategic planners are required to consider necessary relations between the strategic planners and the human resource persons, increasing networking and altering the environment for strategic planning (Forman and Argenti, 2005).

According to Harrington (2006) all actions taken in the accomplishment of strategy affects both the executives and the work force. The human resource factor in strategy implementation involves attracting the right type of people; developing the knowledge, skills and abilities and human resource retention (Maw-Shin, Yung-Lung & Feng-Jhy, 2014). Successful organizations seek to have the right type and numbers of people to perform the duties aimed to achieve the firm’s objectives (Schuler, Randall & Jackson 2006). To capitalize an organization on it potentials, it must design and deliver human resource practices that focus on necessary employee performance competencies, creating a HR system with vertical and horizontal alignment around those competencies (Herbert, Heneman and Anthony, 2011). Misalignment of human resource practices can produce conflicting messages to employees, leading to reduced motivation and commitment to the company strategy. In addition, attempts to adopt isolated best practices without sufficient consideration of fit have negative consequences (Samnani and Singh, 2013).

Ultimately, successful strategy implementation requires getting three things right: the social system, the technical system, and the business process system. When making strategic shifts in their organizations, most executive teams tend to do a better job of bringing business processes into line with their new strategy and identifying the benefits of new technology, than aligning the social system with the strategy. In (Becker et al., 2001), co-creator with Robert Kaplan of the Balanced Scorecard concept, observes that while human capital is the foundation for creating value in the new economy, human assets are the least understood by most business leaders and therefore the least effectively managed. HR can help effect improvements in both technology and business processes by helping to breakdown silos and enhance cross-company communication, top to bottom, and side to side.

2.3.4 Financial Resource

Financial metrics have long been the standard for assessing a firm’s performance. The Balanced Score card supports the role of finance in establishing and monitoring specific and measurable financial strategic goals on a coordinated, integrated basis, thus enabling the firm to operate efficiently and effectively.
Strategies fail in implementation due to lack of resources (Lussier and Achua, 2009). The finance strategic plan is an arrangement that focuses on how to successfully; make money, spend money, and estimate the income and operating cost (Hrebiniak, 2006). The total amount necessary to effectively manage an organization is planned for by executives as they settle on the requirements for the execution of their sections goals as well as the objective (Hrebiniak, 2006).

A recent school of thought based on extensive research suggests that competitive advantage of a firm depends on the resources the firm can command (Grattan, 2011). Financial resources are one of the critical resources which affect the ability of an organization to execute given tasks. According to Hussey (2013) financial resources can be a limiting factor and the way which it is obtained may make it easier or harder to further resources in the future. Leveraging of the firm is a key strategic decision and affects the strategies which are developed in the future and how successfully they can be implemented. Leadership plays a key role in financial resource allocation and alignment; a leader must prioritize and make resources available during strategic implementation (Lussier and Achua, 2009).

Financial metrics have generically been used as a mode of accessing performance of an organization. Strategy implementation shows role of finance as the establishing and monitoring of specific and measurable financial strategic goals on a coordinated and integrated manner (Thompson, Strickland, & Gamble, 2009). Financial resources Management function is a critical function of the management team of any organization (McCarthy, 2012). This function is even more important when financial resources are highly limited and capital allocations are difficult (McCarthy et al 2012). The financial resource management team therefore has to be fully engaged and involved in the decision-making process of the business. The strategy should detail how all financial and non-financial resources will be managed to support delivery.

2.4 Effect of Organization Culture on strategy implementation

Goffee and Jones (1996) describe organization culture as the “glue that holds organizations together”. Organizational culture is involved with the values and beliefs of an organization which determines how people interact with each other and how they execute tasks. According to Mullins (2007), culture impacts most aspects of organizational life, such as how decisions are made, who makes them, how rewards are distributed, who gets promoted,
how people are treated and how organization responds to environmental changes. Higgins (2005) defines organizational culture as the fundamental suppositions and values that are commonly shared by people in an organization that is run reflexively. For an organization to function efficiently there has to be a commonly acknowledged set of practices, John (2006) refers to these combined and lightly considered suppositions as the model of an organization.

2.4.1 Culture and Strategy Implementation Fit
A healthy organizational culture could be an important prerequisite for a successful strategy implementation. Peters and Waterman (1982) identify Mckinsey’s 7s framework of superordinate goals which argues that effective organizational change is the relationship between strategy, structure, systems, style, skills, staff and shared values. He further observes that organizations succeed through strong, unified cultures that are produced and reproduced by physical artifacts, symbols, ceremonies, stories, slogans, dress and setting. The best organization cultures are those that are consistently executing on the strategies that make for good leadership development and actualization of organizational goals. Top management aim at creating enterprise wide standards, practices, and metrics for leadership. They cascade programs and processes down through the organization to improve impact and drive cultural change (Fulmer, 2005).

Decision making forms one of the most important functions of a manager. Making decisions involves making a judgment regarding how to act in a given situation after considering alternative courses of action (Yeyarathnam, 2006). Decisions made by top level executives can be said to be the most crucial in determination how strategy will be implemented (Rao, 2009). The culture of an organization also makes employees identify what they believe is critical, achievable and personally important to them (Kachru, 2005).

Peters and Waterman (1982) recognizes that many organizations unaware of the cultural diversities within which they exist find themselves unable to successfully implement strategies (Harison, 2004). Comerford (1985) argues that a culture that is grounded in strategy-supportive values, practices and behavioural norms adds to the power and effectiveness of a company’s strategy execution effort.
A constricted culture strategy fit is required for an organization to be able to successfully implement strategy. A tight culture strategy fit furthers an organization’s execution of strategy, provides clear guidance on ‘how we do things around here’, produces significant peer pressure to conform to the acceptable norms and promotes strong employee identification and commitment to a company’s vision, performance targets and strategy (Comerford, 1985). Oliver (1992) identifies cultural fit as one of the forms of fit that affects an organization’s adaptation processes.

2.4.2 Types of Organization Culture and their Effect on Strategy Implementation

Research on organizational culture and its effect on other organizational variables became widespread during 1980s. Lund (2003) alludes to the fact that “the 1980s witnessed a flow in popularity to examine the concept of organizational culture as managers became increasingly aware of the ways that an organizational culture can affect employees and organizations”. Organizational culture has been mentioned as “the shared philosophies, ideologies, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes and norms”(Kilmann et. al., 1985). Dodek et al., (2010) further suggests that “culture is to an organization what personality is to the individual- a hidden, yet unifying theme that provides meaning, direction, and mobilization”.

Cultures can be categorized in a spectrum of weak to strong cultures. Lee (1984) and Mehta and Krishnan (2004) suggest that successful companies apparently have strong cultures. It is complicated to measure a typology of organizational culture. However, Cameron and Quinn, (1999) model (1999) of Competing Values Framework (CVF) is one of the most extended and comprehensive and has been used in many empirical studies (Naranjo-Valencia et.al, 2011; Sanz-Valle et.al, 2011; Lao and Ngo, 2004; Igo and Skitmore, 2006; Obenchain and Johnson, 2004). The Cameron and Quinn’s CVF model uses two dimensions to categorize culture into four types (Figure 1)
By considering two dimensions, stability versus flexibility and internal focus versus external position, Cameron and Quinn (1999) proposed a model which describes four types of culture: Clan, Adhocracy, Hierarchy and Market.

2.4.2.1 Clan Culture

Clan culture also known as family culture focuses on internal issues but its emphasis is on flexibility rather than stability. In this kind of culture, partnership, teamwork, and corporate commitment to employees are regarded as mail characteristics (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). Clan oriented cultures are family-like, with a focus on mentoring, nurturing, and “doing things together (Tipster, 2013).

2.4.2.2 Adhocracy Culture

Adhocracy culture tends to external organization matters and emphasizes flexibility and change more than resistance (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). Adhocracy oriented cultures are
dynamic and entrepreneurial, with a focus on risk-taking, innovation, and “doing things first” (Tipster, 2013).

2.4.2.3 Hierarchy Culture

Hierarchy culture, based on Weber’s bureaucracy theory, focuses on internal efficiency, cooperation and sticking to dominant characteristics (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). Hierarchy oriented cultures are structured and controlled, with a focus on efficiency, stability and “doing things right” (Tipster, 2013).

2.4.2.4 Market Culture

Market culture is control oriented and focuses on external organization affairs. Organizations with this culture use observation and resistance to reach higher level of productivity and competitiveness (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). Market oriented cultures are results oriented, with a focus on competition, achievement, and “getting the job done” (Tipster, 2013).

These organizational culture categories are helpful in providing a foundation upon which strategy planners can use to structure their solutions and account for the important role that culture plays. Aligning a company’s strategy with its culture reduces the disruptive nature of the change, even though it’s still part of change. Strategic leaders must strive to ensure that culture and strategy work in collaboration for success, and in a balanced and efficient manner.

2.4.3 Organization Culture Challenge

One of the major challenges in strategy implementation appears to be more cultural and behavioural in nature, including the impact of poor integration of activities and diminished feelings of ownership and commitment (Aaltonen and Ikavalko, 2002).

Corboy and O’Corrbui (2006) identify the deadly sins of strategy implementation which involve: a lack of understanding of how the strategy should be implemented; customers and staff not fully appreciating the strategy; difficulties and obstacles not acknowledged, recognized or acted upon; and ignoring the day-to-day business imperatives. Marginson (2002) contend that strategy implementation evolves either from a process of winning group commitment through a coalitional form of decision-making, or as a result of complete coalitional involvement of implementation staff through a strong corporate culture.
Organizational Culture is a strength that can be a weakness. It is strength because it eases and economizes communication, facilitates organizational decision making and control and may generate higher levels of cooperation and commitment to the organization which are necessary for strategy implementation. However it can be a weakness when important shared beliefs and values interfere with the need for business, its strategy and the people working on a company’s behalf. This is a major weakness because it is hard to change the content of a culture (Pearce and Robinson, 2003).

In a collaborative Model of strategy implementation, organizations have both a strong culture and deep-rooted traditions. The challenge of successful implementation results from; lack of cultivation of strong cultural values to meet the changing organizational needs. The distinction between “thinkers” and “doers” begins to fade but does not totally disappear.

2.5 Chapter Summary
This chapter has presented a review of literature on factors that potentially influence strategy implementation success. These factors relate to Leadership behaviour, resource allocation, and effect of organization culture on strategy implementation. The factors underpinning each factor constitute the variables that the study will continue to investigate. The next chapter will describe research methodology that will be used for the study.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter presents a discussion of the methodology that will be adopted in this study. The chapter will comprise; the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures & data analysis methods that will be employed in the study, and a summary of the chapter
3.2 Research Design
Research design can be defined as the strategy and structure conceived in a bid to acquire solutions to research problems; it is also defined as a blueprint for collection, measurement and data analysis (Creswell, 2012). The research design that will be employed in this study is the descriptive research design, this allows for collection of data that demonstrates relationships and describe environment as is. Descriptive study addresses the "what" of the research (Shields & Nandhini, 2013). The study aims at collecting primary data from respondents on their attitudes and opinions in relation to factors that influence successful strategy implementation.

Descriptive study is meant to aid in the explanation of phenomena or characteristics associated with a subject population, it seeks to answer questions such as who, what, when, where and how of any provided topic in its wake, (Blumberg, Cooper & Schindler, 2008). The research design is best suited for the study in trying to access the factors affecting strategy implementation in private university. The research seeks to answer the following questions: How organizations strategic leadership affects strategy implementation, How institutional resource allocation affects strategy implementation and How organization culture is bound to affect strategy implementation process at United States International University- Africa (USIU-A).

The research design will be in form of a simple interpretive study as described by Creswell, (2003) and will adopt a hybrid of survey and case study to generate primary data. This format is arguably the most efficient means of collecting emotional as well as factual information. The advantages are the familiarity of respondents to an interview structure, the ability to discuss complex issues and its adaptive characteristics (Walker, 1985).

3.3 Population and Sampling Design
3.3.1 Population
A population is the total collection of elements about which you wish to make inferences (Cooper and Schindler, 2000). Additionally, (Polit and Hungler, 1999) refer to the population as an aggregate or totality of all the objects, subjects or members that conform to a set of specifications. The population of interest in this study comprised the total population of 5350 that consisted of; faculty (130), Staff (220) and students (5,000) at the United States International University- Africa (USIU-A). The staff and faculty numbers
were retrieved from human resources list of employees, while student numbers were determined by Registar’s office list for students enrolled in summer semester 2016.

3.3.2 Sampling Design
Mouton (1996) defines a sample as elements selected with the intention of finding out something about the total population from which they are taken.

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame
A sampling frame is a comprehensive list of individuals or objects from which the sample is drawn (Drost, 2011). According to (Blumberg et al, 2008) the sampling frame, represents a list of elements from which a sample is actually drawn. The simple idea behind sampling is to primarily draw out certain characteristics representative of the entire population. Consequently, the choice of a sample is important. With the USIU population, a sample was drawn from the list of students, staff and faculty studying and working in USIU at the time of the study.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique
A sampling technique is a scientific or statistical method of selecting the sampling units that would offer the requisite estimates with their related margins of uncertainty; this would emerge from the probe of only part (sample) and not the whole population (Blumberg et al, 2008). The study will took the form of probability sampling. Stratified sampling technique was used; where members of the population were first divided into stratas, then simple random sampling was used to determine participants selected to be part of the quantitative data collection. Purposive sampling was used to identify respondents for interviews to collect qualitative data.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
According to Blumberg et al (2008) and Saunders (2012), sample size is the actual number of respondents that would be representative of the population under study, they proceed to state that the size must be large and should bear some proportional relationship to the size of population from which it is drawn. The sample size is determined by a three based criterion; the level of precision, the level of confidence, and the degree of variability in the attributes being measured.
The sample size for Faculty and Staff represented 10% of the population. Gay (1983), states that for descriptive studies a sample size of 10% is a good representative of the population. On the other hand, a 10% sample of the student population would be disproportionate to the staff and faculty sample size thus creating a large variation in strata representation. Therefore, a sample 35 (thirty five) students (0.007%) was used to inhibit extreme variations amongst the groups represented. The table below gives a distribution of the sample size of 70 (seventy).

Table 3.1: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.007%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, two representatives were purposively selected from each stratum to take part in interviews. A total of 6 respondents out of the sample size of 70 (seventy) were requested to be part of the qualitative analysis.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

The study adopted the use of questionnaires and individual interviews. Online questionnaires were used due to the easy administration, speedy delivery and ability to reach a mass audience at once. It was cost efficient as input by respondents was automated, although several questionnaires were also printed and administered physically. The questionnaires made use of checklists and rating scales i.e. Likert scale. This will help simplify and quantify the behaviour and attitudes of respondents. The questionnaire was divided into four Sections. Section A focused on Demographic data, Section B Leadership Factors on Strategy Implementation, Section C Effects of Resource allocation on Strategy Implementation and Section D Effects of Organization Culture on Strategy Implementation.
Interviews took the form of direct interaction with individuals on a one to one basis. The questions were open-ended; to allow for interviewees to give additional information regarding the subject under investigation. This also allowed for in-depth interviewing and the researcher was able to make follow-up questions on the subject. The interviewees also had a chance to ask for clarification whenever there was need. This method is more appropriate for the qualitative nature of research.

3.5 Research Procedure

The research procedure involved conducting a pilot study or a pre-test, according to Blumberg et al, (2008) this is best suited to analyze the questions and determine whether the questions are properly framed and to ensure they are not ambiguous. Pilot testing is important as it evaluates the respondents’ interest, Saunders et al, (2012) further states that pilot studies are vital for analyzing the time it takes to answer the questions as well as assessing validity of the questions. This procedure was conducted by administering both the questionnaire and interview guide to a total of 2 (three) respondents. One interview respondent and 2(two) questionnaire respondents .One person was selected, from each stratum from the sample size of 70 (seventy) through purposive sampling. This was to specifically enable the researcher to adjust the questions; as well as get objectivity and usefulness of the process. After validation of questions was done, the questionnaire and interview guide were used to interview the selected respondents for the survey. Once questionnaires were filled they were used for analysis.

3.6 Data Analysis Method

The study adopted both quantitative and qualitative method of data analysis. To ensure ease of analysis in quantitative analysis, the questionnaires were first coded as per variable in each question of the study. This did not only minimize the margin of error but also assured accuracy during data analysis. Following data collection and coding, quantitative analysis was applied using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics is simply a process of transforming a mass of raw data into tables, charts, with frequency distribution and percentages which are a very vital part of making sense of the data (Denscombe, 2012). Data was then analyzed using SPSS program to compute descriptive statistics for the collected set of data. Qualitative data mostly collected from interviews was analysed using ATLAS.ti.
The results were summarized and categorized according to themes, and presented in tables and frequency distribution tables.

### 3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented a description of the methodology that will be used in carrying out the study. The research design is descriptive in nature with the main focus on the USIU Africa population. Data will collected by use of questionnaires and interviews; the questionnaires will be pilot tested before they are administered to the respondents to ensure validity. The data analysis method explains how data will be analysed, and presented in tables, graphs, and charts. The next chapter will discuss the results and findings from the study.

---

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS**

**4.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the research findings based on the following specific objectives; to identify leadership factors that contribute to successful strategy implementation, to examine the influence of organization resource allocation towards successful strategy implementation, and the effect of organization culture on strategy implementation processes.

**4.2 General Information**
The study comprised a sample size 70 respondents based on a population of 5,350 USIU students, staff, and faculty who were presently registered for summer semester 2015.

The population consisted of a population of 220 full time staff, faculty population of 130, and a student population of 5,000. Out of the 70 selected respondents, 68 responded and two did not respond, thus recording a response of 97.14%.

The response rate was sufficient and representative as it conformed to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) stipulation that; a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good while a response rate of over 70% is excellent. Consequently, a representation of 97.14% for this study fell in the excellent category.

**Figure 4.2: Summary of Respondents**

The figure above indicates that all staff and Students respondents provided feedback on the survey and two faculty members did not respond. The table indicates that 16.2% were faculty members, 32.4% represented staff, and 51.5% were students.

**Table 4.2: Duration at USIU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above reflects that a majority (57.4%) of respondents had an experience of less than 3 years with USIU, 26.5% with an average of between 4-7 years, 10.3% with 7-9 years, 1.5% respondents with over 12 years, and another 1.5% with less than 3 years.
Figure 4.3: School Represented

The figure above indicates that Science and technology school was represented by 29.4%, School of business by 25%, other staff & faculty, and school of Humanities and social sciences were both represented by 22.1%, and school of Pharmacy and Health sciences was represented by 1.5%.

4.3 Effect of Leadership factors on Strategy Implementation

Table 4. 3 Clear Communication from leadership towards implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School represented</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study aimed at finding out whether there was clear communication from leadership regarding the strategy implementation process. The respondents agreed by 54.4%, 17.6% strongly agreed while 25% were neutral. However, 1.5% strongly disagreed and another 1.5% disagreed.

**Table 4.4 Leadership involvement in strategy implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher aimed at finding out whether the leadership of the university was involved in the implementation process. A majority of 55.9% agreed and 25% strongly agreed while 16.5% were neutral but 1.5% strongly disagreed and another 1.5% disagreed.

**Table 4.5: Suitability of Communication Channels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study focused on finding out whether the channels used to communicate implementation issues were appropriate in promoting the process. The table indicates that 39.7% agreed and 23.5% strongly agreed while 35.5% were neutral but a minority of 1.5% disagreed.

**Table 4.6: Leadership Involvement and Employee Support towards implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher’s aim was to investigate whether employees felt inspired and motivated by leadership at finding out whether the leadership of the university was involved in the implementation process. A majority of 55.9% agreed and 16.2% strongly agreed while 27.9% were neutral.

**Table 4.7: Leadership Preparedness for unexpected situations**
The researcher aimed at finding out whether the leadership had accounted for, and shown preparedness for unexpected circumstances that may arise in the process. The table indicates that 44.1% agreed and 16.2% strongly agreed while 30.9% were neutral.

### 4.4 Effect of Resource Allocation on Strategy Implementation

**Table 4.8: Assigning of Tasks and Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to investigate the level of clarity in assigning activities and tasks within the process. A majority of 54.4% agreed and 20.6% strongly agreed while 19.1% were neutral. Conversely, a minority of 5.9 % disagreed.
Table 4.9: Structure Supports Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study focused on finding out whether the current university structures supported the implementation process. A majority 61.8% agreed and 22.1% strongly agreed while 7.4% were neutral and 8.8% disagreed.

Table 4.10: USIU recruits Talented Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher wanted to establish whether the university recruits employees with appropriate skills for their job. The table indicates that 57.4% agreed and 20.6% strongly agreed while 17.6% were neutral but 4.4% disagreed.
Table 4.11: Employee Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to determine whether there were employee development programs through knowledge sharing and training at USIU. The table indicates that 38.2% agreed and 20.6% strongly agreed while 29.4% were neutral and 10.3% disagreed.

Table 4.12: Allocation of Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher wanted to find out whether the university resources were clearly aligned to the strategy process. The table indicates that 55.9% agreed and 5.9% strongly agreed while
26.5% were neutral, 10.3% disagreed and 1.5% strongly disagreed.

4.5 Effect of Organization Culture on Strategy Implementation

Table 4.13: Culture Strategy Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher’s aim was to examine whether there is a Culture-Strategy that supports the implementation process. The findings revealed that 47.1% agreed and 16.2% strongly agreed while 32.4% were neutral. However, 4.4% disagreed.

Table 4.14: New management understands process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study sought to determine whether the current change in top management has demonstrated a clear understanding of the USIU strategy process. The table indicates that 55.9% agreed and 19.1% strongly agreed while 20.6% were neutral and 4.4% disagreed.

### Table 4.15: Coordination between Leaders and Executers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher wanted to find out whether the university culture promoted coordination between the leaders and executers of the implementation process. The table indicates that 45.6% agreed and 16.2% strongly agreed while 29.4% were neutral, 4.4% disagreed and 4.4% strongly disagreed.

### Table 4.16: Cultural Values of Execution team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study sought to determine whether the execution team demonstrated cultural values that met the changing organization needs. The results indicate 50% agreed and 7.4% strongly agreed while 36.8% were neutral, 1.5% disagreed and 4.4% strongly disagreed.

Table 4.17: Embracing change in Business Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher wanted to determine whether the university quickly embrace change to meet business environment needs that promote implementation process. The table indicates that 41.2% agreed and 20.6% strongly agreed while 30.9% were neutral, 4.4% disagreed, 2.9% strongly disagreed.

4.5 Chapter Summary

The study comprised a sample size 70 respondents based on a population of 5,350 USIU students, staff, and faculty who were presently registered for summer semester 2015. The
response rate of the study was at 97.14% with a total of 68 respondents. It emerged that 57.4% of respondents had an experience of less than 3 years with USIU, 26.5% with an average of between 4-7 years, 10.3% with 7-9 years, 1.5% respondents with over 12 years, and another 1.5% with less than 3 years.

The findings of the chapter revealed that there is clear communication from leadership by 72% recorded as agreed and strongly agreed, while 84.9% agreed that leadership was involved in the implementation process. The results further revealed that leadership involvement inspired and supported employees through the implementation process.

The results also showed that 83.8% agreed that the university structure adequately supports strategy implementation. It also emerged that the university recruits employees with appropriate skills for their job with 78% agreed and strongly agreed. Although majority of 61.8% agreed that allocation of resources is clearly aligned to USIU strategies, 11.8% disagreed will the resource allocation subject.

It also emerged that 63.3% agreed that there was a culture-strategy fit to promote the implementation process. A majority of 75% agreed that change in top management has demonstrated a clear understanding of the strategy process. Coordination of activities between leaders and executers was agreed upon by 61.8%. Another 61.8% agreed that the university demonstrates preparedness by quickly embracing the changing business environment to promote the strategy implementation process.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION
This final chapter of the research project presents a summary, discussions, conclusions and recommendations of the study. The summary provided was based on the purpose of study, specific objectives of the study, the methodology used and the findings of the study. The discussions section will focus on the major findings of the study as guided by the specific objectives of the study. The recommendations for the project will be centred on areas of improvement or practise, and recommendations for further studies.

5.2 SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the critical success factors that influence strategy implementation at USIU. The study was guided by the following specific objectives; to identify Leadership Factors that contribute to successful strategy implementation at United States International University-Africa (USIU-A), to determine the effect of Organization Resource Allocation on strategy implementation at United States International University-Africa (USIU-A) and to establish effect of Organization Culture on strategy implementation at United States International University-Africa (USIU-A).

The study adopted a descriptive research design. The population used for the study comprised the total populace of 5350 that consisted of; faculty (130), Staff (220) and students (5,000) at the United States International University- Africa (USIU-A) registered for summer semester, 2016. The study took the form of probability sampling, where stratified sampling technique was used. Simple random sampling was quantitative data collection while purposive sampling was used to identify respondents for interviews to collect qualitative data.
The study adopted the use of questionnaires and individual interviews where several questionnaires were printed and administered physically and others administered online. Interviews took the form of direct interaction with individuals on a one to one basis.

The research procedure involved conducting a pilot study, which was vital for analyzing the time it takes to answer the questions as well as assessing validity of the questions. The study adopted both quantitative and qualitative method of data analysis. Data was then analyzed using SPSS program to compute descriptive statistics for the collected set of data. Qualitative data mostly collected from interviews was analysed using ATLAS.ti.

The findings of the study revealed that there is clear communication from leadership with a score of 72% recorded as agreed and strongly agreed, whereas 84.9% agreed that leadership was involved in the implementation process. The results further revealed that leadership involvement inspired and supported employees through the implementation process at 71%.

The effect organization resource allocation on strategy implementation results showed that 83.8% agreed that the university structure adequately supports strategy implementation. The findings further revealed that the university recruits employees with appropriate skills for their job with 78% recorded as agreed and strongly agreed; both combined. Although a majority of 61.8% agreed that allocation of resources is clearly aligned to USIU strategies, a visible 11.8% disagreed implying that the resource allocation was not satisfactory.

To establish effect of organization culture on strategy implementation at USIU, it emerged that 63.3% agreed that there was a culture-strategy fit to promote the implementation process. A majority of 75% further agreed that the new leadership in top management had demonstrated a clear understanding of the strategy process. Coordination of activities between leaders and executers was agreed upon by 61.8%. Additionally, another 61.8% agreed that the university demonstrates preparedness by quickly embracing the changing business environment to promote the strategy implementation process.

5.3 DISCUSSION

5.3.1 Identify Leadership factors that contribute to successful strategy at USIU-A The study established that there was clear communication from leadership towards the USIU community regarding the strategy implementation process thus supporting the course. According to Mazzola and Kellermanns (2010) effective communication is a key
requirement for effective strategy implementation. The lack of shared knowledge with lower management and non-management employees creates barriers for successful strategy implementation. Henry (2008) additionally supports the former authors that; the formulated strategy in the world will amount to nothing if it is poorly communicated thought out the organizations. Effective communications can construct the leader’s credibility and increase employees commitment and loyalty to the leader and the organization (Choan, 2003). The study also revealed that the channels used to communicate implementation issues were appropriate.

The study revealed that the leadership of the university was involved in the implementation process. According to root (2015) Strategic implementation or any kind of new company policy or program requires participation from all of the departments that will be affected. Company leadership needs to identify what those departments are and create an implementation team that consists of representatives from each affected group. Mooney (2014), further explains that leaders should keep abreast of the problems that arise and handle them expeditiously. They should also document the process carefully so that, they and others can refer to the literature for future ventures.

According to Mooney (2014), your attitude will prove contagious for the staff. If you are energetic and willing to give your best to the company, others will follow suit. When encouraging your staff you need to be a consistent role model who stays on tasks, works to solve problems and keeps to a schedule. The study also revealed that employees felt inspired and motivated by leadership involvement in the in the implementation process. Speculand (2009) reiterates that leaders need to create the right conditions in their organization in order to realize good employee behaviour.

In reference to leadership preparedness, finding revealed that the leadership had accounted for change, and shown preparedness for unexpected circumstances that may arise in the implementation process. Every business environment is faced with turbulent circumstances that result from uncontrollable factors. Olsen et al (2005), agree that today's global competitive environment is complex, dynamic, and largely unpredictable. A future-oriented and flexible leadership style is therefore required. Flaum, (2002) observes that leaders need to be able to identify opportunities swiftly and be capable of turning challenges into opportunities.
5.3.2 Determining the effect of Organization Resource Allocation on strategy implementation at USIU-A

The study revealed that the method of assigning activities and tasks amongst the implementation team was clear within the team players. Samnani and Singh (2013), stipulate that misalignment of human resource practices can produce conflicting messages to employees, leading to reduced motivation and commitment to the company strategy. On the backside Mazzola and Kellermanns (2010), suggest that efficient communication should be able to give compressive explanation of new duties, responsibilities and obligations which are to be carried in a given organization. To capitalize an organization on its potential, it must design and deliver human resource practices that focus on necessary employee performance competencies, creating a HR system with vertical and horizontal alignment around those competencies (Herbert, Heneman and Anthony, 2011).

A majority of respondents agreed that the current university structures supported the implementation process. Chandler (1962) demonstrated the thesis that structure follows strategy based on a four case study of American conglomerates that had dominance in their industries. Chandler (1962) observed that institutional needs differ therefore different structures are required to implement different strategies. Mazzolla and Kellermanns (2010), relay that proper strategy-structure alignment is a necessary precursor to successful implementation of new strategies. Ideally, structures are changed when they no longer provide the coordination and control necessary to implement strategies successfully Chandler (1962).

Successful organizations seek to have the right type and numbers of people to perform the duties aimed to achieve the firm’s objectives (Schuler, Randall & Jackson 2006). The researcher established that USIU recruits employees with appropriate skills for their job. The study further determined that the university staff also benefited from employee development programs through training and knowledge sharing. Maw-Shin, Yung-Lung & Feng-Jhy (2014), stipulate that the human resource factor in strategy implementation involves attracting the right type of people; developing the knowledge, skills and abilities and human resource retention.
The researcher observed that majority of respondents agreed upon the university resources being properly aligned to the strategy process. However, a considerable minority group declined. A recent school of thought based on extensive research suggests that competitive advantage of a firm depends on the resources the firm can command (Grattan, 2011). Leveraging a firm is therefore a key strategic decision and affects the strategies which are developed in the future and how successfully they can be implemented. Leadership plays a key role in financial resource allocation and alignment; a leader must prioritize and make resources available during strategic implementation (Lussier and Achua, 2009). Strategy should therefore factor how all financial and non-financial resources should be managed to support delivery (McCarthy, 2012).

5.3.3 Establish effect of Organization Culture on strategy implementation at (USIU-A)

The study revealed that here is a Culture-Strategy fit that supports the implementation process. Oliver (1992) identifies cultural fit as one of the forms of fit that affects an organization’s adaptation processes. Peters and Waterman (1982) recognize that many organizations unaware of the cultural diversities within which they exist find themselves unable to successfully implement strategies. This implies that a constricted culture strategy fit is required for an organization to be able to successfully implement strategy (Harison, 2004). Comerford (1985) argues that a culture that is grounded in strategy-supportive values, practices and behavioural norms adds to the power and effectiveness of a company’s strategy execution effort. The culture of an organization also makes employees identify what they believe is critical, achievable and personally important to them (Kachru, 2005).

Other findings of the study revealed that the new vice chancellor has demonstrated a clear understanding of the USIU strategy process. The current university culture also promotes coordination of activity between the leaders and executers of the various functions within the implementation process. Mehta and Krishnan (2004) suggest that successful companies apparently have strong cultures. The Cameron and Quinn’s CVF model uses two dimensions to categorize culture into four types Clan, Adhocracy, Hierarchy and Market based on two dimensions of, stability versus flexibility and internal focus versus external position.

In reference to cultural values, the study showed that execution team demonstrated that USIU met the changing organization needs to support the implementation process. Pearce
and Robinson (2003) term organizational culture as a strength that can be a weakness. It is strength because it eases and economizes communication, facilitates organizational decision making and control and may generate higher levels of cooperation and commitment to the organization which are necessary for strategy implementation. However it can be a weakness when important shared beliefs and values interfere with the need for business, its strategy and the people working on a firm’s behalf.

The study also determined that the university quickly embrace change to meet business environment needs that promote the implementation process. Barnat (1996) emphasizes that every business environment is faced with turbulent circumstances that result from uncontrollable factors. These are world events or circumstances which significantly affect investment values and business conditions. Leaders that make change must also grapple with such unexpected forces both inside and outside the organization. This may result from shift in government regulations, union activism, competitive assaults, mergers and acquisitions, and political and international crises are. All these are a reality of corporate life today (Barnat, 1996)

5.4 CONCLUSIONS

5.4.1 Leadership and Strategy Implementation at USIU-A

The findings of the study established that there is clear communication from top management regarding matters of strategy implementation. The leadership not only begins with setting goals and communicating them to employees but also prioritizes objectives, clarifies processes and, transmits the vision to the team. The responses revealed that the leadership is involved and takes responsibility of the implementation process. The top management involvement in turn inspired and supported employees encouraging them to participate in implementation process with understanding commitment towards attaining the objectives. The university uses a variety of communication channels to convey information and report progress.

5.4.2 Organization Resource Allocation and Strategy Implementation at USIU-A
The study also revealed that the university structure adequately supports strategy implementation thorough its ability to allocate resources, formulate functional objectives and plan for operational effectiveness. The functional areas are well represented through their participation in the implementation process as well as taking into account their functional needs. It also emerged that human resources were properly aligned based on the recruitment of competent employees for their respective jobs. Tasks and activities of implementation team were also clearly assigned.

Findings on a correlation between strategies and business processes emerged as a key component of resource alignment to the university, implying a structure–strategy fit. However, a reasonable minority of respondents were dissatisfied with allocation of adequate financial resources to uphold the implementation process.

5.4.3 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation at USIU-A

The study established a culture-strategy fit geared towards promotion of the implementation process. There is a clear understanding of ‘how we do things around here’, a significant need to conform to acceptable norms of behaviour and strong commitment USIU’s vision, performance targets and strategy. From the study, it was established that the new leadership had demonstrated a clear understanding of the strategy process, and exhibited openness to understand the organization culture. Coordination of activities between leaders and executers was also evident. Moreover, the study revealed that the universities’ preparedness to swiftly embracing the changing business environment to promote the strategy implementation process.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Leadership and Strategy Implementation at USIU-A

Grow capabilities: The current USIU leadership should lead the university towards using available growth opportunities by developing their inner capability. These may be through identifying and developing key participant’s skills within the implementation team. Additionally, USIU should seek more students’ counsel on future trends and anticipated
needs. The small student representation in implementation team should be complemented by additional resourceful students.

Reward Systems: Leadership should come up with more interesting ideas of keeping the process exciting and fun. They could introduce rewards and promotions for team members that exhibit exemplary outcomes as they work towards successful implementations. The leaders should use transparent approaches to give rewards based on merit as well as in alignment to the strategic planning process.

5.5.1.2 Organization Resource Allocation and Strategy Implementation at USIU-A
Finance Management: This function is more important to USIU; where financial resources are highly limited and capital allocations are challenging. The university could form a financial resource management team that has to be fully engaged and involved in the decision-making of resource planning of the process. Good strategy should also detail how all financial and non-financial resources should be managed to support delivery

Fund Raising: The university should formulate other creative ideas for sourcing of additional funds to be used by the implementation team. Most important to consider is that the sources of funding are clearly spelt out and aligned to the university strategy.

5.5.1.3 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation at USIU-A

Adopt a conscious culture: the university should consider finding out and communicating their culture based on dimensions of organizational culture along with the typologies of culture. Through determining USIU’s strategy needs, the most appropriate culture(s) will be identified from the universities objectives. For instance; Adhocracy, Clan, Hierarchy and Market or a combination of all to a favourable degree. The preferred culture could then be communicated and implemented with ease amongst teams.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

The important role of implementation of strategies is vital and can no longer be ignored in terms of rating the success of failure of up to 90% of strategy as revealed by various studies. There is considerable number of studies on success factors that affect strategy implementation in private firms on the basis of internal organization factors. Further studies
may be conducted to identify external factors affect strategy implementation, and how they could be addressed.

In addition to the proposed study, further research may be conducted for other sectors besides institutions of higher learning.
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APPENDIX I:
Introduction Letter

Date April 7, 2016

Dear Participant,

My name is Linda Vutagwa, I am a graduate student at United States International University Africa working on my MBA project. I am examining critical factors that influence strategy implementation with a focus on USIU. I have chosen you to participate in this study because of the significant role you play as part of USIU community. I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached survey.

The questionnaire will take approximately 8 minutes to complete. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk. Should you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible and comply with the survey instructions in each section.

Copies of the project will be provided to United States International University. If you would like a summary copy of this study please provide your email address for follow up.

Thank you for taking the time to contribute to this study. If you require additional information or have questions, please contact me at the address listed below.

Sincerely,

Linda Vutagwa Kezengwa

Email: lkezengwa@yahoo.com
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AT USIU

Kindly fill all the questions by ticking against one answer for each statement

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Please tick one answer for each of statements below:
   - Student
   - Staff
   - Faculty

2. How long have you worked/studied at USIU
   - Less than 3 Years
   - 4-6 Years
   - 7-9 Years
   - 10-12 Years
   - Above 12 Years

3. What school do you represent at USIU?
   - Humanities & Social Sciences
   - Science & Technology
   - Pharmacy & Health Sciences
   - Business
   - Other

SECTION B: Strategic Leadership factors on Strategy Implementation

Please tick one answer that corresponds with your personal opinion for each of the statements below

4. There is a clear communication from leadership towards the implementation process
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

5. The current university leadership is involved in strategy implementation
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6. The communication channels used are suitable in promoting the strategy implementation process
SECTION C: Effects of Organization Resource Alignment on Strategy Implementation

Please tick one answer that corresponds with your personal opinion for each statement below.

7. Leadership involvement inspires and motivates employees to support the implementation process
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

8. The university leadership has demonstrated preparedness and accounted into unexpected circumstances during the implementation process
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

9. Key strategy implementation tasks and activities are clearly assigned
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

10. The university structure adequately supports strategy implementation
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

11. The organization recruits talented employees with the right skills for their respective job
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

12. There are employee development programs in the university through formal training and knowledge sharing
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

13. Allocation of resources is clearly aligned to the organization strategies
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
SECTION D: Organization Culture on Strategy Implementation

Please tick one answer that corresponds with your personal opinion for each statement below:

14. The university Culture- Strategy fit links towards the implementation process
   - Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree Agree

15. The recent change in top management has demonstrated a clear understanding of the implementation process
   - Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree Agree

16. There is proper coordination of activity between leaders and executers in implementation process
   - Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree Agree

17. The execution team represents strong cultural values that meet the changing organizational needs
   - Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree Agree

18. The university quickly embraces changing business environment needs that promote the strategy implementation process
   - Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree Agree

THANKYOU

APPENDIX III: INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Choose one
   - Student Staff Faculty

2. How long have you worked/studied at USIU
   - Less than 4-6 Years 7-9 Years 10-12 Years Above 12 Years
3 Years

3. What do you consider as the most important factors when implementing the universities’ strategies?

4. What is/has been the leadership roles in determining success through the strategy implementation process?

5. How has the recent change in Vice Chancellor affected the implementation process?

6. How would you define the allocation of organization resources (Human, Finance, & Others) in alignment to strategy implementation?

7. How would you describe the current organization structure in relation to the strategy implementation process?

8. Does the university implementation team possess the required skills for their respective job?

9. How has the current USIU culture facilitated/or lacked in the execution of the strategic plan?

10. Does the USIU management formulate an effective organization culture for the implementation process?

APPENDIX IV: IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Data Instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test the Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing/Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX V: IMPLEMENTATION BUDGET

## IMPLEMENTATION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expense</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Photocopying</td>
<td>Covers direct out-of-pocket expense, that includes questionnaire production, printing, distribution, and collection</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>Pens and booklets</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire design</td>
<td>Pay designer to come up with suitable questionnaire forms as advised</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized domain</td>
<td>Purchase of personal domain to be used for research purpose</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>To book appointments with identified respondents for qualitative interviews</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Communication Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>Fuel cost to travel to USIU/interview venues within Nairobi</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Travel Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Expenses that result from unseen circumstances</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost (KES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>