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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the barriers to strategy implementation among real estate companies in Kenya focusing on Suraya Property Group Limited. The study was guided by the following three research questions: What are the barriers Suraya Property Group Limited face while implementing their strategic plans? What solutions have Suraya Property Group Limited applied to handle the barriers they face while implementing strategic plans? Which of these solutions are deemed effective by the management of Suraya Property Group Limited?

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The sample population was the 95 employees of Suraya Property Group Limited. A stratified sampling technique to select a sample size of 76 respondents was used. Data was analysed both for descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) and inferential statistics (correlation analysis). Tables and figures were used in presenting data results.

The findings on barriers to strategy implementation established that majority of the respondents agreed that barriers to strategy implementation were: lack of sufficient resources to operationalize the strategic plans; the Suraya management did not put in place adequate plans to coordinate the implementation of the strategic plans; the strategic plans did not take into account personal expectations hence the stakeholders were not motivated towards the implementation process; people did not just buy-in the idea in implementation of the strategic plan; and, there was no accountability and there was a feeling that the resources for strategic plan implementation were somehow misappropriated.

Findings on the solutions to strategy implementation barriers showed that there should be the idea that clear communication from the top management to various operational units, allocation of adequate financial resources in execution of the strategic plans, relevant members of staff should be involved during strategy planning and development, staff should be motivated and sensitized on the strategic plans, proper monitoring system for the implementation of the strategic plans, and flexible strategic plan to take care of unforeseen circumstances like inflation, new government legislation, among others.
The findings of this study revealed the existence of a statistically significant relationship between solutions and effective solutions to strategy implementation barriers. Effective communication and employee involvement were cited as effective solutions to strategy implementation barriers.

The study recommends that the management of Suraya Property Group Limited should put more effort in ensuring effective communication during strategy formulation and its implementation. This is assumed to bridge the gap between formulators and implementers. Information flow should be fast and clear from the top management to the individual staff in various operational units in Suraya Property Group Limited. Employee involvement was another effective solution. Suraya Property Group Limited should apply this concept of involving relevant staff members when developing strategy and during its implementation. The strategic plans are formulated and implemented by people, as a result, staff involvement becomes key. When the employees are involved, their opinions, and aspirations will be taken into consideration; in effect, implementation process will be in synchrony with their personal objectives, passion, skills and talents. It is suggested that such a study be done in other firms in other sectors to increase the statistical power of the study and more reliable results. There is therefore a great potential for research in this direction. This study can also be improved by looking at post implementation of strategic plans.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Porter (1996) defines strategy as the creation of unique and valuable position by involving different sets of activities so as to be competitive. Strategy itself can be seen as a plan for an organization, where after recognizing the need for strategic change, the manager sets goals, and then he must determine actions to achieve those goals with the resources he has available (Brinkschröder, 2014). The notion of strategy implementation might be viewed as being straightforward where a strategy is formulated and then it is implemented (Otley, 2003). Alu and Lie (2014) posit that in the last decades, there has been an increased interest in the implementation of strategy, a shift from pure focus on just its formulation, as this is considered the major building block of organization success. The key to success is an integrative view of the implementation (Raps, 2005). Successful implementation of any strategy might be a big huddle to organizations.

Formulating strategy is perceived to be difficult, making strategy work by executing or implementing it throughout the organization is considered even more difficult, hence without effective implementation, no business strategy can ever succeed (Alu Andersen & Lie, 2014). What makes strategy implementation difficult? Al-Ghamdi (1998) argues that there are seven hindrances to strategy implementation process: lack of understanding of one’s role in the execution process; deviation from planned objective; changes in responsibilities of employees being not clear; people are not fully rewarded for the execution of plans; inadequate directions given by departmental managers; information system used for implementation is usually inadequate; and lastly, overall goals are not well understood by employees.

In real estate sectors, just like other sectors, decisions will be effective if such decisions support the enterprise’s overall business objectives, and this result can be achieved only by the explicit consideration of how real estate strategy supports corporate strategy and the sub-strategies for component elements of the corporation, and then in turn how specific real estate operating decisions support the real estate strategy (Nourse & Roulac, 2009). Hewlett (1999) reveals that real estate companies can gain a competitive advantage by formulating and implementing a strategic plan since the strategic planning process gives focus to the
organization and allows it to measure its accomplishments against expectations. This process is said to have four basic steps, namely, situation analysis, strategy planning, implementation and assessment; the first step being examining the company's present status in terms of competencies relative to the competition, to the industry and to the economy; the second step involving determining which strategies the firm will adopt to meet its goals; while the implementation stage entails identifying and assigning resources and responsibilities; finally, assessments must be conducted regularly to determine if methods are effective and if goals are met (Hewlett, 1999). The real estate sector has undergone dynamic volatilities since the 2008 credit crunch that tumbled both the financial sector and the real estate market (Bergsman, 2009). To remain relevant, it is only prudent for real estate companies to successfully implement their business strategies.

Real estate is sometimes inaccurately spoken of as a profession, but it is essentially a business, and the principal divisions of the real estate business are investment, operation and agency (Kimmons, 2010). Real estate is property consisting of land and the buildings on it, along with its natural resources such as crops, minerals, or water, immovable property of this nature (Cummings, 2010). Research findings by Antonio (2006) indicated that real estate accounts for a large share of wealth; about 33% and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of about 11% in the United States of America. Smith (2008) observes that real estate market is one that is characterized by almost predictable cycles of booms and busts.

A majority of listed companies with the exception of banks are involved in real estate development and real estate investments. A study by Muthee (2012) reveals that there will be continued resilience of the housing market as a long term investment in Kenya with strong demand holding prices firm throughout the economic slowdown and growing property prices continuing to drive overall property returns.

Thus it is on this basis that the study aimed to investigate barriers to strategy implementation in real estate companies in Kenya with a focus on Suraya Property Group Limited.

Suraya Property Group Limited is a real estate company that was incorporated in 2006 by Pete and Sue Muraya. There are three under this umbrella group: Plence Architects, Sales and Suraya Facilities Management. There are currently 95 employees working across all departments in Head Office. The Group has a vision is to become the leading property development company in Africa by creating lifestyles that change the way
people live, work and play through innovation, eco-friendly and affordable developments. The Group’s mission is to create quality, affordable housing through a goal oriented team that executes innovative ideas to change the landscape of the housing development while establishing sustainable wealth and a signature brand (Suraya Property Group Limited, 2017).

Muraya’s firm is one of the few that can boast of having housing projects across all the market segments – from the high-end to the lower-middle-income groups. The firm started with Rosslyn Gardens near Gigiri, Nairobi, in its formative years for the high-end market segment, then came to the upper-middle-income segment with Fourways Junction on Kiambu Road and then Encasa (off Mombasa Road) for the lower-middle-income segment (Suraya Property Group Limited, 2017).

Some of the other real estate properties completed by Suraya Property Group include Fourways Junction phase I and phase II, Rosslyn Gardens; Rosslyn Heights, Loneview Marionettes, Loneview Apartments, The Lynx Mbagathi, Encasa Mombasa Road and Spring Valley Business Park in Nairobi. Other properties under development include; Encase Mombasa Road Phase II, Fourways Classix, Lynx Muchai drive, Tiara at Chalbi drive, Terrace at Lavington, The Falls at Riverside, Lynx at Ngong Road, Lynx at West and Lynx at Royal (Suraya Property Group Limited, 2017).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Suraya Property Group Limited has the vision to become the leading property development company in Africa by creating lifestyles that change the way people live, work and play through innovation, eco-friendly and affordable developments. This can only be achieved by formulating and successfully implementing business strategies. Suraya has faced a number of barriers towards implementing her strategic objectives in an attempt to strive towards her vision. Several scholars have conducted studies on organizations’ challenges towards implementing their strategies. Gatheru (2015) performed a study on challenges of strategy implementation in Nairobi city county, Kenya. It was found out that Nairobi County had a well formulated vision, mission, core values and strategies under implementation to enable them achieve their strategic objectives, although only 50% of the County strategies were implemented in the last 3 years. Koigi (2016) carried out a similar study on the Office of Auditor General of Kenya and revealed that the challenges of strategy implementation were;
resistance to change, culture problems, insufficient acceptance by implementers; inadequate funding of activities; time constraints; logistic issues, bureaucracy, lack of stakeholder involvement, poor communication, lack of adequate staff, inadequate implementation of information and communication technologies, delay and inadequate funding for audit operations hinder execution of strategy implementation process, delay in availing documents and responding to audit queries, inadequate staffing, lack of independence in utilization of available resources and biased performance management, slow implementation of policies, inadequate regulations and guidelines system.

Other empirical studies have been carried out in telecommunication companies in Kenya. Most scholars have concentrated their studies around public sector in Kenya, where less attention is given to the private sector especially real estate.

This study focused on real estate industry in Kenya taking a case of Suraya Property Group Limited. The researcher having a working experience in the real estate sector in Kenya, provided a great opportunity to explore challenges or barriers that real estate companies do face in successful implementation of business strategies and how these barriers can be surmounted in the real estate industry. This study will also look at how each solution is effective in addressing these barriers to strategic implementation and also focusing on real estate sector in Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the barriers to strategy implementation among real estate companies in Kenya focusing on Suraya Property Group Limited.

1.4 Research Questions

1.4.1 What are the barriers Suraya Property Group Limited face while implementing strategic objectives?
1.4.2 What are the solutions to the barriers Suraya Property Group Limited face while implementing strategic objectives?
1.4.3 Which of these solutions are deemed effective by the management of Suraya Property Group Limited?
1.5 **Significance of the Study**

1.5.1 **Suraya Property Group Limited**

The study could be valuable to a number of stakeholders including managers at Suraya Property Group Limited, policy makers, Suraya Property Group Limited customers, researchers and academicians and real estate industry in general. It is believed that managers at Suraya Property Group Limited will utilize the findings of this study relevant in that it will inform them of the various ways in which they can overcome challenges during strategic implementation of their goals.

1.5.2 **Construction Authority of Kenya**

The findings of this study will be valuable to the Construction Authority of Kenya and other Government Ministries in formulation of policies and regulations. For instance, the Construction Authority of Kenya will use the findings of this study in advising the real estate companies in Kenya on wise strategic implementation, as a result, set the companies on global competitive map.

1.5.4 **Researchers and Academicians**

Future researchers and academicians can adopt the findings of this study relevant in that it will act as an empirical source of their future studies on strategic implementation besides suggesting areas for further research. Scholars can also benefit in terms of the contribution to the general body of knowledge in the broad area of strategy planning and execution. This will not only enhance the understanding of barriers in strategic implementation in real estate companies but also enable the development of further areas of research interest.

1.6 **Scope of the Study**

This study focused on Suraya Property Group Limited which is a real estate company in Kenya. The respondents were the current employees of the company. These are employees of different skills and background as they have worked with the company for varying period. The company currently has 95 employees at the Head Office. These employees who comprise different categories were the target population.
1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Barriers

Dictionary.com (2017) defines barrier as anything that restrains or obstructs progress, access, among others. In this context, barriers refer to the challenges, obstacles or hindrances organizations, such as real estate companies, do face during the implementation of their business strategies.

1.7.2 Strategic Objectives

Strategic objectives refer to an organization’s articulated aims or responses geared towards addressing major change or improvement, competitiveness or social issues, and business advantages; they set an organization’s longer-term directions and guide resource allocations and redistributions and they are usually articulated in strategic plan document (Dess, 2005).

1.7.2 Strategy

Strategy has been used to mean a method or plan chosen to bring about a desired future, such as achievement of a goal or solution to a problem (Business Dictionary, 2017).

1.7.2 Strategy Formulation

Strategy formulation is defined as the process employed by management or executives to adjust the organization and its activities to the environment; strategies are said to be goal oriented streams of decisions (Miller, 1975).

1.7.3 Strategy Implementation

Strategy implementation is the translation of chosen strategy into organizational action so as to achieve formulated strategic goals and objectives involving resource mobilization, restructuring, cultural changes, technological changes, systems and process changes, policy changes and leadership changes (Kaplan & Norton, The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action, 1996). Strategies are usually packaged in Strategic Plans of organizations which span periods like five (5) years, ten (10) years, and so on.
1.7.4 Real Estate

Real estate is property consisting of land and the buildings on it, along with its natural resources such as crops, minerals, or water, immovable property of this nature (Cummings, 2010). Real estate industry is the focus for these research, whereby challenges for strategy implementation are investigated and their solutions.

1.7.5 Suraya Property Group Limited

Suraya Property Group Limited is the case study for this research project. It is a real estate company that was incorporated in 2006 by Pete and Sue Muraya, located in Suraya Studio, Shanzu Link, Off Lower Kabete Road, Nairobi, Kenya (Suraya Property Group Limited, 2017).

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter contains the background information, problem statement, purpose of this study, its significance, scope and definition of terms. This chapter started by exploring the background information relating to the study. In this section, a review on strategy implementation has been elaborated, emphasis has been put on barriers to strategy implementation in organization generally. The study has illustrated the state of real estate sector in Kenya and how the sector contributes to the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This sub-section has also described Suraya Property Group Limited which is the case study of this project. The chapter has explained the problem statement of the proposed study; it has reviewed past scholars in related area and has identified gaps that this study is expected to fill. The purpose of the project research has been stated, its expected contribution to different audiences, with clear scope that the project will tackle. The chapter has concluded with definition of various terms as will be applied in this project.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The chapter presents a review of the related literature on the barriers faced by real estate companies during strategy implementation by various researchers, scholars and authors. The chapter commences with reviewing strategy, strategic planning and implementation. It follows with theories surrounding barriers to strategic implementation, then possible solutions to these barriers. The section concludes by analyzing the effectiveness of these solutions.

2.2 Barriers to Strategy Implementation

This section reviews the barriers faced by organizations during strategy implementation. It starts with introducing the concepts of strategy, then strategy planning and implementation are described, and lastly, it analyzes the barriers to strategy implementation.

2.2.1 The Concept of Strategy

Strategy can be defined as a method or a plan chosen to bring about a desired future, such as achievement of a goal or solution to a problem (Business Dictionary, 2017). Oster (1999) claims that strategy is a plan to get us from one point to another where mission, vision, goals, objectives, and/or values define what the new point is. Strategies are usually large scale activities that shape the direction of an organization with a focus on developing ways of solving existing problems, preventing or mitigating the impact of foreseeable threats as well as leveraging existing and anticipated opportunities (Dooris, Kelley, & Trainer, 2004). Strategy can therefore be termed as a plan to change an organization from good to better in accordance to the overall mandate of that organization, through formulation and implementation the plan.

Strategy itself can be seen as a plan for an organization, where after recognizing the need for strategic change, the manager sets goals, and then he determine actions to achieve those goals with the resources he has available (Brinkschröder, 2014). It is argued that there are three
models of strategy; linear, adaptive, and interpretive (Chaffee, 1985). According to the linear view, strategy consists of integrated decisions, actions, or plans that will set and achieve viable organizational goals where both goals and the means of achieving them are results of strategic decision. Adaptive model is concerned with the development of a viable match between the opportunities and risks present in the external environment and the organization's capabilities and resources for exploiting these opportunities. Chaffee (1985) further illustrates that strategy in the interpretive model might be defined as orienting metaphors or frames of reference that allow the organization and its environment to be understood by organizational stakeholders.

2.2.2 Strategy Planning and Implementation

Strategic planning process provides a format for developing specific strategies, converting those strategies into a business planning process, and establishing measurable and attainable organizational goals; it is, thus, a process that involves not only determining where an organization wants and needs to go, but also how it is going to get there (Hussey, 1999). It is argued that increasing the level of sophistication of strategic planning process does not increase any performance advantage in an organization, higher performance it attributable only to the effectiveness of the implementation of the strategic plan (Hahn & Powers, 1999). Strategic planning processes can take many forms and be approached in any ways. Strategic planning processes typically involve several man hours of top executive time as well as leaders in middle management, highly paid consultants or consulting firms, as well as space, supplies and other resources (Dooris, Kelley & Trainer, 2004; Fathi & Wilson, 2009). With the amount of resources typically involved in strategic plans for large organizations, the planning process is vitally important.

According to Martin (2014), strategic plans all tend to be somehow similar since they usually have three major parts: the first being a vision or mission statement that sets out a relatively lofty and aspirational goal; the second one is a list of initiative like product launches, geographic expansions, and construction project that the organization will carry out in pursuit of the goal, and is usually very organized but also very long where the length of the list is generally constrained only by affordability; and lastly, the third element being the conversion of the initiatives into financials where the plan dovetails nicely with the annual budget.
Any strategy well formulated and not acted upon may be considered useless as no strategy at all. Strategy implementation is the translation of chosen strategy into organizational action so as to achieve formulated strategic goals and objectives. The implementation process usually involves resource mobilization, restructuring, cultural changes, technological changes, systems and process changes, policy changes and leadership changes (Kaplan & Norton, The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action, 1996). Hrebiniak (2006) observed that although formulating a consistent strategy is a difficult task for any management team, making that strategy work or implementing it throughout the organization is even more difficult. Niven (2002) further states that strategy execution is one thing to sit down and craft what is seemingly a winning strategy, but successfully implementing it is another thing entirely, meaning the two are totally different.

Sashital and Wilemon (1996) have pointed out that some terms synonymous with “implementation”, such as “execution”, and “actualization of goals” are used in the management literature, but are not frequently applied by managers themselves. Thompson and Strickland (1998) have stressed that strategy-implementation/strategy-execution task is the most complicated and time-consuming part of strategy management (in Monzavi, Mirabi, & Jamshidi, 2013). Thus, it can be considered that strategy-implementation would not different from strategy-execution. Yang et al. (2009) explain that there was no agreed upon definition for strategy execution, however, they still identify three distinguishable concepts for strategy execution: the first perspective focuses on the procedural viewpoint and uses strategy execution as a series of accurately planned consecutive steps. The second perspective defines strategy execution as an almost coordinated operations (but often parallel) and third one, behavioral analysis of these operations. Some authors combine the procedural and behavioral with the operational perspective, to create what is called the hybrid point of view (Monzavi, Mirabi, & Jamshidi, 2013).

Okumus (2001) expounded the above framework and added three new variables to it. The summarized implementation framework has four sections: content (strategic decision making, executing different projects), context (internal context: organizational structure, organizational culture, organizational learning; external content: environmental uncertainty in the general and task environment), process (operational planning, resources allocation, people, communications, monitoring and feedback, external partners) and outcome (tangible and intangible outcomes of the project).
2.2.3 Barriers

It has been illustrated that strategic implementation is more vital than just a strategic plan on paper. Implementation is basically the actualization of the plan. The implementation is again more difficult than the planning. Practitioners do emphatically agree that it is a lot easier to develop a sound strategic plan than it is to make it happen (Thompson A. A., 1993). Most strategies stumble in the implementation phase and fail to see their actualization (Allio, 2005).

The following sections highlight various barriers to strategy implementation

Certain scholars argue that there are seven hindrances to strategy implementation process: lack of understanding of one’s role in the execution process; deviation from planned objective; changes in responsibilities of employees being not clear; people are not fully rewarded for the execution of plans; inadequate directions given by departmental mangers; information system used for implementation is usually inadequate; and lastly, overall goals are not well understood by employees (Al-Ghamdi, 1998). Research by Alexander (1985) identified twenty-two major obstacles to strategy implementation, of which ten were cited by over fifty per cent of firms sampled as major problems.

Based on case studies, Hansen, Boyd and Kryder (1998) identified additional implementation problems as: failing to periodically alter the plan or adapt it to changes in the business environment; deviation from original objectives; and, lack of confidence about success.

According to views held by Kaplan & Norton (2001), in the current business landscape, it is emphasized to implement solid strategies as the unique and sustainable ways by which organizations create value, however, research reveals that companies have an increasingly difficult time executing the strategies they need to remain competitive. One reason for this is clearly that while these strategies, and the business issues behind them, are changing constantly, the tools for measuring the effectiveness of these strategies have not kept pace (Kaplan & Norton, 2001).

2.2.3.1 Vision, People, Management and Resource Barriers

It is claimed that strategy is very difficult to even best organization to effectively implement, and the barriers to strategy execution have been identified as vision barrier, people barrier,
management barrier, and resource barrier (Niven, 2002). These barriers are illustrated in figure 2.1 below.

**Figure 2.1: Barriers to Strategy Execution (Niven, 2002)**

Niven (2002) describes these barriers in the following paragraphs.

Vision barrier occurs due to unawareness of the vision by the organization. In this case, it is argued that only 5% of the work force understands the strategy. It is evident that most organizations have now adopted vision statements to communicate as fundamental values and beliefs to their respective employees; (Ahmad, Rajuddin, & others, 2005), usually, a vision is a statement that addresses core beliefs and identifies target markets and core products. The organization vision statements are designed to be inspirational and provide energy throughout the whole organization. Developing the vision statement is often considered as the first step in strategic planning (Misankova & Kocisova, 2014). Vision statements are often difficult to put into practice because it is seldom to see a wide gap between the words on paper and the employees' day-to-day actions as those who should implement the strategies in most case do not understand the vision and the strategy (Ahmad, Rajuddin, & others, 2005). It is argued that vision barrier arises when vision and strategies are not explained to other organizational staff in a way that they can comprehend (Abuya, 2014). It is noted that lack of communication of the vision and strategy further impedes the workforce ability to understand the organization’s vision and strategy, where, if lower levels of management and the workforce do not know, or understand the organization’s vision and strategy, they will be unable to understand their role in the execution of the organization’s strategy and it is seldom
that employees are committed and also give their buy-in to a strategic plan if they do not understand it. (Davis, Jansen van Rensburg, & Venter, 2016).

After looking at the vision barrier, people barrier is described. According to Niven (2002), only 25% of managers have personal objectives and incentives linked to strategy where most incentive compensation systems are tied to short-term financial results, instead of the long-term initiatives that support strategy execution. This indicates that if employees are incentivized, the rewards may be an effective driver to successful strategy implementation; this seems to be consistent with the strategy implementation framework by Okumus (2003) which recommends incentives as a key factor to implementing strategies successfully. In this case, people who should implement the strategy become a barrier just because they do not care about the future or long-term gain of the strategy if their immediate personal objectives cannot be met.

What is resource barrier? This barrier is as a result of having insufficient resources to execute the strategy. It is noted that 60% of organizations do not link budgets to strategy (Niven, 2002). This occurrence is not uncommon, as in many companies the budgeting and strategic planning functions do not interact. And since budgets are the traditional tools for planning the allocation of human and financial resources, strategic plans and strategic initiatives may fall short in terms of necessary resources.

Management barrier comes in as a result of 85% of executive teams usually spending less than one hour per month discussing the strategy; it is uncommon that when you hold operations reviews, the majority of time dedicated to a discussion of financial results, focusing on "budget versus actual" variances, but since budgets are often not linked to the strategic plan, the discussions may completely avoid any focus on the true value drivers in the business (Niven, 2002).

2.2.3.2 Lack of Communication

Lack of communication has been cited as a hindrance to strategy implementation in various organizations. It is argued that between the ideal of strategy alignment and the reality of its implementation lie many difficulties; lack of proper communication being one of them (Beer & Eisenstat, 2000); this difficulty comes in because of the fact that a well-conceived strategy
communicated to the organization is equated to its implementation. Absence of communication hence means absence of strategy implementation.

A case study conducted to identify barriers to the successful strategy implementation in a Norwegian ferry-cruise company revealed that a communication problem believed to be influenced to some extent by the organizational structure, constituted the key barriers to the implementation of planned strategic activities. (Heide, Grønhaug, & Johannessen, 2002).

Aaltonen & Ikavalko (2002) also identified lack of communication, among others, as a barrier to strategy implementation since the stakeholders in the strategy implementation are unawareness or have a misunderstanding of the strategy. This in effect, makes it had for strategic plan that is not well communicated to be implemented successfully.

### 2.2.3.3 Negligence on Employees

Ignoring employee input during strategy formulation can lead to barriers ahead of strategy implementation. Niven (2002) argues that only 25% of managers have personal objectives and incentives linked to strategy where most incentive compensation systems are tied to short-term financial results, instead of the long-term initiatives that support strategy execution, and hence, this puts employees’ concerns out of strategic plans. It is the employees that do the implementation of the strategic plans. People would not fully support implementation of strategic initiatives when they have an anemic or nonexistent level of engagement as employees (Harter, Schmidt, Asplund, Killham, & Agrawal, 2010). Employee engagement becomes the core. Employee engagement is said to be all about the relationship between an individual and the organization for which they work (Mirvis, 2012). This does not necessarily mean that employees will be warm and happy or agreeing with everything the organization says or does, but it is about being committed to seeing the relationship through and trusting that even when they disagree, they trust and value the relationship they have with their employer (Welch, 2011). Neglecting employees will lead to lack of buy-in of the strategic plans by these employees (Cepa, 2015).

### 2.2.3 Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

The solutions to barriers of strategy implementation is basically implementing strategies successfully by matching the planned and the realized strategies, which together is
aimed at reaching the organizational vision. The components of strategy implementation (Waterman, 1982) are, organization competencies, capabilities, strengths; resources; strategy-supportive policies; best practice and continuous improvement; information and communication systems; rewards and incentives; environment/culture/strategy fit are not necessarily successive and they cannot be detached from one another.

Empirical findings by Miller (1997) highlight four factors that appear to be critical for the successful management of implementation: backing, clear aims and planning, and a conducive climate, with an assumption that events will not get in the way (Miller S. , 1997). Perhaps surprisingly, other factors, such as having relevant experience, giving implementation priority, having abundant resources, an appropriate structure and implementation flexibly, appear to matter rather less (Miller, 1997). It is argued that the balanced scorecard, subject to the adoption of suitable processes, can address the key problems associated with strategy implementation including communication, the role of middle managers and integration with existing control systems (Atkinson, 2006).

According to Allio (2005), strategy development usually receives significant attention and resources, but implementation is often neglected, with disastrous consequences, as a result, using a straightforward approach, format, and process, managers mandated with realization of strategy can bridge the gap between rhetoric and reality; they can succeed in accomplishing what they set out to do, and think and act strategically.

According to Brinkschröder (2014), the most important solutions to challenges facing strategy implementation are: ensuring information exchange and meeting points between personnel of the different subsidiaries; making communication interesting short and flexible to clearly convey overall objectives, increase atmosphere and motivation; more familiar conversations with every level in the organization even strengthen their effects; give support to raise understanding and enthusiasm; building teams and hold meetings to organize and allocate; incentives for the employees to motivate for strategic change; and, leadership and giving responsibility to raise commitment and identification.

Based on arguments by Nutt (1986), there are four types of implementation tactics used by managers in executing strategies: intervention, participation, persuasion, and edict. Intervention refers to strategy adjustments during the implementation stage by introducing
new norms and practices; while participation consists of articulating strategic goals and nominating a task force that develops and proposes corresponding implementation options; persuasion consists of the tactic of using the involved parties to convince employees about the decided course of actions; and lastly, the main mechanism for implementation in the edicts tactics (that relies on power and is characterized by absence of participation) is the issuing of directives (Nutt, 1997).

A study on challenges of strategy implementation at Kakamega Teachers Savings and Credit Cooperative Society in Kenya by Avigoke (2013) recommended solutions to challenges of strategy implementation as: performing assessment of the internal environment; formulation of appropriate policies; procuring a new information technology system; hiring and training more staff; and developing an appropriate reward system. This study thus reveals a new perspective of solution, the introduction of information management system in strategy implementation.

Other scholars have also suggested measures to solve strategy implementation challenges which include streamlining staff reward and motivation mechanism, instituting staff development program for skills enhancement, beef up fundraising and adequate resource allocation, ensure participation of all key stakeholders in strategy formulation and implementation processes, and developing an effective communication system to ensure effective information sharing (Musambayi, 2012).

A rigorous study by Cepa (2015) entitled “Developing a framework for the strategy content-process relationship in view of implementation problems-a multiple case study” identified that solutions offered to strategy implementation challenges from various literature are as diverse as the potential sources of the problem of ineffective or inefficient strategy implementation. A summary of commonly appearing implementation problems with the commonly proposed solutions are displayed in figure 2 below.
Figure 2.2: Mapping of strategy implementation solutions with strategy implementation problems (Cepa, 2015)
From figure 2.2 above, we find a summary of solutions to strategy implementation problems as effective communication, clear allocation of responsibilities, clear accountability, clear prioritization, action planning / budgeting, having more concrete strategy, allocating sufficient resources, rewards system supports strategy, (Cross-functional) cooperation, control – long term goals into short term objectives, effective performance monitoring, aligning organizational design and capabilities with the strategy.

2.2.4 Effective Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

This study tries not just to find solutions for successful strategy implementation but to evaluate the effectiveness of these solutions, especially in the context of real estate in Kenya.

2.2.4.1 Effective Communication

It is revealed that for strategy implementation communication can be the biggest barrier if lacking and disturbed or the biggest solution to help to be effective (Brinkschröder, 2014). For this case, having a clear and effective communication should be seen as one of the main solutions for strategy implementation challenges.

Gavurová (2010) in her publication defines basic principles which could help to achieve an effective implementation of the strategy of an organization are:

- Communication of the strategy through the whole company is a key to implementation. Employees are not inclined to organizational changes that accompany the implementation of the strategy so there is a need for effective communication of strategic goals, their achievement as well as their influence on daily activities of employees. Communication enables everybody in the organization to know the direction the organization is going and what the objectives are, as well as, the vision, thus the ideal state; communication serves as a mean to reach this consensus. (Brinkschröder, 2014). Management’s task is to ensure that this communication takes place, between themselves and middle management, between different functions and between other important connections in the organization.

2.2.4.2 Employee Involvement

Employee involvement or simply, employee engagement is one of the most effective solutions to problems of strategy execution. Robinson et al. (2004) define employee
engagement as “a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee.”

Involving employees in the implementation of the strategy is another factor. Keeping initiative on employees to find effective way for achieving strategic goals allows company to eliminate employee’s resistance to changes which may be brought about by the new strategy to be implemented (Gavurová, 2010).

Strategic implementation includes planning and executing strategies related to process changes in an organization. In businesses of all sizes, including small businesses, implementation assists in ensuring that changes occur appropriately across all departments and teams within the company, where on both a macro level, which involves the entire organization, and a micro level, which focuses on each individual within the organization, change needs to be well-thought-out and communicated effectively to be successful. Employee Involvement has become a very significant topic today as there is an allotment affray in the market in every locality of study, every person has got access to technology, finance and new procedures of employed; it is only the manpower which makes all the distinction. If an organization wants the lead, it will have to involve its people in discussions & decision making where strategy implementation comes in (Zafar, Butt, & Afzal, 2014).

It is argued that if change is truly constant, then it stands to reason that organizations level of commitment to employee engagements should be as well since the people working for an organization are at the heart of effective response to any call for change (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). People are far less likely to help participate in planning or support implementation of strategic initiatives when they have an anemic or nonexistent level of engagement as employees (Harter, Schmidt, Asplund, Killham, & Agrawal, 2010). Employee engagement is said to be all about the relationship between an individual and the organization for which they work (Mirvis, 2012). It does not necessarily mean being warm and happy or agreeing with everything the organization says or does, but it is about being committed to seeing the relationship through and trusting that even when they disagree, they trust and value the relationship they have with their employer (Welch, 2011).
The extent of employee engagement can be measured by how connected, committed, and vested an employee is in their relationship to their employer (Millar, 2012; Welch, 2011), highly engaged employees are more likely to go above and beyond the call of duty to ensure the organization’s success (Smith & Cantrell, 2011; Tomlinson, 2010). Increased employee engagement is driven by positive emotions in regard to empowerment, enthusiasm, confidence, inspiration, and value, meaning, if an employee feels valued, empowered, enthusiastic, confident, and inspired by an organization, they are more likely to have a high level of engagement with that organization (Tims, Bakker, & Xanthopoulou, 2011).

Markos & Sridevi (2010) posit that employee engagement is particularly important when organizations face various threats and have to find opportunities in challenging times, and this implies too during strategy implementation. Different business models, new technologies, and changing global demographics are also contributing to a tension that demands a response (Stern, 2013; Zing, 2010). Strategic planning efforts in higher education, just as in other organizations, tend to be more effective when stakeholders throughout the organization are involved in developing the strategy and planning the execution (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Fathi & Wilson, 2009; Ofori & Atiogbe, 2012). Senior leadership visions are often misinterpreted or poorly executed when the involvement of staff from various organizational areas is overlooked (Ofori & Atiogbe, 2012). Markos & Sridevi (2010) observed that in a certain study of strategic planning processes at three universities in Ghana, one of the findings was that staff perceived strategic plans as the responsibility of top management, so they took little or no ownership of actions to support successful implementation. At Brigham Young University in Idaho, staff from departments throughout the organization were involved heavily in the strategic planning process so they took ownership of seeing them successfully implemented (Christensen & Eyring, 2011).

2.2.4.3 Organizational Change

Different scholars have coincided to the fact that unless internal and external factors are static, strategic plans tend to lead to organizational change, since effective change is highly dependent upon employee engagement (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Francesca Gambarotto & Cammozzo, 2010).

A company should adjust the organizational structure to company’s processes in connection with outputs from employees and control systems so as to maximize the processes.
Control is in the process of implementation of the strategy necessary and the problem is content and methodology of control, it is necessary to focus not only on control of the implementation of the strategy but also on the relevance of the strategy given by changing internal and external environment of the company.

2.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter reviews the literature on the strategy formulation, strategy implementation, barriers to strategy implementation, and solutions for strategy implementation barriers. Again, effectiveness of these solutions has also been reviewed. Following, chapter three, describes the research methodology that was adopted for the study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology that was adopted for the study. The study research design is presented first, followed by population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures and finally, data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Design

There are many definitions of research design. According to Cooper and Schindler (2014), research design constitutes the outline for the collection, measurement, and analysis of data. It expresses both the structure of the research problem, which consists of the framework, organization, or configuration of the relationships among variables of a study and the plan of investigation used to obtain realistic evidence on those relationships.

This study applied descriptive research design because its purpose is to produce an accurate representation of persons, events, or situations. According to Kothari (2008), a descriptive research design reports the manner in which things are thus aids in establishing the current position of the studied population. The study had three independent variables; barriers to strategy implementation; and solutions to strategy implementation barriers. The dependent variable was effectiveness of the solutions to strategy implementation barriers.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

According to Cooper and Schindler (2003), a population is the total collection of elements about which we wish to make inferences. Target population in statistics is the specific population about which information is desired. According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009), a population is a well-defined or set of people, services, elements, and events, group of things or households that are being investigated. The target population comprised of management and non-management employees of Suraya Property Group Limited in Head office who are a total of 95 in number. It is cheaper to carry out the research from a sample
rather than from the entire population due to logistical aspects. The population was grouped into three categories to differentiate management from other employees. This classification was adopted so as to segment the population and aid in the investigation process. These are distributed as shown in the Table 3.1 below:

**Table 3.1: Population Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.2 Sampling Design and Technique

Sampling ensures that some elements of a population are selected as representative of the whole population. In this section, detailed description of sampling frame, sampling technique and the actual sample size was provided.

#### 3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009), a sampling frame is a list of elements from which the sample is actually drawn and closely related to the population. According to Cooper and Schindler (2003), a sampling frame defines a set of elements from which a researcher can select a sample of the target population. The sampling frame for this study was a list of all employees in Head office provided by the Human Resource Department. The list constituted a total of 95 employees. The employees were categorized into top level management, supervisor level and junior level. The sampling frame was obtained from the Human Resource Manager at Suraya Property Group Limited.

#### 3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

To ensure fair representation and generalization of the findings to the general population, proportional stratified random sample was used. According to Walimann (2005), proportional stratified sampling is used when the cases in a population fall into distinctly different
categories of a known sample of that population. When proportions of the different strata in a population are known, then each stratum must be represented in the same proportion within the overall sample. Coopers and Schindler (2000) support this when they contend that stratified sampling gives statistical efficiency increase on a sample which provides adequate data for analyzing the various sub-population and enables difference research methods and procedures to be used in different strata. This technique was adopted since the study was to collect views from top management to technical members of staff in Suraya Property Group Limited; that is, top managers, supervisors, and junior staff.

3.3.2.3 Sample size

According to Smith, Thorpe and Jackson (2008), a sample refers to a subset of those entities that decisions relate to. They poised that the sample must be carefully selected to be representative of the population and the researcher also needs to ensure that the subdivisions entails in the analysis are accurately catered for. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) suggests that for descriptive studies at least 20% - 50% of the total population is enough.

The sample size for the study was determined by Denscombe (2007) formula as follows:

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}
\]

Where;

- \( n \) = sample size
- \( N \) = Total Population
- \( 1 \) = Constant
- \( e^2 \) = estimated standard error at 95% confidence level

The sample size distribution is illustrated in table 3.2.
Table 3.2: Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection Methods

This study used primary data collected using questionnaires. The questionnaires included both open and closed ended in line with the objectives of the study. The choice of the method is on the premise that data collected using a questionnaire is easily understood and therefore perceived as authoritative. The questionnaires was designed in the form of a five point Likert scale rating. A Likert Scale is a rating scale that requires the subject to indicate his or her degree of agreement or disagreement to a statement (Likert, 1932). A set of items in the questionnaire addressed each specific objective. The questionnaire had four sections: biodata part for capturing biodata and work related details of the respondent; barriers faced by the respondent to implement strategy; solutions that have been adopted in order to curb these barriers; and, effectiveness of these solutions. Additionally, using questionnaire was believed to provide greater control over the research process.

3.5 Research Procedures

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), the accuracy of data to be collected largely depends on the data collection instruments in terms of validity and reliability. The questionnaire designed by the researcher was based on the research questions was pre-tested to determine the suitability of the tool before the actual administration. Pretesting was done by administering the questionnaire to ten (10) respondents who were selected randomly from the sample size. This enabled the researcher to fine tune the questionnaire for objectivity and efficiency of the process. The questionnaire took about 10 minutes to complete.
The questionnaire was distributed to respondents by the researcher using a drop and pick approach. Respondents were assured of anonymity by giving questionnaires unique numbers instead of respondents’ name. Only the researcher understood the codes on the questionnaires hence ensuring respondent confidentiality. A clear explanation was given to respondents as to how they would benefit from the research. All these were aimed at ensuring a high response rate.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Before processing the responses, data preparation was done on the completed questionnaires by editing, coding, entering, and cleaning the data. The study applied quantitative method of data analysis. To ensure effective analysis, the questionnaire were coded according to each variable of the study to ensure the margin of error is minimized as to assure accuracy during analysis. The quantitative analysis adopted descriptive statistics. According to Denscombe (1998), descriptive statistics involves a process of transforming a mass of raw data in to tables, charts, with frequency distribution and percentages, which are a vital part of making sense of the data. Data was analyzed using IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0 program and presented using tables and pie charts to give a clear understanding of the research findings. Inferential statistics makes inferences about populations using data drawn from the population. Inferential statistics correlation analysis was used to determine the effectiveness of the solutions to strategy implementation barriers.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter enumerates the research methodology and design. It has given a detailed analysis of the research design, which was descriptive in nature focusing on Suraya Property Group Limited. The population was all the employees in Suraya Property Group Limited in Head office. The sample size, sampling techniques and the use of a questionnaire as a primary data collection instrument was described. The questionnaire were pilot tested before a refined one administered to the respondents. Data analysis was done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 and presented in forms of tables and charts.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the results and findings of the study. Initial analysis is on the demographic data highlighted by the descriptive characteristics of the respondents. Descriptive statistics for barriers to strategy implementation, solutions to these barriers, and effective solutions to the barriers follow. Lastly, inferential statistics highlighting correlation is illustrated. IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0 program was also used to analyze the data. The results are shown using tables and figures.

4.1.1 Response Rate

This study had an overall response rate of 93% as shown in table 4.1. Of the 76 questionnaires given out, 71 questionnaires were returned fully filled. The moderate high response rate was attributed by the fact that the researcher is an employee of Suraya Property Group Limited, therefore, was able to do adequate follow up, and also offer clarification to the study respondents. Supervisors had the highest response rate of 100%, followed by top management with 93%, lastly junior staff recorded the least response rate of 91%. The high response rate of the supervisors was due to the fact that the researcher is also a supervisor and could blend well and administer the questionnaires effectively. The juniors had the lowest response rate because most of them are usually out of the field especially marketers.

Table 4.1 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.2 Reliability Analysis

A reliability analysis was conducted using a Cronbach’s Alpha test to determine the validity of the study instrument, questionnaire in this case. For a study to be reliable and valid, it has to have a Cronbach Alpha above 0.6. The average Cronbach Alpha value for this study was 0.829 as illustrated using the mean of the three Alpha values shown below.

Table 4.2 Cronbach’s Alpha Value for Barriers to Strategy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Cronbach’s Alpha Value for Solutions to Barriers to Strategy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Cronbach’s Alpha Value for Effective Solutions to Barriers to Strategy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Demographic Data

Demographic data for this study included respondents’ job level, work experience in the organization, respondents’ opinions on relevance between their job and company’s overall goal, level of awareness of the company strategy, and opinion on the success of the past strategic plans.

4.2.1 Response Based on Gender

This question was intended to find out the gender distribution of the various respondents in Suraya Property Group Limited. The results of the findings are indicated in Figure 4.1 below.
The results indicate that 59% of the respondents were male and about 41% of the respondents being female. It is shown that male respondents surpassed the female respondents by about 18%. This was attributed to the fact that real estate sector is dominated by males and Suraya Property Group Limited would obviously employee more males than females.

![Gender of Respondents](image)

**Figure 4.1: Gender of Respondents**

### 4.2.2 Respondents’ Job Levels

This particular research question sought to determine the various job levels held by the respondents in Suraya Property Group Limited. The results of the findings are indicated in Figure 4.2. The findings presented indicated that 19.7% of the respondents were top managers, 25% were middle level managers, and a whopping 55% were junior staff members. This reflects normal organizational setup where top levels having fewer personnel compared to the lower cadres.

![Respondents Job Levels](image)

**Figure 4.2: Respondents Job Levels**
4.2.3 Respondents’ Work Experience at Suraya Property Group Limited

This question sought to discover how many years the respondent had worked for Suraya Property Group Limited. The findings are shown in Figure 4.3.

The results show that majority of the respondents had worked between 6 months and 2 years in the company, being 28%, followed closely with those who had worked for the organization between 3 years to 5 years, being 25%. 18% had worked for over 10 years, 15% having worked for less than 6 months, while about 13% had worked between 6 years and 9 years for the company. Strategic plans are usually long-term, so those who have worked for at least three years would provide useful information; this group was about 56% of the respondents.

![Pie chart showing respondents' work experience at Suraya Property Group Limited](image)

Figure 4.3: Respondents Number of Years at Suraya Property Group Limited
4.2.4 Response Based on Relevance of Work and Company’s Overall Strategy

This question was aimed to determine the opinions of respondents on how relevant their work were in relation to the company overall strategy. The results are displayed in the Figure 4.4.

The findings showed that 32% of respondents exuded confidence that their work was very relevant, with about 31% saying their work was relevant, 15% indicated their work to be somewhat relevant, about 13% saying their work was not relevant to the company’s overall strategy, while only 8% were not sure whether their work was relevant or not to the organization’s overall strategy.

![Figure 4.4: Respondents Work Relevance to Overall Strategy](image-url)
4.2.5 Response on How Long the Employees have Heard/Participated in the Strategy Implementation

This question was sought to determine whether respondents had heard or participated in the past strategy implementation of the company. The results are illustrated in Figure 4.5.

The findings showed that 39% had participated in the strategy implementation for less than 5 years, about 34% less than a year, about 10% were not sure, while 8% less than 10 years, and another 8% also over 10 years.

Figure 4.5: Respondents’ Duration based on Strategy Implementation
4.2.5 Response Based on the Rating the Success of Past Strategy Implementation

This question was sought to determine the respondents’ rating of the success of past strategy implementation. The results are illustrated in Figure 4.6.

The findings showed that 28% believed less than 25% had been achieved, and another 28% were not sure about what had been achieved. 18% agreed that about 50% had been achieved, 15% saying less than 10% achieved, and only 8% believed over 75% of the past strategy implementation had been achieved.

![Figure 4.6: Respondents' Success Rating on Past Strategy Implementation](image)

4.3 Barriers to Strategy Implementation

This section sought to determine the opinion of the respondents on to what were the barriers to implementing the strategic plans of Suraya Property Group Limited.

The respondents were presented with various statement constructs that depicted barriers to strategy implementation at Suraya Property Group Limited. A total of nine (9) constructs were provided to the respondents. A summary of findings can be seen in the Table 4.5.
The results showed that 33.8% strongly agreed, 14.1% agreed, 28.2% neutral, 12.7% disagreed as 11.3% strongly disagreeing that barrier to strategy implementation was that there was no accountability and they felt that the resources for strategic plan implementation were misappropriated. 31% strongly agreed, 23.9% agreed, 15.5% neutral, 19.5% disagreed, while 11.3% strongly disagreed that another barrier was that no sufficient resources were availed to operationalize the strategic plan. 29.6% strongly agreed, 18.3% agreed, 28.2% neutral, 9.9% disagreed, and only 4.1% strongly disagreeing that there were changes in operating environment such as government legislation, tariffs, among others, that hindered strategy implementation. Another barrier construct was that the strategic plan did not take into account their personal expectations neither were they motivated towards the implementation process where 28.2% strongly agreed, 14.1% agreed, 32.4% neutral, 18.3% disagreed and only 7.0% strongly disagreeing with it. 25.4% strongly agreed that the Suraya Property Group Limited management did not put in place adequate plans to coordinate the implementation of the strategic plan. Another 22.5% strongly agreed, 33.8% agreed, 14.1% were neutral, 16.9% disagreed 9.9% strongly disagreed that they could not achieve their part because they lacked the skills and tools for strategy implementation. 21.1% strongly agreed, 29.6% agreed, 35.2% neutral, 7.0% disagreed and strongly disagreed that because they did not receive any communication regarding the organization strategic plan, the strategic plans could not be implemented. 21.1% strongly agreed, 29.6% agreed, 35.2% neutral, 7.0% disagreed and strongly disagreed that because they did not just buy-in the idea in the implementation of the strategic plan, strategic objectives could not be achieved. Only 18.6% strongly agreed that the strategic plans were more ambitious and could not be achieved in reality, as 31.4% agreed, 21.4% neutral, 14.3% both disagreed and strongly disagreed on the same.
### Table 4.5: Barriers to Strategy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement construct</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did not receive any communication regarding the organization strategic plan.</td>
<td>15 21.1</td>
<td>15 21.1</td>
<td>13 18.3</td>
<td>14 19.7</td>
<td>14 19.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were no sufficient resources to operationalize the strategic plan.</td>
<td>22 31.0</td>
<td>17 23.9</td>
<td>11 15.5</td>
<td>14 19.7</td>
<td>7 9.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic plan did not take into account my personal expectations neither was I</td>
<td>20 28.2</td>
<td>10 14.1</td>
<td>23 32.4</td>
<td>13 18.3</td>
<td>5 7.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated towards the implementation process.</td>
<td>18 25.4</td>
<td>24 33.8</td>
<td>10 14.1</td>
<td>12 16.9</td>
<td>7 9.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management did not put in place adequate plans to coordinate the implementation</td>
<td>13 18.6</td>
<td>22 31.4</td>
<td>15 21.4</td>
<td>10 14.3</td>
<td>10 14.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the strategic plan.</td>
<td>18 25.4</td>
<td>24 33.8</td>
<td>10 14.1</td>
<td>12 16.9</td>
<td>7 9.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic plan was more ambitious and could not be achieved in reality.</td>
<td>13 18.6</td>
<td>22 31.4</td>
<td>15 21.4</td>
<td>10 14.3</td>
<td>10 14.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were changes in operating environment such as government legislation, tariffs,</td>
<td>21 29.6</td>
<td>13 18.3</td>
<td>20 28.2</td>
<td>7 9.9</td>
<td>10 14.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among others.</td>
<td>24 33.8</td>
<td>10 14.1</td>
<td>20 28.2</td>
<td>9 12.7</td>
<td>8 11.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not just buy-in the idea in implementation of the strategic plan.</td>
<td>15 21.1</td>
<td>21 29.6</td>
<td>25 35.2</td>
<td>5 7.0</td>
<td>5 7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no accountability and I feel the resources for strategic plan implementation</td>
<td>24 33.8</td>
<td>10 14.1</td>
<td>20 28.2</td>
<td>9 12.7</td>
<td>8 11.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were misappropriated.</td>
<td>16 22.5</td>
<td>10 14.1</td>
<td>19 26.8</td>
<td>16 22.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

This section sought to determine the opinion of the respondents on the solutions that have been applied to address the barriers to implementing the Suraya’s strategic plans. The findings can be seen in the Table 4.6.

A total of 74.6% strongly agreed, while 16.9% agreed, 4.2% neutral, 2.8% disagreed, and only 1.4% strongly disagreed that a solution to strategy implementation was that there should be clear communication from the top management to various operational units. In terms of resources, 68.4% strongly agreed, 21.1% agreed, 8.5% neutral, and 5.6% disagreed that the top management should allocate adequate financial resources to execute the strategic plan. 54.9% strongly agreed, while 29.6% agreed, 11.3% neutral, and 4.2% disagreed that all relevant members of staff should be involved in the formulation of strategic plan for it to succeed. 62% strongly agreed, 22.5% agreed, 8.5% neutral, 5.6% disagreed, and only 1.4% strongly disagreed that staff motivation and sensitization on the strategic plan would be one of the solution to strategy implementation barrier. 62% strongly agreed, 26.8% agreed, 7% neutral, while 4.2% disagreed that there should be proper monitoring system for the implementation of strategic plan. 39.4% strongly agreed, 18.3% agreed, 22.5% neutral, 8.5% disagreed, and 11.3% strongly disagreed that the management should hire new staff members who have necessary skills and competence to execute the strategic plan. 49.3% strongly agreed, 28.2% agreed, 12.7% neutral, 5.6% disagreed, and 4.2% strongly disagreed that strategic plan should be formulated with individual objectives of staff members in mind. 47.9% strongly agreed, while 23.9% agreed, 15.5% neutral, 5.6% disagreed, and also 7% strongly disagreed that the management should align strategic plan to the organization design and culture. 57.7% strongly agreed, 29.6% agreed, 5.6% neutral, 1.4% disagreed, while 5.6% strongly disagreed that a solution to strategy implementation was that the strategic plan should be flexible enough to take care of unforeseen circumstances like inflation, new government legislation, among others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement construct</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should be clear communication from the top management to various operational units</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The top management should allocate adequate financial resources to execute the strategic plan.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All relevant members of staff should be involved in the formulation of strategic plan.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be staff motivation and sensitization on the strategic plan.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be proper monitoring system for the implementation of strategic plan.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management should hire new staff members who have necessary skills and competence to execute the strategic plan.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic plan should be formulated with individual objectives of staff members in mind.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management should align strategic plan to the organization design and culture.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic plan should be flexible enough to take care of unforeseen circumstances like inflation, new government legislation, among others.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Effective Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

This study was aimed at investigating barriers hindering strategy implementation, and not only solutions to these barriers, but also, effective solutions to these barriers. Hence, this study sought respondent's views on the effective solutions that has brought real change in strategy implementation at Suraya Property Group Limited. Eight (8) statement constructs were used in the survey.

In terms of effective communication being one of the effective solutions, a whopping 78.9% strongly agreed, 16.9% agreed, and only 4.2% disagreed; none was neither neutral nor strongly disagreed. 53.5% strongly agreed, 31% agreed, 14% neutral that employee involvement was another effective solution to strategy implementation barrier. Having sufficient resources was cited as one of the effective solution by 60.6% strongly agreeing, 28.2% agreeing, 7% neutral, 2.8 disagreeing, while 2.8% strongly disagreeing. 54.9% strongly agreed, 31% agreed, 8.5% neutral, 2.8% disagreed, and another 2.8% strongly disagreed that monitoring and evaluation would be another effective solution. Based on organization culture change, 46.5% strongly agreed, 19.7% agreed, 29.6% neutral, 2.8% disagreed, while 1.4% strongly disagreed. 54.9% strongly agreed, 26.8% agreed, 14.1% neutral, 2.8% disagreed, and 1.4% strongly disagreed on the fact that leadership was another effective solution. 59.2% strongly agreed, 25.4% agreed, 11.3% neutral, 2.8% disagreed, and 1.4% strongly disagreed that competence and skills was effective solution too. Re-evaluation of organization goals was supported by 47.9% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 22.5% agreed and the same number were neutral, 4.2 disagreed, and 2.8% strongly disagreed.
When all statement constructs for each section were consolidated using combined mean and combined standard deviation, the results in table 4.8 were realized. From the table, it was found out that majority of the respondents tried to agree with the constructs for effective solutions to strategy implementation barriers where the mean was 1.66 while standard deviation was 0.91. This was followed by solutions to strategy implementation barriers with combined mean of 1.72 and 1.01. Respondents tried to deviate away from agreeing with constructs for barriers to strategy implementation in which case combined mean of 2.67 and combined standard deviation of 1.34 were realized.

Table 4.8: Summary of Strategy Implementation Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Implementation Components</th>
<th>Combined Mean</th>
<th>Combined Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Strategy Implementation</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution to the Barriers</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Solutions to the Barriers</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis was performed to determine whether there existed any relationships between barriers to strategy implementation, solutions to strategy implementation barriers, effective solutions to strategy implementation barriers. Findings of the study show barriers to strategy implementation and solutions to strategy implementation barriers, \( r (0.17), p > 0.01 \), therefore there is no correlation between barriers to strategy implementation and solutions to strategy implementation barriers. Barriers to strategy implementation and effective solutions to these barriers show \( r (0.22) \) and \( p>0.01 \), implying no correlation between the two. Solutions to strategy implementation versus effective solutions to the strategy implementation barriers has \( r (0.35) \) and \( p \leq 0.01 \). This shows there is a positive correlation between solutions to strategy implementation barriers and effective solutions to the strategy implementation barriers. This is illustrated in Table 4.5.

Table 4.9: Correlation Analysis Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>EffectiveSolutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EffectiveSolutions</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the study results and findings. The initial analysis tackled the demographic data highlighted by the descriptive characteristics of the respondents. Descriptive statistics for barriers to strategy implementation, solutions to these barriers, and effective solutions to the barriers were elaborated. Lastly, inferential statistics highlighting correlation was illustrated. IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0 program was used to analyze the data. The results were shown using tables and figures.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the study discussion, conclusion and recommendation are presented. The initial section brings to the attention the summary of the entire study. This is followed by discussions on various aspects of the study: the first one being barriers to strategy implementation; then solutions to these barriers; lastly, effective solutions to these barriers hindering strategy implementation. The study conclusions and recommendations are presented respectively.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the barriers to strategy implementation among real estate companies in Kenya focusing on Suraya Property Group Limited. The study was guided by the following three research questions: What are the barriers Suraya Property Group Limited face while implementing their strategic plans? What solutions have Suraya Property Group Limited applied to handle the barriers they face while implementing strategic plans? Which of these solutions are deemed effective by the management of Suraya Property Group Limited?

This study adopted a descriptive research design because such research designs are geared towards producing accurate representation of persons, events, or situations. According to Kothari (2008), a descriptive research design reports the manner in which things are as a result aids in establishing the current position of the studied population. The study had two independent variables; barriers to strategy implementation; and solutions to strategy implementation barriers. The dependent variable was effectiveness of the solutions to strategy implementation barriers.

The target population of this study was both the management and non-management employees of Suraya Property Group Limited in the Head Office. The sampling frame for this study was thus a list of all employees in Head office provided by the Human Resource Department. The list constituted a total of 95 employees. The population was grouped into
three categories to differentiate management from other employees. This classification was adopted so as to segment the population and aid in the investigation process. Hence, the employees were categorized into top level management, supervisor level and junior level.

A sample size of 76 respondents was selected using a stratified sampling technique. This sampling technique was adopted since the study was to collect views from top management to technical members of staff in Suraya Property Group Limited; that is, top managers, supervisors, and junior staff.

This study applied questionnaires to collect primary data. A structured closed ended questionnaire was used to collect this data. The choice of the method is on the premise that data collected using a questionnaire is believed to be easily understood, therefore perceived as authoritative. The questionnaires was designed in the form of a five point Likert scale rating. A set of items in the questionnaires addressed each specific objective. The questionnaire had four sections: biodata part for capturing biodata and work related details of the respondent; barriers faced by the respondent’s organization to implement strategic plans; solutions that have been adopted in order to curb these barriers; and, effectiveness of these solutions to strategy implementation barriers. Additionally, using questionnaire was believed to provide greater control over the research process.

The questionnaires were distributed to respondents by the researcher using a drop and pick approach. Respondents were assured of anonymity by giving questionnaires unique numbers instead of respondents’ names. Only the researcher understood the codes on the questionnaires hence ensuring respondent confidentiality. A clear explanation was given to respondents as to how they would benefit from the research. All these were aimed at ensuring a high response rate.

Prior to processing the responses, data preparation was done on the completed questionnaires by editing, coding, entering, and cleaning the data. The study applied quantitative method of data analysis. To ensure effective analysis, the questionnaire were coded according to each variable of the study to ensure the margin of error is minimized as to assure accuracy during analysis. The quantitative analysis adopted descriptive statistics. Data was analyzed using IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0 program and presented using tables and pie charts to give a clear understanding of the research findings. Inferential statistics makes inferences about populations using data drawn from the population.
Inferential statistics correlation analysis was used to determine the effectiveness of the solutions to strategy implementation barriers.

Data was then presented using tables and figures. A reliability analysis was conducted using a Cronbach’s Alpha test to determine the validity of the study instrument, questionnaire in this case. For a study to be reliable and valid, it has to have a Cronbach Alpha above 0.6. The average Cronbach Alpha value for this study was 0.829. The findings reveal that majority of the respondents tried to agree with the constructs for effective solutions to strategy implementation barriers where the mean was 1.66 while standard deviation was 0.91. This was followed by solutions to strategy implementation barriers with combined mean of 1.72 and 1.01. Respondents tried to deviate away from agreeing with constructs for barriers to strategy implementation in which case combined mean of 2.67 and combined standard deviation of 1.34 were realized.

5.3 Discussions

5.3.1 Barriers to Strategy Implementation

This study established that majority of the respondents agreed that barriers to strategy implementation were: lack of sufficient resources to operationalize the strategic plans; the Suraya management did not put in place adequate plans to coordinate the implementation of the strategic plans; the strategic plans did not take into account personal expectations hence the stakeholders were not motivated towards the implementation process; people did not just buy-in the idea in implementation of the strategic plan; and, there was no accountability and there was a feeling that the resources for strategic plan implementation were somehow misappropriated.

However, it did not come out clearly whether the following could bring hindrance to successful strategy implementation: lack of communication regarding the organization strategic plan; changes in operating environment such as government legislation, tariffs, among others; the strategic plan being more ambitious hence could not be achieved in reality; and people could not achieve their part due to lack of skills and tools for implementation.

The barrier as a result of having insufficient resources to execute the strategy is in line with the findings of Niven (2002). It is argued that 60% of organizations do not link budgets to
strategy (Niven, 2002); this occurrence is observed to be common in many companies where the budgeting and strategic planning functions do not interact, since budgets are the traditional tools for planning the allocation of human and financial resources, strategic plans and strategic initiatives may fall short in terms of necessary resources. Lack of sufficient resources may also be due to embezzlement of funds meant for strategy execution.

This study has revealed that lack of adequate plan to coordinate the strategy implementation plans is another barrier to strategy implementation. This confirms a claim by Al-Ghamdi (1998) who identified seven hindrances to strategy implementation process: lack of understanding of one’s role in the execution process; deviation from planned objective; changes in responsibilities of employees being not clear; people are not fully rewarded for the execution of plans; inadequate directions given by departmental managers; information system used for implementation is usually inadequate; and lastly, overall goals are not well understood by employees.

It did not come out clearly whether changes in operating environment such as government legislation, tariffs, among others, would hinder strategy implementation in the Suraya Property Group Limited. According to views held by Kaplan & Norton (2001), companies have an increasingly difficult time executing the strategies they need in order to remain competitive. One reason being that while these strategies, and the business issues behind them are changing constantly, the tools for measuring the effectiveness of these strategies have not kept pace. Further, case studies carried out by Hansen, Boyd and Kryder (1998) revealed that failing to periodically alter the plan or adapt it to changes in the business environment was identified as another hindrance to strategy implementation.

5.3.2 Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

Majority of the respondents of Suraya Property Group Limited overwhelmingly supported the idea that clear communication from the top management to various operational units was a solution to strategy implementation failure. This argument concurs with findings by Brinkschröder (2014) where he posits that the most important solutions to challenges facing strategy implementation are: ensuring information exchange and meeting points between personnel of the different subsidiaries; making communication interesting short and flexible to clearly convey overall objectives, increase atmosphere and motivation; more familiar
conversations with every level in the organization even strengthen their effects. It is also argued that the balanced scorecard, subject to the adoption of suitable processes, can address the key problems associated with strategy implementation including communication, the role of middle managers and integration with existing control systems (Atkinson, 2006).

Allocation of adequate financial resources in execution of the strategic plan also came out strongly among the respondents. This is seen to echo claims by Allio (2005). He argues that strategy development usually receives significant attention and resources, but implementation is often neglected, with disastrous consequences, as a result, using a straightforward approach, format, and process, managers mandated with realization of strategy can bridge the gap between rhetoric and reality; they can succeed in accomplishing what they set out to do, and think and act strategically (Allio, 2005).

It was also noted by the respondents that relevant members of staff should be involved during strategy planning and development so that when it comes to implementation, then no barriers are encountered. This confirms arguments by Musambayi (2012) where participation of all key stakeholders in strategy formulation and implementation processes, among other factors, is presented as solution to strategy implementation barriers.

Many respondents also strongly agreed with the fact that staff motivation and sensitization on the strategic plan could also be a solution to strategy implementation barrier. Based on arguments by Nutt (1986), there are four types of implementation tactics applied by managers to execute strategies: intervention, participation, persuasion, and edict. The persuasion bit consists of the tactic of using the involved parties to convince employees about the decided course of actions.

It was also hinted that proper monitoring system for the implementation of the strategic plan can also prevent implementation failure. A study on challenges of strategy implementation at Kakamega Teachers Savings and Credit Cooperative Society in Kenya by Avigoke (2013) recommended some solutions to challenges of strategy implementation as among them procuring a new information technology system to monitor the implementation process at the organization.

Having a strategic plan that is flexible enough to take care of unforeseen circumstances like inflation, and new government legislation, among others, was also seen as a solution.
However, empirical findings by Miller (1997), an appropriate structure and implementation flexibly, appear to matter rather less. This seems to contrary to the opinions held by the respondents.

5.3.3 Effective Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

The findings of this study revealed the existence of a statistically significant relationship between solutions and effective solutions to strategy implementation barriers. This study did not just investigate the solutions, but rather effective solutions to handle implementation obstacles of strategic plans. Effective communication was revealed to be top rated effective solution by the respondents. It is argued that strategy implementation communication can be the biggest barrier if lacking and disturbed or the biggest solution to help the strategy implementation to be effective (Brinkschröder, 2014). Gavurová (2010) in her publication defends communication as a basic principle which could help to achieve an effective implementation of the strategy of an organization.

Employee involvement was also cited as another effective solution to strategy implementation barrier. This supports the reason that keeping initiative on employees to find effective way for achieving strategic goals allows company to eliminate employee’s resistance to changes which may be brought about by the new strategy to be implemented (Gavurová, 2010). This is further confirmed by opinion that if an organization wants the lead, it will have to involve its people in discussions & decision making where strategy implementation comes in (Zafar, Butt, & Afzal, 2014). It is argued that if change is truly constant, then it stands to reason that organizations level of commitment to employee engagements should be as well since the people working for an organization are at the heart of effective response to any call for change (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). People are far less likely to help participate in planning or support implementation of strategic initiatives when they have an anemic or nonexistent level of engagement as employees (Harter, Schmidt, Asplund, Killham, & Agrawal, 2010).
5.4 Conclusion

In conclusion to the above research, the researcher had the following recommendations.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Barriers to Strategy Implementation

The study revealed barriers to strategy implementation in Suraya Property Group Limited such as: lack of sufficient resources to operationalize the strategic plans; the Suraya management did not put in place adequate plans to coordinate the implementation of the strategic plans; the strategic plans did not take into account personal expectations hence the stakeholders were not motivated towards the implementation process; people did not just buy-in the idea in implementation of the strategic plan; and, there was no accountability and there was a feeling that the resources for strategic plan implementation were somehow misappropriated. These barriers were to open eyes for Suraya Property Group Limited management so that action could be taken to change ways of implementing strategic plans.

The management should take into consideration the cause of insufficient resources to execute strategic plans, inadequate plans for coordination of strategic plan implementation, having strategic plans that do put into consideration personal expectations of the stakeholders making the implementers not motivated towards the implementation process, lack of accountability and having a feeling of misappropriation of resources meant for implementation of strategic plans.

5.5.1.2 Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

Suraya Property Group Limited should adopt various solutions to barriers for strategy implementation. For strategic plans to be successfully be implemented there should be clear communication from the top management to various operational units. Allocation of adequate financial resources in execution of the strategic plan also came out strongly among the respondents. The management should plan and budget with Strategic Plans in mind, ensuring that there is adequate resources allocated for what is put on paper as strategic plan. It seems strategy development is what receives significant attention and resources, but implementation
is often neglected. The management should also involve relevant members of staff during strategy planning and development so that when it comes to implementation, then no barriers are encountered. Staff motivation and sensitization on the strategic plans should also be emphasized to the management. The management should adopt intervention, participation, persuasion, and edict strategies to achieve sensitization and motivation of staff towards strategic plans. Due to advancement of technology, Suraya Property Group Limited should automate the process of strategy implementation through adoption of information management system tasked with proper monitoring system for the implementation of the strategic plans. The real estate organization should also have strategic plans that are flexible enough to take care of unforeseen circumstances like inflation, and new government legislation, among others.

5.5.1.3 Effective Solutions to Strategy Implementation Barriers

Since the findings of this study revealed the existence of a statistically significant relationship between solutions and effective solutions to strategy implementation barriers, it was interesting to discuss these effective solutions that the respondents came up with. These solutions were put forward to determine the how effective they were in handling the barriers encountered during implementation of strategic plans of Suraya Property Group Limited.

Through this, the management should put more effort in ensuring effective communication during strategy formulation and its implementation. This is assumed to bridge the gap between formulators and implementers. Information flow should be fast and clear from the top management to the individual staff in various operational units in Suraya Property Group Limited.

It also came clear that employee involvement was another effective solution to strategy implementation barrier. Suraya Property Group Limited should apply this concept of involving relevant staff members when developing strategy and during its implementation. The strategic plans are formulated and implemented by people, as a result, staff involvement becomes key. When the employees are involved, their opinions, and aspirations will be taken into consideration; in effect, implementation process will be in synchrony with their personal objectives, passion, skills and talent.
5.5.2 Recommendations for Future Research

This study mainly focused on barriers to strategy implementation, solutions and effective solutions to these strategy implementation barriers. It is recommended that other studies be done to unearth more on this subject area. This is assumed will ensure increased reliability of the statistics and effects for generalization. This study concentrated only one company in real estate sector, this implies that the results of this study are therefore skewed towards the perceptions and data from only one organization. It is suggested that such a study be done in other firms in other sectors to increase the statistical power of the study and more reliable results. There is therefore a great potential for research in this direction. This study can also be improved by looking at post implementation of strategic plans. This implies trying to investigate solutions that have long term effects and those that may have short term effects. It would be interesting to separate these solutions and also determine them based on various sectors especially private firms.
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APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER

P.O BOX 62872-00200
Nairobi, Kenya.

Dear respondent,

RE: PARTICIPATION IN AN ACADEMIC SURVEY

I am a graduate student pursuing Master of Business Administration (MBA) at the United States International University. I am currently conducting a research study entitled “BARRIERS TO STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AMONG REAL ESTATE COMPANIES IN KENYA: A CASE OF SURAYA PROPERTY GROUP LIMITED.”

You have been requested as one of the respondents to participate in the survey.

The results of the survey will be instrumental for Suraya Property Group Limited in identifying the barriers to implementing strategy and finding solutions to those barriers so that the company can be in a position to avoid those pitfalls while implementing their strategic objectives.

This is an Academic research and confidentiality shall strictly be adhered to. Your name will not appear anywhere in the report. Please complete all your items to reflect your opinions and experiences. The data collected will be used for purposes of this academic research only. Kindly spare at least 10 minutes to complete four sections of the questionnaire attached.

Yours Sincerely,

Fridah Ndinda Muteti
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your Gender?
   Female [ ]   Male [ ]

2. What is your job/grade level?
   Junior Management [ ]   Middle Management [ ]   Senior Management [ ]

3. Give a rating to your answer by ticking on the appropriate box for the following questions with the options provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>How long have you worked for this organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Less than 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Between 6 months to 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Between 3 – 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Between 6 – 9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Over 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>In your own experience, how do you rate your work relevance to the company overall goal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Not relevant at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Somehow relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- Relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Very relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>How long have you heard about or participated in strategic plan for this organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Less than a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Less than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes</td>
<td>Description</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>4 – Less than 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Over 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**iv)** In your own judgement, rate the success of the last strategic plan of this organization.

1 - Less than 10% achieved
2 - About 25% achieved
3 - I am not sure
4 - About 50% achieved
5 - Over 75% achieved

### SECTION B: BARRIERS TO STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION

How do you rate the following as the barriers to implementing this organization strategic plan?

**Directions:** For each of the statements below kindly tick only one based on the following scale. Strongly agree – 1; Somewhat agree – 2; Neither Agree or Disagree – 3; Somewhat Disagree – 4; Strongly Disagree - 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I did not receive any communication regarding the organization strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There were no sufficient resources to operationalize the strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The strategic plan did not take into account my personal expectations neither was I motivated towards the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The management did not put in place adequate plans to coordinate the implementation of the strategic plan.

8. The strategic plan was more ambitious and could not be achieved in reality.

9. There were changes in operating environment such as government legislation, tariffs, among others.

10. I did not just buy-in the idea in implementation of the strategic plan.

11. There was no accountability and I feel the resources for strategic plan implementation were misappropriated.

12. I could not achieve my part because I lacked the skills and tools for implementation.

### SECTION C: SOLUTIONS TO STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS

How do you rate the following solutions to the barriers in implementing this organization strategic plan?

**Directions:** For each of the statements below kindly tick only one based on the following scale. Strongly agree – 1; Somewhat agree – 2; Neither Agree or Disagree – 3; Somewhat Disagree – 4; Strongly Disagree - 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>There should be clear communication from the top management to various operational units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The top management should allocate adequate financial resources to execute the strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>All relevant members of staff should be involved in the formulation of strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>There should be staff motivation and sensitization on the strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>There should be proper monitoring system for the implementation of strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The management should hire new staff members who have necessary skills and competence to execute the strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The strategic plan should be formulated with individual objectives of staff members in mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The management should align strategic plan to the organization design and culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The strategic plan should be flexible enough to take care of unforeseen circumstances like inflation, new government legislation, among others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS TO STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS

Based on your experience with the organization, how can you rate the following solutions as effective to strategic implementation barriers?

**Directions:** For each of the statements below kindly tick only one based on the following scale. Strongly agree – 1; Somewhat agree – 2; Neither Agree or Disagree – 3; Somewhat Disagree – 4; Strongly Disagree - 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Effective communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Employment involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Sufficient resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Organization culture change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Competence and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Re-evaluation of organization goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE END
THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE.