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ABSTRACT
This study sought to identify the factors that affect strategy implementation in the geospatial industry in Kenya with a key focus on Ramani Geosystems Group. The specific objectives that guided the study were: to determine the nature and scope of strategic management and strategy implementation; to determine the effect of organizational communication on strategy implementation; to determine the effect of organization culture on strategy implementation; and to determine the effect of organization structure on strategy implementation.

The study employed a descriptive research design. The target population of this study composed of the directors, managers and regular employees working in Ramani Geosystems Group in Nairobi who were 82 in total. The sampling frame of this study was the list of all employees, and was sourced from Human Resource department. The study employed stratified random sampling to ensure all parts of the population were represented and to reduce the error in estimation. The Yamane formula was used to determine the sample size which was 75 employees. The study used primary data that was collected using questionnaires. Completed questionnaires were edited to ensure consistency and completeness. Data was coded into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics analyzed the mean, standard deviation, and distribution among certain parameters. Inferential statistics was carried out to determine the influence of organizational communication, organizational culture and organizational culture on strategy implementation. The equation used was \( Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon \). Results were presented in the form of tables and figures.

The study revealed that, Ramani Geosystems Group had mobilized and motivated its employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action, as well as stimulated them to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives. The study reveals that the organization had failed in terms of motivating strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process.
The study showed that there was clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff, and the communication practices of the organization were a hindrance to strategy implementation. The organization’s leadership did not encourage feedback from the staff, and communication in the organization was top-to-bottom. The study also showed that, the organization’s management did not communicate with subordinates regularly on strategy matters, even though the communication was geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal.

The study revealed that, the organization had a mission statement and a vision which it stuck to and followed, however, the organization’s management was not open to new ideas from all levels of staff. The company’s staff attitudes were closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives, and they understood their roles, and they also worked together to attain the organization’s vision. The study showed that, staff in the organization were motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision, however, they were not able to approach the management with new ideas.

The study showed that, the organization’s structure was bureaucratic, and it had clear lines of authority. The organizational structure enhanced the organization’s effectiveness and flexibility, but it did not encourage employee participation in decision making. The organizational structure gave clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation, and it did aid the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation from top-to-bottom. However, the organization’s structure was rigid and inhibited change, and the organization’s management did not relate well with staff members from the lower levels of management.

This study recommends the organization to improve its communication with employees in terms of strategic plans and decisions, so that the entire organization (management and employees) can work towards a common goal. It recommends the organization to create a feedback system from the employees so that it may have a better foundation in adjusting its implementation plans that will results in lower costs of implementation, as a result of proper resource allocation.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Strategy implementation occurs in a very turbulent environment. Today's turbulent business environment is characterized by variables such as intense competition, rapidly changing technology, globalization and changing stakeholder demands (Nelissen & van Selm, 2008). The rapid changes in the firm's macro and microenvironment require that firms have a strategy in order to adapt, survive and thrive. Organizations which do not have a strategy are unable to react proactively and are therefore unable to compete in the business environment (Gupta, 2011).

Ramani Geosystems, like all other Environment Serving Organizations (ESOs), requires strategic management. An Environment Serving Organization is defined as any organization that provides goods and/or services to the environment and consumes resources from the environment in the process (Sullivan, n.d.). The level of turbulence in the environment should define the response of the ESO (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990). Environmental turbulence is defined in terms of the speed of change and the complexity of the environment, the visibility and predictability of the future. Thus, an organization that exists in a complex, fast-changing environment needs to craft strategies that will enable it to react appropriately and in a timely manner.

Strategic management is defined as the set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation, implementation and control of plans designed to achieve an organization's vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives within the business environment in which it operates (Pearce & Robinson, 2007). Strategic management has also been defined as the match between an organization's resources and skills and the environmental opportunities as well as the risks it faces and the purposes it wishes to achieve (Thompson, 1993). Elements of strategy identified by Markiewicz (2011) are that the strategies in the organization may change depending on the environment, strategies show how resources can be utilized to meet the organization’s goals, strategies give overall direction of the development of the organization and strategy creates an organization with a sustainable competitive advantage.
Organizations use strategic management as the process that enables them to react proactively and compete in the turbulent business environment (Gupta, 2011).

Though strategy formulation is a critical and difficult task for organizations, enabling the strategy to work is even more important and is the key to superior organizational performance. Strategy implementation is the process that turns formulated strategy into a series of actions and then results to ensure that the vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives of the organization are successfully achieved as planned (Thompson, Strickland, & Gamble, 2007). Researchers have identified some factors affecting strategic practices such as strategy formulation, communication, organization structure, resource allocation and the executors of the strategy (Li, Guohui, & Eppler, 2008; Okumus, 2001). Strategy implementation is an organization-wide activity that involves all levels of staff. The top levels of the organization are involved in the creation of the vision and articulation of the vision to the lower levels of staff. Management is involved in translating the strategy into tasks that are then delegated to the staff to implement. The success of the strategy implementation process can be measured by comparing the outcomes to the plans. Some of the critical factors that affect strategy implementation include internal communication, organizational culture and organizational structure.

Internal communication is the flow of information through the company. The value of good communication to strategy implementation cannot be gainsaid. Its benefits include faster change, more flexibility and innovation, better quality decisions, better knowledge sharing and a more motivated workforce (Quirke, 2008). Since more staff are involved in strategy implementation than in any other stage of the strategic management process, communication needs to flow throughout the firm at all levels. Effective communication is therefore essential to successful strategy implementation.

Culture in the organizational context refers to visible happenings, structures and behavior of people within an organization (Wilkinson, Fogarty, & Melville, 1996). The culture of an organization forms gradually over time. It affects the way staff work and interact with each other. Culture therefore affects strategy implementation since the behavior and attitudes of
staff towards the strategy and the firm will dictate their dedication to implementation of the strategy. It may obstruct the smooth implementation strategy by creating resistance to change (Quirke, 2008).

Organizational structure is the system of task, reporting and authority relationships within which the work of an organization is done (Griffin & Moorhead, 2010). The structure of an organization will aid or hinder strategy implementation because it enables the staff to work together to effectively implement strategy. The structure must be in alignment with the strategy implementation plans of the organization to ensure success (Markiewicz, 2011).

The geospatial industry consists of individuals, private companies, non-profit organizations, academic and research institutions, and government agencies that research, develop, manufacture, implement, and employ geospatial technology (also known as geomatics) and gather, store, integrate, manage, map, analyze, display, and distribute geographic information, that is, information that is tied to a particular location on Earth (Geospatial Workforce Development Center, 2010). The geospatial industry in Kenya comprises individuals, firms, academics and government institutions who develop, distribute and implement geospatial technology. The geospatial industry goes through discontinuity due to rapid changes in technology, intense competition from transnational firms and changes in the business cycle. This has necessitated changes in the company's strategy over the years. Due to the fact that the effectiveness of strategic management affects the company's performance, knowledge of the factors affecting strategy implementation in the geospatial industry in Kenya is essential.

Ramani Geosystems was founded in 1999 in Kenya with a view to create a geospatial company that offers world class solutions and technologies to East Africa. Ramani has grown from the early years of mapping commercial farms using a motorbike to be the leading airborne survey company in Eastern Africa (Ramani Geosystems, 2014). Today Ramani Geosystems has a focus on providing airborne and space borne geospatial solutions across East Africa, being the only company based in East Africa operating two survey aircraft, both fitted with a large format digital camera and aerial LiDAR/medium format sensor. The
company has data management and production teams based in Nairobi and has experience working in all East African countries. Ramani Land Services was incorporated in January 2014 and created out of the Land Survey department within Ramani Geosystems and is made up of surveyors and survey assistants (Ramani Geosystems, 2014). The company offers services in cadastral services, topographical engineering survey, field mapping, terrestrial scanning and control survey using modern survey equipment.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Strategic management is a crucial component of any firm's success in the business environment. Although numerous studies acknowledge that strategies frequently fail not because of inadequate strategy formulation, but because of insufficient implementation, strategy implementation has received less research attention than strategy formulation. (Li, Guohui, & Eppler, 2008). A review of literature on implementation shows that key issues that affect strategy implementation are organizational structure, organizational culture, leadership, resource allocation, internal communication, commitment of staff to the strategy and incentives.

Several researchers have carried out research on strategy implementation in a variety of private and public-sector organizations in Kenya. Haji (2013) studied the competitive strategy implementation of the Regional Centre for the Mapping of Resources for Development, which is an inter-governmental geospatial firm. This study determined that the RCMRD had both a corporate and functional level strategy. The researcher concluded that the management have a crucial role to play in strategy implementation, and that there is a correlation between having a strategic plan and successful implementation. King'ola (2011) studied the challenges of strategy implementation at a consulting engineering firm in Kenya. The study showed that while there was a three-year strategic plan in place at the organization, strategy implementation was affected by management styles, the culture and misguided priorities.

The use of geospatial information is expanding at a rapid pace in both the public and private sectors. There is a recognition amongst stakeholders in industry and in government that an
understanding of location and place is a component of effective decision making (Indecon International Economic Consultants, 2014). The growing demand for geospatial data in Kenya has caused growth in the geospatial industry and intense competition from transnational firms. Kenyan geospatial firms therefore require robust strategies and successful implementation of these strategies to ensure their survival and growth.

Due to the project-based nature of geospatial work, geospatial firms tend to have a tactical approach to strategy. The firm's primary focus is on day-to-day tasks such as risk management, problem solving and assembling of teams to enable the completion of projects. The staff's focus on project management and completion means that they do not have the firm's overall goals in sight. Since there is difficulty aligning project management with the overall strategy of the firm, there is need to carry out research in this area given the nature of geospatial and similar firms. In addition, Ramani Geosystems' top managers and a large number of staff are technical specialists in their own career fields with limited or no training on strategic formulation and implementation.

This researcher is unaware of any studies on strategy implementation in the geospatial industry in Kenya. Therefore, it has become necessary to carry out this study to establish the nature and scope of strategic management and implementation, and to determine the effects of organizational communication, organization culture and organization structure on strategy implementation. These are the critical factors in strategy implementation and in firms such as those found in the geospatial industry.

1.3 General Objective
The purpose of this study was to identify the factors that affect strategy implementation in the geospatial industry in Kenya.

1.4 Specific Objectives
Specifically, this study sought to determine the following in the geospatial industry in Kenya:

1.4.1 To determine the nature and scope of strategic management and strategy implementation.
1.4.2 To determine the effect of organizational communication on strategy implementation.
1.4.3 To determine the effect of organization culture on strategy implementation
1.4.4 To determine the effect of organization structure on strategy implementation

1.5 Importance of the Study
This study may be important to various stakeholders in the industry and the significance may be as follows:

1.5.1 Ramani Geosystems Management
The company may gain a lot of valuable information and feedback from the research. The management may be able to understand better the factors affecting strategy implementation in the organization. This information may enable the company to take steps to improve the strategy implementation process.

1.5.2 Other Firms in the Kenyan Geospatial Industry
Other firms in the geospatial industry may benefit from this study. Similar firms to Ramani Geosystems are likely facing the same challenges and may therefore need the information obtained in this study. The firms may apply the same recommendations that have been offered in this study as a benchmark to avert some of the challenges that they may be facing.

1.5.3 Researchers
Theoretically, this study has contributed to the general body of knowledge in the factors that affect strategy implementation in the geospatial industry. The study has also provided a basis for further research on this subject area, and may be used as a foundation for future studies within the country by academicians.

1.6 Scope of the Study
This study focused on Ramani Geosystems Group, which comprises of Ramani Geosystems and Ramani Land Services, located in Nairobi, Kenya. Data was collected from staff across the organization. This data was collected between April and May 2017. There were limitations to this study. First, the study focused on one organization, which meant that the
results of this study cannot be generalized to apply to the whole industry. Second, there was the risk of non-response to the questionnaires. To avert this, the researcher used her cordial working relationship with staff to ensure data was collected. Third, the organization could have failed to disclose its strategic management practices to the researcher. To ensure this was overcome, the researcher used her cordial working relationship with the directors to allow for data collection.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Strategic Management
Strategic management is defined as the set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve a company's objectives (Pearce & Robinson, 2009).

1.7.2 Strategy Implementation
Strategy implementation is defined as the process that turns formulated strategy into a series of actions and then results to ensure that the vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives of the organization are successfully achieved as planned (Thompson, Strickland, & Gamble, 2007).

1.7.3 Organization Structure
Organization structure is the system of task, reporting and authority relationships within which the work of the organization is done, and defines form and function of the organization's activities and how parts of the organization fit together (Griffin & Moorhead, 2010).

1.7.4 Organization Culture
Organizational culture is a system of shared norms, expectations and goals held by members that distinguishes the organization from others (Dwivedi, 1995).
1.7.5 Internal Communication
The communications transactions between individuals and/or groups at various levels and in different areas of specialization that are intended to design and redesign organizations, to implement designs, and to co-ordinate day-to-day activities (Frank & Brownell, 1989).

1.8 Chapter Summary
Chapter one sets out a broad discussion of the factors affecting strategy implementation by giving the background of the problem, the problem statement and objectives of the study. The specific objectives of the study have also been addressed. Chapter two gives a review of the literature regarding the area of study. Chapter three details the research organization and methodology of the study. Chapter four presents the study results and findings. Chapter five concludes the study by presenting the study discussions, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature related to the factors influencing strategy implementation. It is organized according to the research questions. It explores the effects of resource allocation, organization culture and organization structure on strategy implementation. At the end of the chapter, a summary of theories and concepts covered in the review will be provided.

2.2 Nature and Scope of Strategic Management

The origin of strategy is in the military, and term strategy is derived from the Greek word ‘strategos’ meaning a general set of maneuvers to overcome an enemy (Eden & Ackerman, 1998). These general maneuvers are analogous to the vision of an organization. The vision of an organization defines a desired future state. Strategic management therefore involves the formulation, implementation and evaluation of the roadmap an organization should take to survive in its environment (Hill, Jones, & Schilling, 2013).

However, in business parlance, there is no definite meaning assigned to strategy but it is a space of knowledge, the attitude in the struggle for existence and growth which is indeed very hard for firms, in a competitive environment (Pearce, & Robinson, 2009). Moreover, strategy can be defined as a set of decisions that cover matters concerned with, type of business the organization is in, the products and services offered, the customers, the prices to be charged, the terms of business, the organizations’ competitors, and the basis on which the organization will compete (Kaufmann, & Feeney, 2012).

According to Hill, Jones, and Schilling (2013), the term strategic management is often used interchangeably with business policy, corporate strategy, and corporate planning. However, a distinction may be drawn between some of them for clear understanding. For instance, Pearce, and Robinson (2009) states that, a differentiation may be drawn between corporate planning and corporate strategy. Even in the absence of competition a company may have a corporate plan, a long-term development plan. For example, even in a monopoly environment companies like The Indian Telephone Industries and Cochin Refineries had
corporate plans but they were not corporate strategy or strategic management. However, when the corporate plan is formulated in a competitive environment, it would amount to corporate strategy/strategic management/business policy (Hill, Jones, & Schilling, 2013).

Strategic Management is therefore a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines the long-run performance of a corporation (Hill, Jones, & Schilling, 2013). It includes Strategic Intent, Environmental scanning (both internal and external), and strategy formulation (strategic planning), strategy implementation, and evaluation and control (Pearce, & Robinson, 2009). According to Kaufmann, and Feeney (2012), the study of strategic management therefore, emphasizes the monitoring and evaluating of external opportunities and threats considering a corporation’s strengths and weaknesses to generate and implement a new strategic direction for an organization.

Therefore, one may conclude that strategic management is the process by which an organization tries to determine what needs to be done to achieve long-term or corporate objectives and more importantly, how these objectives are to be met. Ideally, it is a process by which senior management examines the ‘organization’ and the ‘environment’ in which it operates and attempt to establish an appropriate and optional ‘fit’ between the two to ensure the organization’s success (Kaufmann, & Feeney, 2012).

2.2.1 Nature of Strategic Management

The nature of strategic management is different from other aspects of management as it demands attention to the “big picture” and a rational assessment of the future options (Galan, & Sanchez-Bueno, 2009). It provides: a strategic direction endorsed by the team and stakeholders, a clear business strategy and vision for the future, a mechanism for accountability, a framework for governance at the various levels, a coherent framework for managing risk for ensuring business continuity, and providing the ability to exploit opportunities and respond to external change by taking ongoing strategic decisions (Li, Guohui, & Eppler, 2008).
Therefore, there are four important elements of strategic management: Strategic Analysis: re-examining the position in the market place or competition in terms of its products, services, strategies. Strategic Choice: formulation of suitable courses of action, their evaluation and the choices between them. Strategy Implementation: mobilizing employees to translates formulated strategies into concrete actions. Strategy evaluation and control: measure performance and take corrective actions (Galan, & Sanchez-Bueno, 2009). This study focuses on the last bit of strategy which is strategy implementation.

### 2.2.2 Strategy Implementation

Strategy implementation requires a firm to establish annual objectives, device policies, motivate employees, and allocate resources so that formulated strategies can be executed (Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010). Strategy implementation includes developing a strategy-supportive culture, creating an effective organizational structure, redirecting marketing efforts, preparing budgets, developing and utilizing information systems, and linking employee compensation to organizational performance (Li, Guohui & Eppler, 2008).

Strategy implementation often is called the “action stage” of strategic management. Implementing strategy means mobilizing employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action (King'ola, 2011). Often considered to be the most difficult stage in strategic management, strategy implementation requires personal discipline, commitment, and sacrifice (Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010). Successful strategy implementation hinges upon managers’ ability to motivate employees, which is more an art than a science. Strategies formulated but not implemented serve no useful purpose (King'ola, 2011).

Interpersonal skills are especially critical for successful strategy implementation (Johnson & Scholes, 2002). Strategy implementation activities affect all employees and managers in an organization (King'ola, 2011). Every division and department must decide on answers to questions, such as “What must we do to implement our part of the organization’s strategy?” and “How best can we get the job done?” (Hitt, Ireland & Hoskisson, 2007). The challenge of implementation is to simulate managers and employees throughout an organization to work pride and enthusiasm toward achieves stated objectives (Johnson & Scholes, 2002).
Pearce and Robinson (2009) emphasize that the key requirements for strategy implementation to succeed include leadership styles, policies that empower the employees, resource deployment, information systems, assignment of the correct key personnel and reward and control systems must be in place.

2.2.3 Benefits of Strategic Management

The principal benefit of strategic management has been to help organizations formulate better strategies through the use of a more systematic, logical, and rational approach to strategic choice (Kaufmann & Feeney, 2012). This certainly continues to be a major benefit of strategic management, but research studies now indicate that the process, rather than the decision or document, is the more important contribution of strategic management. Communication is a key to successful strategic management (Markiewicz, 2011). Through involvement in the process, managers and employees become committed to supporting the organization. Dialogue and participation are essential ingredients (Li, Guohui & Eppler, 2008).

The manager in which strategic management is carried out is thus exceptionally important. A major aim of the process is to achieve the understanding of and commitment from all managers and employees (Kaufmann & Feeney, 2012; Johnson & Scholes, 2002). Understanding may be the most important benefit of strategic management, followed by commitment. When managers and employees understand what the organization is doing and why, they often feel that they are a part of the firm and become committed to assisting (Kaufmann & Feeney, 2012). This is especially true when employees also understand linkages between their own compensation and organizational performance. Managers and employees become surprisingly creative and innovative when they understand and support the firm’s mission, objectives, and strategies (Johnson & Scholes, 2002). A great benefit of strategic management, then, is the opportunity that the process provides to empower individuals (Markiewicz, 2011). Empowerments is the act of strengthening employee’ sense of effectiveness by encouraging them to participate in decision making and to exercise initiative and imagination, and rewarding them for doing so (Kaufmann & Feeney, 2012).
More and more organizations are decentralizing the strategic management process, recognizing that planning must involve lower-level managers and employees. The notion of centralized staff planning is being replaced in organizations by decentralized line-manager planning (Kaufmann & Feeney, 2012; Markiewicz, 2011). For example, Walt Disney Company recently dismantled its strategic-planning department and gave those responsibilities back to the Disney business divisions. Former Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Michael Eisner had favored the centralized strategic-planning approach, but new CEO Robert Iger dissolved Disney’s strategic-planning department within weeks of his taking over the top office at Disney (Lauring, 2011). The process is a learning, helping, educating, and supporting activity, not merely a paper-shifting activity among the executives. Strategic management dialogue is more important than a nicely bound strategic management document (Markiewicz, 2011). The worst thing strategists can do is develop strategic plans themselves and then present them to operational managers to execute. Through involvement in the process, line managers become “owners” of strategy. Ownership of strategies by the people who have to execute them is a key to success (Quirke, 2008).

Although making good strategic decisions is the major responsibility of an organization’s owner or CEO, both managers and employees must also be involved in strategy formulation, implementation, and evaluation activities. Participation is a key to gaining commitment for needed changes (Markiewicz, 2011). An increasing number of corporations and institutions are strategic management to make effective decisions. But strategic management is not a guarantee for success; it can be dysfunctional if conducted haphazardly (Lauring, 2011). Pearce and Robinson (2009) have outlined the benefits of strategic management as an enhanced ability of the firm to detect problems in its environment, emphasizing decisions while considering the best alternatives, a reduction of gaps and/or overlaps in employee activities, improving employees’ understanding of the productivity-reward relationship and reducing resistance to change.

2.3 Internal Communication and Strategic Management

Various researchers have found that internal communication is one of the key factors of success in the strategic management process, and particularly at the implementation stage.
After a critical review of strategy implementation frameworks proposed starting in the early 80’s, Okumus (2001) identified ten key variables that affect strategy implementation, one of which was communication. In their seminal study on the use of the Balanced Scorecard performance management method in strategic management, Kaplan and Norton (2001) stated that creation of strategic awareness throughout the organization is critical because employees must learn about and understand the strategy before they implement it. Kernbach et al. (2015) reiterated that the most delicate part of the strategy implementation process is the communication. The communication program adopted by the organization should develop understanding about the strategy, acquire buy-in to develop the strategy, educate the organization on implementation and provide feedback about the strategy (Pearce & Robinson, 2007).

2.3.1 Communication and Buy-In of the Strategy
Communication function values by themselves do not add value to a business. They only add value by influencing the business’ clarity of purpose, quality of interfaces, effectiveness of communication systems and the communication behavior of senior executives. Effective organizational communication can be viewed as an asset to the organization (Clutterbuck, 2002). In their analysis of the empirical findings on strategy implementation, Peng and Littlejohn (2001) found that communication is pervasive in every aspect of strategy implementation, and it is related in a complex way to organization processes, organizational context and implementation objectives, which in turn impact the implementation process. Communication affects the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation but does not guarantee the success of implementation.

One of the concerns of researchers in organizational communication is the creation of shared understanding of the strategy within the organization. A study carried on 12 organizations by Aaltonen and Ikavalko (2002) focused on the way in which strategies were communicated, interpreted and adopted, and what effect they had on the action of the members. The researchers found that the large amount of information communicated to the members of the organization does not guarantee understanding. Interpretation, acceptance and adoption of the information among strategy implementers is crucial. Tampoe and Macmillan (2000) stated
that the use of corporate communication to establish dialogue with constituencies in order to gain a better understanding of interests they deem important is very important.

In their case study on the communication of strategy, de Salas and Huxley (2014) found that organizations develop complex strategic plans which need an improvement in the organization’s approach to communicating and understanding of the plans throughout the organization. Many organizations’ leadership makes broad statements on the strategy, but do not provide direction on how the individual employee will aid in the achievement of the organization’s goals. Research has found that a common difficulty in designing and implementing strategy results from a difficulty in decomposing goals for lower levels of the organization (Bourne & Neely, 2003). To facilitate effective implementation, a strategy should be communicated in such a way that it is clear not just to those formulating the strategy, but to the majority of employees charged with executing the strategy.

To ensure success and buy-in of the strategy, the communication function of the organization should be the bridge that connects the strategy formulators and executors. Communication should be geared towards sending continual messages to the employees about the company and the strategic direction it is taking. Employees who are closest to the customers and who carry out the processes that create value for the organization should be fully aware of the strategy so as to enable the organization to achieve it (Kaplan & Norton, Creating the Office of Strategy Management, 2005).

Strategic communication is an area that is receiving attention from researchers. Strategic communication is defined as a strategy to interpret an organization’s vision, values, goals and intentions to its audiences (D'Aprix, 1996). These audiences include stakeholders, employees, the government and the society at large. It means having a communication strategy that is fully aligned and integrated with the business strategy (Steyn, 2004).

2.3.2 Barriers to Effective Communication
Manmelin (2007) stated that the success of any modern business today depends increasingly on what customers and stakeholders think about the company and what it is doing, which
gives importance to the role of communication. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2006) discussed the connection between communications and strategy, and came to a conclusion that a company can establish competitive advantage through managing communications in order to mold perceptions and interpretations of the constituents and not just creating desired outcomes by using material resources.

One of the barriers to communication is interpersonal cohesion that arises in heterogeneous groups of employees (Jones et al., 2006). Organizational communication should be emphasized at interpersonal, intergroup or organizational level. Heterogeneous groups of employees and stakeholders is a reality in this era of globalization, therefore intercultural communication has to be taken into account (Lauring, 2011). The organization should put mechanisms in place that enable people with different cultural backgrounds communicate clearly and that the information is not misconstrued, leading to conflict. Communication should always have the end goal of strategic consensus in mind.

While most organizations view communication as coming from the top down, research has shown that effective communication should be open and honest, and should allow for feedback to come from the subordinates to the organization’s leadership (Beer & Eisenstat, 2000). The employees charged with implementation should be able to tell the management about problems in the implementation of strategy. Without this early warning system, the management will only find out about problems after the implementation process has failed, at which point resources have been needlessly directed to the process.

Li, Guohui and Eppler (2008) found that employees in restrictive communication environments performed poorly compared to those working in supportive and open communication climates. The phenomenon of ‘organizational silence’, defined as widespread withholding of information about potential problems or issues by employees, has been identified by some researchers as a collective phenomenon that permeates throughout the organization (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). They postulated that there are powerful forces in many organizations that may create conditions conducive to silence. They argue that organizational silence adversely affects the organization’s ability to change and develop.
2.3.3 Communication and Organizational Change

Implementation of strategic plans requires changes to the organization since it operates in an environment subject to turbulence (Markiewicz, 2011). Significant changes to the organization are often gradual and are subject to change themselves as the organization gathers more information from its internal and external environments.

According to Cummings and Worley (2014), it is imperative that the organization’s leadership and members plan organizational change so as to achieve the organization’s vision and goals. The interventions that could be implemented to achieve organizational change such as human resource interventions, modification of the organization’s structure and technology and process interventions; would all fail without proper communication.

When implementing strategies, resistance to change must be overcome. If necessary changes do not occur, the strategy will not be successful. Organizational change is necessary to ensure the success of strategy implementation in the organization. Effective communication is necessary to facilitate change because it penetrates every level of the organization irrespective of the circumstances (Elving & van Vuuren, 2008). A communication strategy should coincide with the general stages of planned change and the associated information requirements (Klein, 1996).

According to Kotter (2001), establishing a sense of urgency, forming a powerful coalition, creating and communicating a vision and empowering employees to work on a vision, are some of the key elements required in transforming an organization. Effective communication should comprehensively explain any new duties, responsibilities and obligations in the strategy implementation process to everyone in the organization. Organizational communication provides an avenue for collection of reactions from main constituencies to the strategy of the organization. In this way any undesired reactions can be managed and changes can be made to the strategy implementation process to ensure success.

Uncertainty is the main driver of resistance to change. Effective communication helps to reduce resistance to change and reduces strain on the employees (Nelissen & van Selm,
In a survey among staff members at a psychiatric hospital undergoing large-scale restructuring, it was concluded that communication helped overcoming uncertainty and enhanced employees’ control and well-being (Bordia et al., 2004). The organization’s employees must fully comprehend the need for change and how it may ultimately affect them so as to reduce resistance. Communication during change should address the whole organization so that those who are not involved in the beginning of the process are made aware of the change and how they will be involved at later stages; how the change will affect everyone in the organization down the line; and to counter any misinformation that could arise (Klein, 1996).

2.4 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation

Aaltonen and Ikavalko (2002) state that the major challenges in strategy implementation lie in the cultural and communication aspects of organizations. No matter how good the strategy is, its success in implementation depends on how well it is understood by the people at all levels of the organization and their competence to implement it (Upadhyay, Upadhyay, & Palo, 2013). Organizational culture affects the behavior, ownership and commitment of the staff towards the strategy (Aaltonen & Ikavalko, 2002).

The culture of a group is defined as a pattern of shared basic assumptions and values learned by a group as it solves its problems, and is taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to these problems (Schein E. H., 2010). Culture not only influences the ways in which people think and feel, but also directs and regulates their actions (Stothard, Talbot, Drobnjak, & Fischer, 2013).

The organization, as a group of people, has its own prevailing culture and norms. Research by Dauber, Fink and Yolles (2012) on organization culture took into consideration that organizational values differ from national or societal values; and that organizational values are affected by societal values, organizational members’ personalities and preferences and their tasks.
Schein (1985) contends that the organizational culture is directly linked to espouse values or guiding principles, which is the strategy of the organization. Dauber, Fink and Yolles (2012) argued that culture affects the process of operationalization. Consequently, strategies are put into effect through structures and operations by considering the cultural values held within the organization. Their research concludes that operationalization has to be aligned with the culture, and that the strategy, and operations of an organization are affected by its culture.

2.4.1 Culture and Leadership

Strategic leadership is defined as the leader’s ability to anticipate, envision, and maintain flexibility and to empower others to strategic change as necessary (Hitt, Ireland, & Hoskisson, 2007). Organizational culture affects leadership style of managers. This is with regard to their time-spending, their focus, questions towards their employees and decision-making. Leadership also entails their dominant values and beliefs, the personal and organization norms, and conscious and unconscious symbolic acts which may include dress codes, job titles, and informal meetings with employees (Adkins & Caldwell, 2004).

Strategic leadership contributes to strategy implementation through determining strategic direction, establishing balanced organizational controls, managing the organization’s resources, sustaining an effective organizational culture and emphasizing ethical practices (Jooste & Fourie, 2009). It is vital that strong leadership is provided during strategy implementation. If the strategy formulators, that are the senior executives, are not fully committed to the strategy and step out of the picture when implementation begins, subordinate staff’s commitment and enthusiasm for the strategy will wane (Corboy & Corrbui, 1999). The absence of strategic leadership in implementation implies that implementation is not worth their attention and is therefore unimportant. Leaders must continue to sell the strategy to the organization and communicate the importance of the strategy at all stages of the strategic management cycle.

Leadership styles play a crucial role in determining the success of failure of strategic implementation. In their research into strategy implementation, Bourgeois and Browin (1984) proposed five approaches leaders could take. In the commander approach, the leader provides
direction. In the change approach, the leader focuses on changing the structure of the organization to facilitate implementation. In the collaborative approach, the leader gives some decision making power to subordinates. In the cultural approach, the leader imparts employees throughout the organization with a strong set of collective values which contribute to strategy implementation. In addition to the chosen approach, leadership should support and encourage change through modification of policy and incentives (Siciliano & Hess, 2009).

Leaders should evaluate their approach to management and ensure that their actions and decisions are representative of the organization’s culture. Leadership should not be confined to the top of the organization’s hierarchy, rather, mid-level managers with the potential to develop leadership skills are given authority (Beer & Eisenstat, 2000). Effective leadership should give direction but also receive feedback from the staff lower in the hierarchy. Kaplan and Norton (2001) asserted that the success of strategy depends less on structural issues and more on the leadership from the senior executives. Leaders must create a climate for change, provide the vision for what change could accomplish, win the hearts and minds of everyone in the organization and let staff find innovative ways to accomplish the strategic mission. The organization’s future depends on its ability to unite employees behind an effective leader or leadership team by communicating its goals effectively (Clutterbuck, 2002).

2.4.2 Culture as an Organizational Asset
Culture is classified as an intangible asset that an organization has. It permeates all aspects of an organization’s operations, and therefore has a knock-on effect on the organization’s success or failure. Culture is valuable because it is unique and cannot be imitated easily because it has abstract and tacit components that only the members of the organization in question know. If managed effectively, it is a major economic asset and if managed ineffectively it is a liability and can lead to the organization’s failure (Flamholtz & Randle, 2011).

Griffin et al. (2012) postulate that culture influences managerial risk-taking directly through its effect on individual decision-making and indirectly through its effect on an organization’s managerial practices. All the beliefs, assumptions and behaviors of the management team
become a complete system with unique content that shapes the processes of decision making and influences the choice of strategies, policy, principles and behaviors in the organization. The tendency to take risks affects many decisions such as investment in new initiatives, acquisition and investment in production equipment and technologies, the level of investment in research and development, management of cash flow and credit, the way in which pension funds are handled and the management’s response to innovation in the organization (Weber & Tarba, 2012).

Ethics in the workplace are greatly influenced by the prevailing corporate culture. Proclaimed values appear irrelevant and the organization’s employees tend to act in tandem with the management’s behavior. Value statements in and of themselves have no meaning, but get their significance from the meaning they hold for managers and employees. Thus, when employees perceive managers as trustworthy and ethical, they are likely to act the same way (Guiso, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2015). The most effective way to make the proclaimed values influence action in the organization is to ensure that the actions and decision-making of the leadership are in accordance with the stated values, and that they are foremost in the employees’ minds by displaying them prominently and repeating the message (Giles, 2015).

2.4.3 Alignment of Culture to Strategy

The organization’s intangible assets must be aligned with strategy in order to create value, and value occurs in the context of strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). According to Gupta (2011), organization culture and strategy are highly interrelated, and it is known that once the organization changes strategy, it must align organization culture with strategy or face failure. Cultural changes in organizations are not an easy task because they involve changing the values, attitudes, expectations, beliefs and behavior of people.

Although organizations take several measures including training and motivating employees by way of incentives, there is not a lot of evidence of concrete steps taken by the organizations in building the value base of their employees and leaders in the context of strategy implementation (Upadhyay, Upadhyay, & Palo, 2013). Alignment highlights the importance of recognizing the existing fit between goals and objectives with individuals, work teams, departments and the whole organization (Alagaraja & Shuck, 2015). The better
the fit that an organization achieves with external circumstances, the more likely it is both to effectively target products and services and to win financial and political support, and thereby improve its performance (Meier, O'Toole Jr., Boyne, Walker, & Andrews, 2010).

Organization cultures can be categorized as either strong or weak. Strong cultures create greater consistency in the behavior of employees, and can enhance the employees’ commitment. Weak cultures, on the other hand, are subject to disintegration and abuse (House, 2004). Strong cultures are characterized by widely shared values and beliefs, and they significantly affect staff behavior. Weak cultures are a stumbling block to strategy implementation (Buul, 2010). Jean and Lee (2004) contend that strong culture companies may inadvertently stifle the creativity and innovativeness of their employees through blind commitment to a set of ideas. It makes employees more susceptible to groupthink and less ready to accept different ideas or new modes of thinking, decreasing the intellectual diversity in the organization. Therefore, while strong culture may help the implementation of creative ideas, it may not help to generate them.

Organizational culture does not directly lend its influence on organizational effectiveness, but it exerts its influence through shaping the behavior of organizational members (Zheng, Yang, & McLean, 2010). It is important to note that while organizational culture is related to the organization's performance, but there is no single culture that produces a high level of performance; rather, there can be several organizational cultures, each one leading the organization to adequate performance. Alignment is optimized when there is a strategic fit between the prevailing competitive situation, business strategy, organization culture and leadership style (Chorn, 1991). There must be alignment between cultural norms and the behaviors needed for good strategy execution; if there is misalignment then culture becomes a hindrance because the behaviors and actions are contrary to the set strategy.

### 2.5 Organization Structure and Strategy Implementation

Organization structure is defined as the sum total of the ways in which it divides its labor into distinct tasks and then achieves coordination among them (Mintzberg, 1979). Structural choice must support an organization’s strategy. Chandler (1962) carried out a study of the
corporate structure of four major American conglomerates so as to ascertain the relationship between structure and strategy. The analysis from the study indicated that strategy precedes structure, and from this came the widely-cited maxim ‘structure follows strategy’. Mintzberg (1990) and Ansoff (1991), while critiquing Mintzberg’s paper on the design school, came to the same conclusion. Some researchers studying the relationship between structure and strategy have come to the conclusion that strategy follows structure. Hall and Saias (1980) argue that structure, strategy and the environment are closely linked; and that whereas the structure of the organization may be created by managers, it is this same structure which constrains the strategic choices of the managers.

More recent studies have concluded that structure and strategy have a chicken-and-egg or reciprocal relationship. A 10-year empirical study into whether a diversification strategy facilitates subsequent divisionalization, and hence structure follows strategy; or whether the multidivisional structure leads to a diversification strategy, and hence strategy follows structure; concluded that strategic diversification affects structural divisionalization, and in turn, structural divisionalization affects strategic diversification (Galan & Sanchez-Bueno, 2009). Further studies into this reciprocal relationship have been carried out to determine the hierarchy of the elements in the relationship, specifically which of the elements have a greater influence on the other. Amburgey and Dacin (1994) conclude that strategy is a much more important determinant of structure than structure is of strategy.

There is need to understand the demands or needs of a given strategy and choose a structure which best meets the requisite needs (Hrebiniak, 2013). Strategy implementation often involves change in organization structure, incentives, people, objectives and responsibilities. The most necessary elements to describe the shape of an organization are its breadth and depth (Colombo & Delmastro, 2002). The depth defines the number of hierarchical layers or management levels that lay between the top management and operational employees. The breadth could be measured by the control span, that is, the number of a supervisor’s direct reports or subordinates. Most companies are configured in terms of four basic elements of organizational structure. These are namely; span of control, centralization, formalization and departmentalization. Based on their study of over 200 businesses and business units where
the dimension of organizational structure was investigated, Olson et al (2005) found that in order for strategy to create superior performance, it must be complemented by appropriate organizational characteristics and employee behavior. The study concluded that there are structural dimensions that influence communication, coordination and decision making which are key to strategy implementation; which are formalization, centralization and specialization.

2.5.1 Formalization

Formalization is the degree to which an organization standardizes behavior through rules, procedures, training and related mechanism (Carl & Kaplan, 1998). Rules and procedures are used to define appropriate behavior, solve minor problems and organization of activities to benefit the staff and the organization. In highly formalized firms, there are defined procedures that cover work processes, clear job descriptions and many organizational rules.

Organizations tend to become more formalized as the number of staff involved becomes larger (Hempel et al., 2012). Formalization also occurs when work activities become more routine and are documented and standardized. In highly formalized organizations, employees have little discretion over what is to be done, when it is done and how it is done (Carl & Kaplan, 1998). In organizations with low formalization, employees have more discretion over how they do their work (Love, Priem, and Lumpkin, 2002).

Formalization is popularly derided as bureaucratic red tape and is viewed as an obstacle to overcome. Research into the formal rules in a Dutch organization to investigate the relationship between subjective and objective measures of formalization concluded that red tape and formalization are distinct concepts, and formalization is not a necessary condition for red tape (Kaufmann & Feeney, 2012). Hempel et al (2012) argue that rather than being a negative factor, formalization can act to promote efficiency and empowerment of employees. However, highly formalized firms with too many rules and procedures have reduced flexibility, which means situations are responded to by employing standardized procedures even when the procedures need to be varied to suit the situation. This leads to stress, work dissatisfaction, demotivation and a decline in efficiency.
2.5.2 Centralization and Decentralization

Centralization defines the formal decision-making authority that is held by a small group of people, typically those at the helm of the organizational hierarchy. In more centralized organizations, the zone of individuals’ discretion in decision-making narrows rapidly as one progresses from organization members at the highest level downward toward members at operative levels. Those members closest to the pinnacle of centralized organizations make most decisions, while lower-level members have relatively little say over either business issues or operational procedures (Love, Priem, and Lumpkin, 2002).

In more decentralized organizations, however, individuals’ discretion in decision making remains relatively wide even at lower levels. Most organizations begin with centralized structures and become more decentralized as they grow and diversify and as activities and decision-making becomes too burdensome for a single authority (Love, Priem, and Lumpkin, 2002). The strategy chosen by a firm often influences the structure of the firm. According to Chandler (1962) a strategy such as diversification of products and markets required a more decentralized structure, called the multidivisional form, so as to respond adequately to consumer needs.

Centralization works best for organizations in relatively stable situations while a more decentralized approach is more effective for firms in complex and changing conditions (Kreitner, 2009). A more decentralized organization will adapt faster to any changes in the environment because decisions can be made and implemented at more levels of the hierarchy, while for centralized organizations will adapt slower since decision have to be made at the higher rungs of the ladder and then trickle down to the lower levels for implementation.

2.5.3 Span of Control

The number of people who report directly to a manager represents that manager’s span of control (Kreitner, 2009). Managers with a narrow span of control have a few people reporting to them while those with a wide span of control have many people reporting to them. Narrow spans of control foster organizations with many levels in the hierarchy while wide spans of
control foster flat organization structures. Wider spans of control mean less administrative expenses and more self-management, and enhanced efficiency and performance. Eventually, however, large manager-employee ratios impede managers’ ability to communicate, coordinate, and supervise (Theobald & Nicholson-Crotty, 2005). This causes inadequate supervision and loss of control. Organizations should therefore carefully choose the ideal span of control.

There is no ideal span of control for all organizations since they carry out different kinds of work (Kreitner, 2009). A wider span of control is possible and effective when employees perform routine tasks since there is less need for direct intervention from supervisors. A narrow span of control is necessary when employees perform complex tasks since there is a need for more supervision and coaching (Johnson & Scholes, Exploring Corporate Strategy, 2002). Organizations therefore have to work out a reasonable balance and come up with an ideal span of control. Theobald and Nicholson-Crotty (2005) suggest that there may be an optimal span of control for a goal, but that may not be optimal for a different goal within the organization. Therefore, even within the same organization, the span of control may vary depending on the strategy.

Corporate restructuring methods such as delayering and redundancy or downsizing influence the span of control. Delayering is decreasing the number of management levels in an organization which leads to the flattening of an organization’s hierarchy. The surviving managers typically have wider spans of control both in terms of the number of workers reporting to them and in the variety of tasks they have to manage (Worall, Cooper, & Campbell, 2000). Even as organizations enjoy reduced costs and more empowered employees when they reduce the layers in their hierarchy, some experts warn that there are also negative long-term consequences of cutting out too much of the middle management. These are increased stress and workload for surviving managers, undermining managerial functions and restricting managerial career development (Worall, Cooper, & Campbell, 2000). The workload can be reduced by delegation, which is assigning various degrees of decision-making to lower-level employees. The amount of stress does not change, however, because the ultimate responsibility still lies with the manager (Kreitner, 2009). Redundancy
or downsizing, on the other hand, means a general reduction in the workforce. If downsizing occurs for a targeted level of management, this causes delayering. Delayering programs often involve downsizing (Littler & Innes, 2004). Organizations must strike the correct balance between flat and tall organizational structures. Tall structures have the advantage of direct supervision but have the disadvantage of higher overheads and relay information from the external environment very slowly (John & Meier, 2001).

Aligning the organization structure to the strategy is a crucial step to implementation. Strategy implementation is known to be messy, involving many departments in the firm. It entails coordinating and motivating departments or functional units to share common goals (Noble, 1999). Many organizations have been experimenting with organizational structures that facilitate empowered cross-functional communication (Tucker, Meyer, & Westerman, 1996). The main aim of this trend is to become more efficient and competitive by reducing barriers to communication and to enable better performance on strategic goals.

2.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a review of literature on factors that affect strategy implementation. The chapter started with an introduction, and an explanation of the nature and scope of strategic management. The section was followed by the influence of internal communication, organizational culture and resources on strategy implementation. Chapter three outlines the methodology that was used to collect data.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the research design and methodology. This is followed by the description of the population and the sample design. Thereafter the sample size, data collection methods, research procedures, and data analysis methods have been provided.

3.2 Research Design
According to Cooper and Schindler (2014), a research design is the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data which fulfils the researcher’s objectives. Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) describe research design as an overall plan of how the researcher undertakes in answering the research questions. For this study, the researcher employed descriptive research design. A descriptive study is concerned with determining the frequency with which something occurs or the relationship between variables (Bryman and Bell, 2003). This design was appropriate because the researcher intended to establish whether the variables; organizational communication, organization culture and structure (independent variables) affected the implementation of strategy (dependent variable). The dependent variable is strategy implementation and the independent variables are organizational communication, organization culture and organization structure.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design
3.3.1 Population
Target population refers to all the members of a real or hypothetical set of people, events or subjects to which a researcher wishes to generalize the results of the study (Kothari, 2004). The target population of this study was composed of the directors, managers and regular employees working in Ramani Geosystems Group in Nairobi. According to the Human Resource department of Ramani Geosystems, there are 82 employees working for the organization. For this study, the population was distributed as shown in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1 Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ramani Geosystems (2017)

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

The sampling frame is a complete list of all the cases in the population from which a sample is drawn (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). It is a list of all the items or individuals in the population which can be sampled (Kothari, 2004). The sampling frame of this study was the list of directors and staff working in all departments of Ramani Geosystems Group. The source of the list was the Human Resource department of Ramani Geosystems Group.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

The population was divided into strata. For this study, stratified random sampling were used for the study. Cooper and Schindler (2014) define stratified random sampling is accomplished by dividing the population into strata based on a set of attributes, and then drawing a random sample from each of the strata. Stratified random sampling ensures all parts of the population are represented and reduces the error in estimation. The strata to be used in the study was based on the organizational hierarchy of directors, managers and general staff. From each of the strata, samples were derived independently. Disproportionate sampling was used for the strata in the study, whereby, for the directors and managers, the whole population was considered.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

Kothari (2004) contends that when the universe is small, a sample survey is inappropriate. For the staff stratum, the normal distribution Yamane formula was used. The formula was as follows:
\[ n = \frac{NZ^2pq}{(E^2(N - 1) + Z^2pq)} \]

Where:
- \( n \) = is the sample size
- \( Z \) = is the level of confidence required, which is 95%. \( Z \) is set at 1.96
- \( p \) and \( q \) are the population proportions, set at 0.5
- \( E \) = is the accuracy of the sample proportions set at 0.05 (5%)
- \( N \) = is the population size (75)

Using the Yamane formula, it gave the study a sample size of 72 respondents that were distributed as shown in Table 3.2.

### Table 3.2 Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2017)

### 3.4 Data Collection Methods

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, the researcher used primary data. The data was collected using questionnaires. The questionnaires were self-administered. Questionnaires were suitable because they had no bias since the researcher’s opinion did not influence the respondents. They were also easy to administer. The questionnaires had five sections; one for collecting demographic data, and the other four addressed each of the independent variables; which are nature and scope of strategic management, organizational communication, organizational culture, and organizational structure. The variables were measured using interval and ordinal scales. For interval measures, a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used to measure respondents’ agreement with
the concepts being researched. Most of the questions in the questionnaires were closed-ended.

3.5 Research Procedures

The researcher obtained permission to carry out research from the Human Resource manager of Ramani Geosystems. The researcher then carried out a pretest on the questionnaire through a pilot study. This was to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire and to identify any ambiguous, awkward or offensive questions (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The researcher sought opinions of experts in the field of study, especially lecturers from the Chandaria School of Business. This facilitated any revisions and modifications of the questionnaire.

Printed questionnaires were sent to a pilot group of 5 individuals from the target population. These respondents were conveniently selected and were excluded from the major study. Reliability was measured using the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient ($\alpha$). The alpha value ranges from 0 to 1, and the closer the value is to 1 the greater the reliability of the questionnaire. Nunnally (1978) recommends that instruments used in research should have reliability of about 0.70 and above. If the instrument has a reliability of 0.7 and above it indicates that the instrument is reliable and therefore would need no amendments before administering. Final administration of printed questionnaires followed the test. The researcher followed up with the respondents through emails, telephone calls and visits to ensure a high number of responses.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Cooper and Schindler (2014) define data analysis as the reduction of collected data, developing summaries, looking for patterns and applying statistical techniques. The completed questionnaires were edited to ensure consistency and completeness. Data was coded into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the mean, standard deviation and distribution among certain parameters. This information will be presented in tables and figures. Inferential statistics using a linear regression analysis
was carried out to determine the influence of organizational communication, organizational culture and organizational culture on strategy implementation. The equation used was

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

Where:
- \( Y \) = Strategy Implementation
- \( X_1 \) = Nature and Scope of Strategic Management
- \( X_2 \) = Organizational Communication
- \( X_3 \) = Organization Culture
- \( X_4 \) = Organization Structure
- \( \beta_i \) = Coefficients of the independent variables
- \( \varepsilon \) = Error term

**3.7 Chapter Summary**

This chapter outlined the procedure that was used in collecting and analyzing data. It started with the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures and finally data analysis methods. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results and findings of the study presented in the form of tables and figures. Descriptions of the figures are presented to give meaning to the data presented. The section was guided by the study objectives and the questionnaires analyzed.

4.2 Response Rate and Background Information

4.2.1 Response Rate
The researcher handed out 75 questionnaires to the target population and received 64 questionnaires. After data cleaning and sorting, only 55 instruments were deemed valid and therefore used for analysis. This results gave the study a response rate of 73.3% which was above the required threshold.

![Figure 4.1 Response Rate]

Figure 4.1 Response Rate

4.2.2 Gender
The respondents were asked to indicate their gender and the results in Figure 4.2 shows that 58.2% were male and 41.8% were female. These results show that the organization had more male counterparts which could be attributed to it being a technology driven organization. The female population was also significantly high indicating that more females are getting into the technology driven organizations.
### 4.2.3 Age

The respondents were asked to indicate their age and the results in Figure 4.3 shows that 69.1% were aged between 26-35 years, 20% were aged below 25 years, 7.3% were aged between 36-45 years, and 3.6% were aged above 46 years. These results show that the organization had more youths employed in the organization, and this could be attributed to the organization being technology driven, making the youths the most productive employees for the organization.

#### Figure 4.3 Age

### 4.2.4 Level of Education

The respondents were asked to indicate their level of education and the results in Figure 4.4 shows that 67.3% had undergraduate degrees, 21.8% had diplomas, and 10.9% had postgraduate degrees. These results show that the organization had well educated employees,
and this could be attributed to the organization being technology driven, making the youths the most productive employees for the organization.

**Figure 4.4 Level of Education**

**4.2.5 Years in the Organization**

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had been in the organization and the results in Figure 4.5 shows that 23.6% had been in the organization for 1-3 years, 21.8% for 7-9 years, 20% for 4-6 years and above 10 years respectively, and 14.5% for below a year. These results show that majority of the respondents had been with the organization for more than 4 years, making them suitable candidates for the study.

**Figure 4.5 Years in the Organization**
4.3 Nature and Scope of Strategic Management

4.3.1 Extent of Strategy Implementation

The respondents were asked to indicate the level to which the organization had implemented its strategies. Figure 4.6 shows that 50.9% stated it had to a great extent, 18.2% stated very great extent, 16.4% stated little extent, and 14.5% stated moderate extent. These results show that the organization had implemented its strategies to a great extent.

![Figure 4.6 Extent of Strategy Implementation](image)

4.3.2 Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation

The respondents were asked to indicate other factors that influence strategy implementation and Figure 4.7 shows that 40% stated organizational culture, 32.7% stated leadership, 20% stated employees, and 7.3% stated organizational structure. These results show that organizational culture was significant in strategy implementation.

![Figure 4.7 Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation](image)
4.3.3 Rating of Strategic Management and Scope Factors

The respondents were asked to rate strategic management and scope factors using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The results were as shown in Table 4.1. The mean score of >2.5 shows the factors were significant and the standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the response were almost similar.

Table 4.1 Rating of Strategic Management and Scope Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management in the organization involves a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines its long – run performance</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization monitors and evaluates its external environment in light of internal environment while implementing its strategies</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management in the organization provides direction, vision for the future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various levels</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links its employees’ performance</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has mobilized and motivated employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization stimulates its managers and employees to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization motivates strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization ensures that managers and employees understand what it is doing and why, leading to their commitment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization uses strategic management as an opportunity to empower its managers and employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization recognizes that strategic planning involves lower-level managers and employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that strategic management in the organization involves a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines its long – run performance as strongly agreed to by
14.5%, agreed to by 78.2%, and 7.3% were neutral; the results had a mean of 1.93 and a standard deviation of 0.466. The organization monitors and evaluates its external environment in light of internal environment while implementing its strategies as strongly agreed to by 14.5%, agreed to by 41.8%, and 43.6% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.29 and a standard deviation of 0.712. Strategic management in the organization provides direction, vision for the future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various levels as strongly agreed to by 23.6%, agreed to by 30.9%, 25.5% were neutral, and 20% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.42 and a standard deviation of 1.066.

The organization has a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links its employees’ performance as strongly agreed to by 38.2%, agreed to by 23.6%, and 38.2% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.00 and a standard deviation of 0.882. The organization has mobilized and motivated employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action as strongly agreed to by 14.5%, agreed to by 78.2%, and 7.3% were neutral; the results had a mean of 1.93 and a standard deviation of 0.466. The organization stimulates its managers and employees to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives as strongly agreed to by 41.8%, agreed to by 36.4%, and 21.8% were neutral; the results had a mean of 1.80 and a standard deviation of 0.779. The organization did not motivate strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process since majority of the respondents 69.1% were neutral, 16.4% agreed, and 14.5% strongly agreed; the results had a mean of 2.55 and a standard deviation of 0.741.

The organization ensures that managers and employees understand what it is doing and why, leading to their commitment as strongly agreed to by 20%, agreed to by 14.5%, 49.1% were neutral, and 16.4% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.62 and a standard deviation of 0.991. The organization uses strategic management as an opportunity to empower its managers and employees as agreed to by 52.7%, 30.9% were neutral, and 16.4% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.64 and a standard deviation of 0.754. The organization recognizes that strategic planning involves lower-level managers and employees as agreed to by 52.7%, and 47.3% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.47 and a standard deviation of 0.504.
4.3.4 Correlations for Strategic Management and Scope Factors

A Pearson correlation test was carried out for strategic management and scope factors, and the results were as shown in Table 4.2. The threshold for significant factors was a p value of <0.05, thus all factors whose p values were >0.05 were considered insignificant.

Table 4.2 Correlations for Strategic Management and Scope Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management in the organization involves a set of managerial</td>
<td>.284*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions and actions that determines its long – run performance</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization monitors and evaluates its external environment in light of</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal environment while implementing its strategies</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management in the organization provides direction, vision for the</td>
<td>.303*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links</td>
<td>-.791**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its employees’ performance</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has mobilized and motivated employees and managers to</td>
<td>.284*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put formulated strategies into action</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization stimulates its managers and employees to work with pride</td>
<td>-.527**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization motivates strategy implementation through employee</td>
<td>.699**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement in the decision-making process</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization ensures that managers and employees understand what it is</td>
<td>-.315*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing and why, leading to their commitment</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization uses strategic management as an opportunity to empower its</td>
<td>-.663**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managers and employees</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization recognizes that strategic planning involves lower-level</td>
<td>-.401**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managers and employees</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 4.2 shows that strategic management in the organization involving a set of managerial decisions and actions that determine its long-run performance was significant to strategy implementation \((r=0.284, p<0.05)\). The organization monitoring and evaluating its external environment in light of internal environment while implementing its strategies was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation \((r=-0.146, p>0.05)\). Strategic management in the organization providing direction, vision for the future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various levels was significant to strategy implementation \((r=0.303, p<0.05)\).

The organization having a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links its employees’ performance was inversely significant to strategy implementation \((r=-0.791, p<0.05)\). The organization mobilizing and motivating employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action was significant to strategy implementation \((r=0.284, p<0.05)\). The organization stimulating its managers and employees to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives was inversely significant to strategy implementation \((r=-0.527, p<0.05)\). The organization motivating strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process was significant to strategy implementation \((r=0.699, p<0.05)\).

The organization ensuring that managers and employees understand what it is doing and why, leading to their commitment was inversely significant to strategy implementation \((r=-0.315, p<0.05)\). The organization using strategic management as an opportunity to empower its managers and employees was inversely significant to strategy implementation \((r=-0.663, p<0.05)\). The organization recognizing that strategic planning involves lower-level managers and employees was inversely significant to strategy implementation \((r=-0.401, p<0.05)\).

**4.3.5 Regression Analysis for Strategic Management and Scope Factors**

A regression analysis test was carried out to determine the significance of strategic management factors on strategy implementation. The strategic management factors were computed to form two variables (nature of strategic management and benefits of strategic management) that were used for the analysis. Table 4.3 shows the regression model for
strategic management factors on strategy implementation. The adjusted R square value shows that 32% of the variance in strategy implementation could be explained by nature of strategic management, and benefits of strategic management.

**Table 4.3 Model Summary for Strategic Management and Scope Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.24928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant) Nature of Strategic Management, Benefits of Strategic Management

### 4.3.6 Regression Coefficients for Strategic Management and Scope Factors

The computed strategic management factors (nature of strategic management and benefits of strategic management) were calculated to determine their levels of significance to strategy implementation and the results were as shown in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4 Regression Coefficients for Strategic Management and Scope Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>5.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management Benefits</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>4.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategic Implementation

The general form of the equation to predict influence of strategy implementation by strategic management factors was:

\[ Y = 1.038 + 0.210 \text{ Nature of Strategic Management} + 0.219 \text{ Benefits of Strategic Management} \]

The equation shows the coefficient for nature of strategic management was 0.210, which indicates that, for every increase in nature of strategic management, there would be an
average increase of 21% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The equation shows the coefficient for benefits of strategic management was 0.219, which means that, for every increase in benefit of strategic management, there would be an average increase of 21.9% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The p values of .001 and .000 for both factors indicates that, nature of strategic management, and benefits of strategic management were significant factors in strategy implementation.

4.4 Internal Communication and Strategic Management

4.4.1 Extent of Organizational Communication’s Influence

The respondents were asked to indicate the level to which organizational communication influenced strategy implementation. Figure 4.8 shows that 40% stated very great extent, 36.4% stated great extent, and 23.6% stated little extent. These results show that organizational communication influenced strategy implementation to a very great extent.

![Figure 4.8 Extent of Organizational Communication’s Influence](image)

4.4.2 Manner of Internal Communication Influence

The respondents were asked to indicate how they thought internal communication influenced strategy implementation. The responses offered were categorized into 6 categories shown in Figure 4.9. The Figure shows 23.6% stated organizational communication facilitated employee cohesion and teamwork, 20% stated communication facilitated strategy communication, 18.2% stated that communication offered interdepartmental information flow, 16.4% stated that communication offered a sense of direction to employees, 14.5%
stated that communication offered employee understanding of the organizational strategy hence facilitate implementation, and 7.3% stated that communication offered departmental integration.

![Figure 4.9 Manner of Internal Communication Influence](image)

### 4.4.3 Rating of Internal Communication and Strategic Management

The respondents were asked to rate internal communication factors using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The results were as shown in Table 4.5. The mean score of >2.5 shows the factors were significant and the standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the response were almost similar.

Table 4.5 shows that there is clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff as strongly agreed to by 21.8%, agreed to by 61.8%, and disagreed to by 16.4%; the results had a mean of 2.11 and a standard deviation of 0.936. The organization’s communication practices did not enable total understanding of strategy implementation as disagreed to by 56.4%, and agreed to by 23.6%, and 20% were neutral; the results had a mean of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 0.840. The organization’s leadership did not encourage feedback from the staff as disagreed to by 58.2%, and agreed to by 23.6%, and 18.2% were neutral; the results had a mean of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 0.844.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s communication practices enable total understanding of strategy implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership encourages feedback from the staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication comes from the top of the organizational structure to the lower levels, and not from the bottom to the top</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from staff is used in making decisions at the higher levels of the organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure have been communicated clearly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership seeks opinions from staff on strategy implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management communicates with subordinates regularly on strategy matters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s communication is geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy to be implemented has been broken down into individual actions that when achieved produce success</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that communication comes from the top of the organizational structure to the lower levels, and not from the bottom to the top as strongly agreed to by 40%, agreed to by 36.4%, and 23.6% were neutral; the results had a mean of 1.84 and a standard deviation of 0.788. Feedback from staff is not used in making decisions at the higher levels of the organization as disagreed to by 65.5%, and 34.5% were neutral; the results had a mean of 3.65 and a standard deviation of 0.480. Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure have been communicated clearly as agreed to by 74.5%, while 18.2% disagreed, and 7.3% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.44 and a standard deviation of 0.788.

The organization’s leadership did not seek opinions from staff on strategy implementation as strongly disagreed to by 52.7%, disagreed to by 23.6%, and agreed to by 23.6%; the results had a mean of 4.05 and a standard deviation of 1.224. The organization’s management did not communicate with subordinates regularly on strategy matters as strongly disagreed to by 52.7%, and 47.3% disagreed; the results had a mean of 4.53 and a standard deviation of 0.504. The organization’s communication is geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal as agreed to by 54.5%, while 45.5% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.45 and a standard deviation of 0.503. The strategy to be implemented has been broken down into individual actions that when achieved produce success as strongly agreed to by 23.6%, agreed to by 50.9%, while 25.5% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.27 and a standard deviation of 1.096.

4.4.4 Correlations for Internal Communication Factors

A Pearson correlation test was carried out for internal communication factors, and the results were as shown in Table 4.6. The threshold for significant factors was a p value of <0.05, thus all factors whose p values were >0.05 were considered insignificant.

Table 4.6 shows that clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation (r=-0.196, p>0.05). The organization’s communication practices enabling total understanding of strategy implementation was significant to strategy implementation (r=0.930, p<0.05). The organization’s leadership
encouraging feedback from the staff was significant to strategy implementation (r=0.740, p<0.05).

Table 4.6 Correlations for Internal Communication Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff</td>
<td>-.196, .152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s communication practices enable total understanding of strategy implementation</td>
<td>.930**, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership encourages feedback from the staff</td>
<td>.740**, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication comes from the top of the organizational structure to the lower levels, and not from the bottom to the top</td>
<td>-.979**, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from staff is used in making decisions at the higher levels of the organization</td>
<td>-.310*, .021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure have been communicated clearly</td>
<td>.518**, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership seeks opinions from staff on strategy implementation</td>
<td>.910**, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management communicates with subordinates regularly on strategy matters</td>
<td>.633**, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s communication is geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal</td>
<td>.499**, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy to be implemented has been broken down into individual actions that when achieved produce success</td>
<td>.796**, .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The table shows that communication coming from the top of the organizational structure to the lower levels, and not from the bottom to the top was inversely significant to strategy implementation (r=-0.979, p<0.05). Feedback from staff being used in making decisions at
the higher levels of the organization was inversely significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.310$, $p<0.05$). Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure being communicated clearly was significant to strategy implementation ($r=0.518$, $p<0.05$).

The organization’s leadership seeking opinions from staff on strategy implementation was significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.910$, $p<0.05$). The organization’s management communicates with subordinates regularly on strategy matters was significant to strategy implementation ($r=0.633$, $p<0.05$). The organization’s communication being geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal was significant to strategy implementation ($r=0.499$, $p<0.05$). The strategy to be implemented being broken down into individual actions that when achieved produce success was significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.796$, $p<0.05$).

4.4.5 Regression Analysis for Internal Communication Factors

A regression analysis test was carried out to determine the significance of internal communication factors on strategy implementation. The internal communication factors were computed to form three variables (communication and buy-in of strategy, barriers to effective communication, and communication and organizational change) that were used for analysis.

Table 4.7 shows the regression model for internal communication factors and strategy implementation. The adjusted R square value shows that 7.9% of the variance in strategy implementation could be explained by communication and buy-in of strategy, barriers to effective communication, and communication and organizational change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.28998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant) Communication and Buy-In of Strategy, Barriers to Effective Communication, and Communication and Organizational Change
4.4.6 Regression Coefficients for Internal Communication Factors

The computed internal communication factors (communication and buy-in of strategy, barriers to effective communication, and communication and organizational change) were calculated to determine their levels of significance to strategy implementation and the results were as shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 Regression Coefficients for Internal Communication Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Buy-In of Strategy</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication Barrier</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Organizational Change</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategic Implementation

The general form of the equation to predict influence of strategy implementation by internal communication factors was:

\[ Y = 2.192 + 0.166 \text{ Communication and Buy-In of Strategy} - 0.071 \text{ Effective Communication Barrier} - 0.127 \text{ Communication and Organizational Change} \]

The equation shows the coefficient for communication and buy-in of strategy was 0.166, which indicates that, for every increase in communication and buy-in of strategy, there would be an average increase of 16.6% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The equation shows the coefficient for effective communication barrier was -0.071, which means that, for every increase in effective communication barrier, there would be an average decrease of 7.1% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant (this would be
explained by the inverse relationship between the variables). The equation shows the coefficient for communication and organizational change was -0.127, which means that, for every increase in communication and organizational change, there would be an average decrease of 12.7% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant (this would be explained by the inverse relationship between the variables). The p values of 0.026 for communication and buy-in strategy, and 0.049 for communication and organizational change indicates that, communication and buy-in strategy, and communication and organizational change were significant factors in strategy implementation, while effective communication barrier was insignificant to strategy implementation since its p value was >0.05.

4.5 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation

4.5.1 Extent of Organizational Culture’s Influence

The respondents were asked to indicate the level to which organizational culture influenced strategy implementation. Figure 4.10 shows that 54.5% stated very great extent, and 45.5% stated great extent. These results show that organizational culture influenced strategy implementation to a very great extent.

![Figure 4.10 Extent of Organizational Culture’s Influence](image)

**Figure 4.10 Extent of Organizational Culture’s Influence**

4.5.2 Manner of Organizational Culture’s Influence

The respondents were asked to indicate how they thought organizational culture influenced strategy implementation. The responses offered were categorized into 6 categories shown in Figure 4.11. The Figure shows 23.6% stated organization culture defines the beliefs of the
employees as well as the position in terms of “where we are, and who we are”, 20% stated that culture determined the quality of services offered by the organization, 18.2% stated that culture defined the daily operations of the organization, 16.4% stated that culture determined the environment through which communication took place, 14.5% stated that culture determined and facilitated the level of teamwork within the organization, and 7.3% stated that culture determined the level and speed of organizational change.

![Figure 4.11 Manner of Organizational Culture’s Influence](image)

### 4.5.3 Rating of Organizational Culture and Strategic Management

The respondents were asked to rate organizational culture factors using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The results were as shown in Table 4.9. The mean score of >2.5 shows the factors were significant and the standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the response were almost similar.

Table 4.9 shows the organization has a mission statement and a vision staff as strongly agreed to by 83.6%, and agreed to by 16.4%; the results had a mean of 1.16 and a standard deviation of 0.373. The organization sticks to its mission, vision and values all the time staff as strongly agreed to by 56.4%, agreed to by 20%, and disagreed to by 23.6%; the results had a mean of 1.91 and a standard deviation of 1.236. The organization has a fun and friendly working environment staff as strongly agreed to by 30.9%, agreed to by 30.9%, while 38.2% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.07 and a standard deviation of 0.836. The organization’s leadership motivates staff towards a common goal staff as agreed to by 43.6%,
while 25.5% were neutral, and 30.9% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.87 and a standard deviation of 0.862.

### Table 4.9 Rating of Organizational Culture Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a mission statement and a vision</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization sticks to its mission, vision and values all the time</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a fun and friendly working environment</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership motivates staff towards a common goal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management are open to new ideas from all levels of staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff’s attitudes are closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff across all departments understand their roles and work together to attain the organization’s vision</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff are motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff at lower levels are able to approach the management with new ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a culture of taking risks</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management relates well with lower levels in the organization</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership encourages the staff’s personal growth</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization employs leadership that aids and takes into account personal growth and recognizes human dynamics</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows the organization’s management are open to new ideas from all levels of staff as disagreed to by 49.1%, while 43.6% were neutral, and 7.3% agreed; the results had a mean of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 0.629. The staff’s attitudes are closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives as strongly agreed to by 16.4%, agreed to by 43.6%, and disagreed to by 21.8%, while 18.2% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.45 and a standard deviation of 1.015. Staff across all departments understand their roles and work together to attain the organization’s vision as strongly agreed to by 16.4%, and agreed to by 83.6%; the results had a mean of 1.84 and a standard deviation of 0.373. The staff are motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision as agreed to by 38.2%, 23.6% were neutral, 23.6% disagreed, and 14.5% strongly disagreed; the results had a mean of 3.15 and a standard deviation of 1.096. Staff at lower levels are not able to approach the management with new ideas as disagreed to by 41.8%, strongly disagreed to by 14.5%, while 20% were neutral, and 23.6% agreed; the results had a mean of 3.47 and a standard deviation of 1.016.

The organization has a culture of taking risks as strongly agreed to by 56.4%, and agreed to by 7.3%, 20% were neutral, and 16.4% disagreed; the results had a mean of 1.96 and a standard deviation of 1.201. The organization’s management did not relate well with lower levels in the organization as disagreed to by 32.7%, while 36.4% were neutral, 25.5% agreed, and 5.5% strongly agreed; the results had a mean of 2.96 and a standard deviation of 0.902. The organization’s leadership encourages the staff’s personal growth as strongly agreed to by 3.6%, agreed to by 67.3%, and 29.1% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.25 and a standard deviation of 0.517. The organization employs leadership that aids and takes into account personal growth and recognizes human dynamics as strongly agreed to by 1.8%, agreed to by 41.8%, 52.7% were neutral, and 1.8% equally disagreed and strongly disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.60 and a standard deviation of 0.655.

4.5.4 Correlations for Organizational Culture Factors
A Pearson correlation test was carried out for organizational culture factors, and the results were as shown in Table 4.10. The threshold for significant factors was a p value of <0.05, thus all factors whose p values were >0.05 were considered insignificant.
Table 4.10 Correlations for Organizational Culture Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a mission statement and a vision</td>
<td>-.404**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization sticks to its mission, vision and values all the time</td>
<td>-.320*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a fun and friendly working environment</td>
<td>-.830**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership motivates staff towards a common goal</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management are open to new ideas from all levels of staff</td>
<td>-.378**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff’s attitudes are closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives</td>
<td>.459**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff across all departments understand their roles and work together to attain the organization’s vision</td>
<td>.404**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff are motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision</td>
<td>.550**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff at lower levels are able to approach the management with new ideas</td>
<td>-.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a culture of taking risks</td>
<td>-.616**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management relates well with lower levels in the organization</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership encourages the staff’s personal growth</td>
<td>-.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization employs leadership that aids and takes into account personal growth and recognizes human dynamics</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 4.10 shows that the organization having a mission statement and a vision was inversely significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.404$, $p<0.05$). The organization sticking to its mission, vision and values all the time was inversely significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.320$, $p<0.05$). The organization having a fun and friendly working environment was inversely significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.830$, $p<0.05$). The organization’s leadership motivating staff towards a common goal was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.078$, $p>0.05$).

The organization’s management being open to new ideas from all levels of staff was inversely significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.378$, $p<0.05$). The staff’s attitudes being closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives was significant to strategy implementation ($r=0.459$, $p<0.05$). Staff across all departments understanding their roles and working together to attain the organization’s vision was significant to strategy implementation ($r=0.404$, $p<0.05$). Staff being motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision was significant to strategy implementation ($r=0.550$, $p<0.05$). Staff at lower levels being able to approach the management with new ideas was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.175$, $p>0.05$).

The organization having a culture of taking risks was inversely significant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.616$, $p<0.05$). The organization’s management relating well with lower levels in the organization was insignificant to strategy implementation ($r=0.241$, $p>0.05$). The organization’s leadership encouraging the staff’s personal growth was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation ($r=-0.240$, $p>0.05$). The organization employing leadership that aids and takes into account personal growth and recognizes human dynamics was insignificant to strategy implementation ($r=0.000$, $p>0.05$).

### 4.5.5 Regression Analysis for Organizational Culture Factors

A regression analysis test was carried out to determine the significance of organizational culture factors on strategy implementation. The organizational culture factors were computed to form three variables (culture and leadership, culture as an organizational asset, and alignment of culture to strategy) that were used for analysis. Table 4.11 shows the regression
model for organizational culture factors and strategy implementation. The adjusted R square value shows that 14.6% of the variance in strategy implementation could be explained by culture and leadership, culture as an organizational asset, and alignment of culture to strategy.

Table 4.11 Model Summary for Organizational Culture Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.27932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant) Culture and Leadership, Culture as an Organizational Asset, and Alignment of Culture to Strategy

4.5.6 Regression Coefficients for Organizational Culture Factors

The computed organizational culture factors (culture and leadership, culture as an organizational asset, and alignment of culture to strategy) were calculated to determine their levels of significance to strategy implementation and the results were as shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12 Regression Coefficients for Organizational Culture Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Leadership</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture as an Organizational Asset</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of Culture to Strategy</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>2.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategic Implementation

The general form of the equation to predict influence of strategy implementation by organizational culture factors was:

\[ Y = 1.129 + 0.012\text{ Culture and Leadership} + 0.051\text{ Culture as an Organizational Asset} + 0.315\text{ Alignment of Culture to Strategy} \]
The equation shows the coefficient for culture and leadership was 0.012, which indicates that, for every increase in culture and leadership, there would be an average increase of 1.2% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The equation shows the coefficient for culture as an organizational asset was 0.051, which means that, for every increase in culture as an organizational asset, there would be an average increase of 5.1% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The equation shows the coefficient for culture alignment to strategy was 0.315, which means that, for every increase in culture alignment to strategy, there would be an average increase of 31.5% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The p value of 0.048 for culture alignment to strategy indicates that, culture alignment to strategy was a significant factor in strategy implementation since it p value was <0.05. The p values of 0.917 for culture and leadership, and 0.508 for culture as an organizational asset, indicate that these two factors were insignificant to strategy implementation since their p values were >0.05.

4.6 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation

4.6.1 Extent of Organizational Structure’s Influence

The respondents were asked to indicate the level to which organizational structure influenced strategy implementation. Figure 4.12 shows that 38.2% stated very great extent, 36.4% stated great extent, 20% were neutral, 3.6% stated little extent, and 1.8% stated not at all. These results show that organizational structure influenced strategy implementation to a very great extent.

![Figure 4.12 Extent of Organizational Structure’s Influence](image)
4.6.2 Manner of Organizational Structure’s Influence

The respondents were asked to indicate how they thought organizational structure influenced strategy implementation. The responses offered were categorized into 6 categories shown in Figure 4.13. The Figure shows 25.5% stated that it offers organization direction, 23.6% stated that it facilitates communication, 18.2% stated that it delegates labour or work, 16.3% stated it facilitates and enhances teamwork and organizational cohesion, 12.7% stated it outlines both management and divisional levels offering organizational hierarchy, and 3.7% stated it facilitates growth.

![Figure 4.13 Manner of Organizational Structure’s Influence](image)

4.6.3 Rating of Organizational Structure and Strategic Management

The respondents were asked to rate organizational structure factors using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The results were as shown in Table 4.13. The mean score of >2.5 shows the factors were significant and the standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the response were almost similar.

Table 4.13 shows that the organization’s structure is bureaucratic as strongly agreed to by 7.3%, agreed to by 61.8%, and 30.9% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.24 and a standard deviation of 0.576. The current organizational structure has clear lines of authority as strongly agreed to by 20%, agreed to by 65.5%, and 14.5% were neutral; the results had a mean of 1.95 and a standard deviation of 0.591.
Table 4.13 Rating of Organizational Structure Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure is bureaucratic</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current organizational structure has clear lines of authority</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current organizational structure enhances the organization’s effectiveness</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure enhances organizational flexibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure encourages employee participation in decision making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure gives clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure aids the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership has selected the right people for key positions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s department managers have authority to make most decisions regarding their departments</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure is rigid and inhibits change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure ensures that each manager has an optimum number of subordinates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure gives members direction during strategy implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the current organizational structure enhances the organization’s effectiveness as strongly agreed to by 16.4%, agreed to by 27.3%, 32.7% were neutral, and 23.6% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.64 and a standard deviation of 1.025. The
organizational structure enhances organizational flexibility as agreed to by 36.4%, while 63.6% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.64 and a standard deviation of 0.485.

The organizational structure did not encourage employee participation in decision making as disagreed to by 45.5%, strongly disagreed to by 18.2%, 16.4% were neutral, and 20% agreed; the results had a mean of 3.62 and a standard deviation of 1.009. The organizational structure gives clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation as strongly agreed to by 16.4%, agreed to by 43.6%, 21.8% were neutral, and 18.2% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.42 and a standard deviation of 0.975. The organization’s structure aids the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation as agreed to by 36.4%, 30.9% were neutral, 14.5% disagreed, and 18.2% strongly disagreed; the results had a mean of 3.15 and a standard deviation of 1.113. The organization’s leadership has selected the right people for key positions as agreed to by 50.9%, 34.5% were neutral, and 14.5% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.64 and a standard deviation of 0.729.

The organization’s department managers have authority to make most decisions regarding their departments as strongly agreed to by 14.5%, and agreed to by 85.5%; the results had a mean of 1.85 and a standard deviation of 0.356. The organization’s structure is rigid and inhibits change as agreed to by 40%, while 60% were neutral; the results had a mean of 2.60 and a standard deviation of 0.494. The organization’s structure ensures that each manager has an optimum number of subordinates as agreed to by 23.6%, while 54.5% were neutral; the results had a mean of 3.20 and a standard deviation of 1.043. The organizational structure gives members direction during strategy implementation as agreed to by 69.1%, while 16.4% were neutral, and 14.5% disagreed; the results had a mean of 2.45 and a standard deviation of 0.741.

4.6.4 Correlations for Organizational Structure Factors
A Pearson correlation test was carried out for organizational structure factors, and the results were as shown in Table 4.14. The threshold for significant factors was a p value of <0.05, thus all factors whose p values were >0.05 were considered insignificant.
Table 4.14 Correlations for Organizational Structure Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure is bureaucratic</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current organizational structure has clear lines of authority</td>
<td>-0.291*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current organizational structure enhances the organization’s effectiveness</td>
<td>0.610**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure enhances organizational flexibility</td>
<td>0.485**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure encourages employee participation in decision making</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure gives clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure aids the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership has selected the right people for key positions</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s department managers have authority to make most decisions regarding their departments</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure is rigid and inhibits change</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure ensures that each manager has an optimum number of subordinates</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure gives members direction during strategy implementation</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 4.14 shows that the organization’s structure being bureaucratic was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation (r=-0.193, p>0.05). The current organizational
structure having clear lines of authority was inversely significant to strategy implementation (r= \(-0.291\), p<0.05). The current organizational structure enhancing the organization’s effectiveness was significant to strategy implementation (r= \(0.610\), p<0.05). The organizational structure enhancing organizational flexibility was significant to strategy implementation (r= \(0.485\), p<0.05).

The organizational structure encouraging employee participation in decision making was insignificant to strategy implementation (r= \(0.234\), p>0.05). The organizational structure giving clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation was significant to strategy implementation (r= \(0.274\), p<0.05). The organization’s structure aiding the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation was insignificant to strategy implementation (r= \(0.202\), p<0.05). The organization’s leadership selecting the right people for key positions was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation (r= \(-0.184\), p>0.05).

The organization’s department managers having authority to make most decisions regarding their departments was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation (r= \(-0.140\), p>0.05). The organization’s structure being rigid and inhibiting change was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation (r= \(-0.189\), p>0.05). The organization’s structure ensuring that each manager has an optimum number of subordinates was insignificant to strategy implementation (r= \(0.101\), p>0.05). The organizational structure giving members direction during strategy implementation was inversely insignificant to strategy implementation (r= \(-0.141\), p>0.05).

4.6.5 Regression Analysis for Organizational Structure Factors

A regression analysis test was carried out to determine the significance of organizational structure factors on strategy implementation. The organizational structure factors were computed to form three variables (formalization, centralization and decentralization, and span of control) that were used for analysis. Table 4.15 shows the regression model for organizational structure factors and strategy implementation. The adjusted R square value
shows that 26.6% of the variance in strategy implementation could be explained by formalization, centralization and decentralization, and span of control.

### Table 4.15 Model Summary for Organizational Structure Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.25898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant) Formalization, Centralization and Decentralization, and Span of Control

### 4.6.6 Regression Coefficients for Organizational Structure Factors

The computed organizational structure factors (formalization, centralization and decentralization, and span of control) were calculated to determine their levels of significance to strategy implementation and the results were as shown in Table 4.16.

### Table 4.16 Regression Coefficients for Organizational Structure Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization and Decentralization</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of Control</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>3.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Strategic Implementation

The general form of the equation to predict influence of strategy implementation by organizational structure factors was:

\[ Y = 1.145 + 0.023 \text{ Formalization} - 0.114 \text{ Centralization and Decentralization} + 0.476 \text{ Span of Control} \]
The equation shows the coefficient for formalization was 0.023, which indicates that, for every increase in formalization, there would be an average increase of 2.3% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The equation shows the coefficient for centralization and decentralization was -0.114, which means that, for every increase in centralization and decentralization, there would be an average decrease of 11.4% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant (this would be explained by the inverse relationship between the variables). The equation shows the coefficient for span of control was 0.476, which means that, for every increase in span of control, there would be an average increase of 47.6% in strategy implementation if all factors were held constant. The p values of 0.011 for centralization and decentralization, and 0.001 for span of control were significant factors in strategy implementation since the p values were <0.05. The p value of 0872 for formalization indicates that the factor was insignificant to strategy implementation since its p value was >0.05.

4.7 Chapter Summary
This chapter presents the results and findings of the study using tables and figures. Statistical analysis (percentages, means and standard deviations) have been used to indicate the frequencies of the responses and identify the degree of similarity between responses. Correlations have been used to examine significant factors between the study variables, and inferential statistics has been used to show the existing relationship between the independent factors and the dependent factor. The next chapter presents the discussions, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter concludes the study by providing summary of findings, study discussions, the study conclusions, and the study recommendations by providing recommendations for improvement, and recommendations for further studies.

5.2 Summary of Findings
This study sought to identify the factors that affect strategy implementation in the geospatial industry in Kenya with a key focus on Ramani Geosystems Group. The specific objectives that guided the study were: to determine the nature and scope of strategic management and strategy implementation; to determine the effect of organizational communication on strategy implementation; to determine the effect of organization culture on strategy implementation; and to determine the effect of organization structure on strategy implementation.

The study employed a descriptive research design. The target population of this study composed of the directors, managers and regular employees working in Ramani Geosystems Group in Nairobi who were 82 in total. The sampling frame of this study was the list of all employees, and was sourced from Human Resource department. The study employed stratified random sampling to ensure all parts of the population were represented and to reduce the error in estimation. The Yamane formula was used to determine the sample size which was 75 employees. The study used primary data that was collected using questionnaires. Completed questionnaires were edited to ensure consistency and completeness. Data was coded into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics analyzed the mean, standard deviation, and distribution among certain parameters. Inferential statistics was carried out to determine the influence of organizational communication, organizational culture and organizational culture on strategy implementation. The equation used was $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon$. Results were presented in the form of tables and figures.
The study showed that strategic management in organizations involves a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines its long-term performance, and it includes monitoring and evaluating an organizational external environment in light of its internal environment. Strategic management in the organization provides direction, vision for the future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various levels, and it requires a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links employees’ performance to organizational goals. The study revealed that, Ramani Geosystems Group had mobilized and motivated its employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action, as well as stimulated them to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives. The study reveals that the organization had failed in terms of motivating strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process.

The study showed that there was clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff, and the communication practices of the organization were a hindrance to strategy implementation. The organization’s leadership did not encourage feedback from the staff, and communication in the organization was top-to-bottom. Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure were not communicated clearly, since organization’s leadership did not seek the opinions of its staff during strategy implementation. The study also showed that, the organization’s management did not communicate with subordinates regularly on strategy matters, even though the communication was geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal.

The study revealed that, the organization had a mission statement and a vision which it stuck to and followed, however, the organization’s management was not open to new ideas from all levels of staff. The company’s staff attitudes were closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives, and they understood their roles, and also worked together to attain the organization’s vision. The study showed that, staff in the organization were motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision, however, they were not able to approach the management with new ideas.
The study showed that, the organization’s structure was bureaucratic, and it had clear lines of authority. The organizational structure enhanced the organization’s effectiveness and flexibility, but it did not encourage employee participation in decision making. The organizational structure gave clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation, and it did aid the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation from top-to-bottom. The organization’s leadership had selected qualified employees in key positions, and managers had the authority to make most decisions regarding their departments. However, the organization’s structure was rigid and inhibited change, and the organization’s management did not relate well with staff members from the lower levels of management.

5.3 Discussions

5.3.1 Nature and Scope of Strategic Management

Strategic management in Ramani Geosystems Group involves a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines its long – run performance. These results are in agreement with Hill, Jones and Schilling’s (2013) definition of strategic management is a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines the long – run performance of a corporation.

Ramani Geosystems Group monitors and evaluates its external environment in light of internal environment while implementing its strategies. These results are in tandem with Kaufmann and Feeney (2012) who state that, the study of strategic management emphasizes the monitoring and evaluating of external opportunities and threats in light of a corporation’s strengths and weaknesses in order to generate and implement a new strategic direction for an organization.

Strategic management in Ramani Geosystems Group provides direction, vision for the future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various levels. These results are similar to Li, Guohui and Eppler (2008) who state that, strategic management provides a strategic direction endorsed by the team and stakeholders, a clear business strategy and vision for the future, a mechanism for accountability, a framework for governance at the various levels, a coherent framework for managing risk for ensuring business continuity.
Ramani Geosystems Group has a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links its employees’ performance. These results are similar to Li, Guohui and Eppler (2008) who state that, strategy implementation includes developing a strategy-supportive culture, creating an effective organizational structure, redirecting marketing efforts, preparing budgets, developing and utilizing information systems, and linking employee compensation to organizational performance.

Ramani Geosystems Group has mobilized and motivated employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action. These results are in tandem with Galan and Sanchez-Bueno (2009) who states that, strategy implementation mobilizes employees to translate formulated strategies into concrete actions.

Ramani Geosystems Group stimulates its managers and employees to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives. These results differ with Johnson and Scholes’ (2002) findings which found that, the challenge of implementation is to simulate managers and employees throughout an organization to work pride and enthusiasm toward achieves stated objectives.

Ramani Geosystems Group did not motivate strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process. These results differ with Li, Guohui and Eppler (2008) findings which found that, through involvement in the process, managers and employees become committed to supporting the organization.

Ramani Geosystems Group ensures that managers and employees understand what it is doing and why, leading to their commitment. These results are in agreement with Kaufmann and Feeney (2012) who state that, when managers and employees understand what the organization is doing and why, they often feel that they are a part of the firm and become committed to assisting.

Ramani Geosystems Group uses strategic management as an opportunity to empower its managers and employees. These results are in agreement with Markiewicz (2011) who states
that, a great benefit of strategic management, then, is the opportunity that the process provides to empower individuals.

Ramani Geosystems Group recognizes that strategic planning involves lower-level managers and employees. These results are in tandem with Kaufmann and Feeney (2012) who states that, more and more organizations are decentralizing the strategic management process, recognizing that planning must involve lower-level managers and employees. Markiewicz (2011) also states that, the notion of centralized staff planning is being replaced in organizations by decentralized line-manager planning.

5.3.2 Internal Communication and Strategic Management

There is clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff at Ramani Geosystems Group. These results are in tandem with Kaplan and Norton (2001) who stated that, creation of strategic awareness throughout the organization is critical because employees must learn about and understand the strategy before they implement it.

Ramani Geosystems Group’s communication practices did not enable total understanding of strategy implementation. These results differ with Pearce and Robinson (2007) who state that, the communication program adopted by the organization should develop understanding about the strategy, acquire buy-in to develop the strategy, educate the organization on implementation and provide feedback about the strategy.

Ramani Geosystems Group’s leadership did not encourage feedback from the staff. These results differ with Beer and Eisenstat (2000) who note that, while most organizations view communication as coming from the top down, research has shown that effective communication should be open and honest, and should allow for feedback to come from the subordinates to the organization’s leadership.

Communication at Ramani Geosystems Group comes from the top of the organizational structure to the lower levels, and not from the bottom to the top. These results differ with Lauring (2011) who states that, organizational communication should be emphasized at
interpersonal, intergroup or organizational level. Heterogeneous groups of employees and stakeholders is a reality in this era of globalization, therefore intercultural communication has to be taken into account.

Feedback from staff at Ramani Geosystems Group is not used in making decisions at the higher levels of the organization. These results differ with Beer and Eisenstat (2000) who state that, employees charged with implementation should be able to tell the management about problems in the implementation of strategy. Without this early warning system, the management will only find out about problems after the implementation process has failed, at which point resources have been needlessly directed to the process.

Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure at Ramani Geosystems Group have been communicated clearly. These results are in agreement with Elving and van Vuuren (2008) who states that, effective communication is necessary to facilitate change because it penetrates every level of the organization irrespective of the circumstances.

The organization’s leadership of Ramani Geosystems Group did not seek opinions from staff on strategy implementation. These results differ with Tampoe and Macmillan (2000) who stated that, the use of corporate communication should be used to establish dialogue with constituencies in order to gain a better understanding of interests they deem important is very important.

The organization’s management at Ramani Geosystems Group did not communicate with subordinates regularly on strategy matters. These results differ with Bourne and Neely (2003) who state that, to facilitate effective implementation, a strategy should be communicated in such a way that it is clear not just to those formulating the strategy, but to the majority of employees charged with executing the strategy.

The organization’s communication at Ramani Geosystems Group is geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal. These results are in agreement with Steyn (2004)
who states that, communication should be geared towards sending continual messages to the employees about the company and the strategic direction it is taking.

Strategy to be implemented at Ramani Geosystems Group has been broken down into individual actions that when achieved produce success. These results are in agreement with Kotter (2007) who states that, effective communication should comprehensively explain any new duties, responsibilities and obligations in the strategy implementation process to everyone in the organization.

5.3.3 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation
Ramani Geosystems Group has a mission statement and a vision staff. These results are in agreement with Upadhyay, Upadhyay and Palo (2013) who states that, no matter how good the strategy is, its success in implementation depends on how well it is understood by the people at all levels of the organization and their competence to implement it.

Ramani Geosystems Group sticks to its mission, vision and values staff all the time. These results are in agreement with Corboy and Corrbui (1999) who states that, if the strategy formulators, that are the senior executives, are not fully committed to the strategy and step out of the picture when implementation begins, subordinate staff’s commitment and enthusiasm for the strategy will wane.

Ramani Geosystems Group has a fun and friendly working environment staff. These results are in tandem with Kaplan and Norton (2001) who states that, leaders must create a climate for change, provide the vision for what change could accomplish, win the hearts and minds of everyone in the organization and let staff find innovative ways to accomplish the strategic mission.

The leadership at Ramani Geosystems Group motivates staff towards a common goal. These results are in agreement with Clutterbuck (2002) who states that, the organization’s future depends on its ability to unite employees behind an effective leader or leadership team by communicating its goals effectively.
The organization’s management at Ramani Geosystems Group are not open to new ideas from all levels of staff. These results differ with Beer and Eisenstat (2010) who states that, effective leadership should give direction but also receive feedback from the staff lower in the hierarchy. Kaplan and Norton (2001) asserted that the success of strategy depends less on structural issues and more on the leadership from the senior executives.

The staff’s attitudes at Ramani Geosystems Group are closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives. These results are in agreement with Kaplan and Norton (2004) who state that, the organization’s intangible assets must be aligned with strategy in order to create value, and value occurs in the context of strategy.

Staff across all departments at Ramani Geosystems Group understand their roles and work together to attain the organization’s vision. These results are in agreement with Alagaraja and Shuck (2015) who state that, alignment highlights the importance of recognizing the existing fit between goals and objectives with individuals, work teams, departments and the whole organization.

The staff at Ramani Geosystems Group are motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision. These results are in agreement with Meier et al. (2010) who states that, the better the fit that an organization achieves with external circumstances, the more likely it is both to effectively target products and services and to win financial and political support, and thereby improve its performance.

Staff at lower levels in Ramani Geosystems Group are not able to approach the management with new ideas. These results differ with Chorn (1991) who states that, aignment is optimized when there is a strategic fit between the prevailing competitive situation, business strategy, and organization culture and leadership style.

Ramani Geosystems Group has a culture of taking risks. These results are in tandem with Griffin et al. (2012) who postulates that, culture influences managerial risk-taking directly
through its effect on individual decision-making and indirectly through its effect on an organization’s managerial practices.

The organization’s management at Ramani Geosystems Group did not relate well with lower levels in the organization. These results are in tandem with Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales (2015) who states that, when employees perceive managers as trustworthy and ethical, they are likely to act the same way. Giles (2015) notes that, the most effective way to make the proclaimed values influence action in the organization is to ensure that the actions and decision-making of the leadership are in accordance with the stated values, and that they are foremost in the employees’ minds by displaying them prominently and repeating the message.

Leadership at Ramani Geosystems Group encourages the staff’s personal growth and takes into account personal growth, and recognizes human dynamics. These results are in agreement with Upadhyay, Upadhyay and Palo (2013) who state that, although organizations take several measures including training and motivating employees by way of incentives, there is not a lot of evidence of concrete steps taken by the organizations in building the value base of their employees and leaders in the context of strategy implementation.

5.3.4 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation

The organization’s structure at Ramani Geosystems Group is bureaucratic. These results are in agreement with Kaufmann and Feeney (2012) who states that, formalization is popularly derided as bureaucratic red tape and is viewed as an obstacle to overcome.

The current organizational structure at Ramani Geosystems Group has clear lines of authority. These results are in agreement with Carl and Kaplan (1998) who state that, formalization is the degree to which an organization standardizes behavior through rules, procedures, training and related mechanism.

The current organizational structure at Ramani Geosystems Group enhances the organization’s effectiveness. These results are in agreement with Carl and Kaplan (1998)
who state that, rules and procedures are used to define appropriate behavior, solve minor problems and organization of activities to benefit the staff and the organization. In highly formalized firms, there are defined procedures that cover work processes, clear job descriptions and many organizational rules.

The organizational structure at Ramani Geosystems Group enhances organizational flexibility. These results differ with Hempel et al. (2012) who state that, highly formalized firms with too many rules and procedures have reduced flexibility, which means situations are responded to by employing standardized procedures even when the procedures need to be varied to suit the situation. This leads to stress, work dissatisfaction, demotivation and a decline in efficiency.

The organizational structure at Ramani Geosystems Group did not encourage employee participation in decision making. These results are in agreement with Love, Priem and Lumpkin (2002) who state that, in more centralized organizations, the zone of individuals’ discretion in decision-making narrows rapidly as one progresses from organization members at the highest level downward toward members at operative levels. Those members closest to the pinnacle of centralized organizations make most decisions, while lower-level members have relatively little say over either business issues or operational procedures.

The organizational structure at Ramani Geosystems Group gives clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation. These results are in agreement with Kreitner (2009) who states that a wide span of control mean less administrative expenses and more self-management, and enhanced efficiency and performance.

The organization’s structure at Ramani Geosystems Group aids the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation. These results differ with Theobald and Nicholson-Crotty (2005) who state that, large manager-employee ratios impede managers’ ability to communicate, coordinate, and supervise; this causes inadequate supervision and loss of control.
The organization’s leadership at Ramani Geosystems Group has selected the right people for key positions. These results are in agreement with Johnson and Scholes (2002) who states that, a wider span of control is possible and effective when employees perform routine tasks since there is less need for direct intervention from supervisors.

The organization’s department managers at Ramani Geosystems Group have authority to make most decisions regarding their departments. These results are in agreement with Worall, Cooper and Campbell (2000) who state that, managers typically have wider spans of control both in terms of the number of workers reporting to them and in the variety of tasks they have to manage.

The organization’s structure at Ramani Geosystems Group is rigid and inhibits change. These results are in agreement with Worall, Cooper and Campbell (2000) who state that, wider span of control reduces the layers in their hierarchy, some experts warn that there are also negative long-term consequences of cutting out too much of the middle management. These are increased stress and workload for surviving managers, undermining managerial functions and restricting managerial career development.

The organization’s structure at Ramani Geosystems Group ensures that each manager has an optimum number of subordinates. These results are in agreement with Littler and Innes (2004) who state that, redundancy or downsizing, on the other hand, means a general reduction in the workforce. If downsizing occurs for a targeted level of management, this causes delayering.

The organizational structure at Ramani Geosystems Group gives members direction during strategy implementation. These results are in agreement with Tucker, Meyer and Westerman (1996) who state that, many organizations have been experimenting with organizational structures that facilitate empowered cross-functional communication, with the main aim of this trend being to become more efficient and competitive by reducing barriers to communication and to enable better performance on strategic goals.
5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Nature and Scope of Strategic Management
The study concludes that, strategic management in organizations involves a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines its long-term performance, and it includes monitoring and evaluating an organizational external environment in light of its internal environment. Strategic management in the organization provides direction, vision for the future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various levels, and it requires a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links employees’ performance to organizational goals. From the study, it can be concluded that, Ramani Geosystems Group had mobilized and motivated its employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action, as well as stimulated them to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives. The study concludes that, the organization has failed in terms of motivating strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process.

5.4.2 Internal Communication and Strategic Management
The study concludes that, there was clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among all staff, and the communication practices of the organization were a hindrance to strategy implementation. The organization’s leadership did not encourage feedback from the staff, and communication in the organization was top-to-bottom. Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure were not communicated clearly, since organization’s leadership did not seek the opinions of its staff during strategy implementation. It can be concluded that, the organization’s management did not communicate with subordinates regularly on strategy matters, even though the communication was geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal.

5.4.3 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation
The study concludes that, the organization had a mission statement and a vision which it stuck to and followed, however, the organization’s management was not open to new ideas from all levels of staff. The company’s staff attitudes were closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives, and they understood their roles, and also worked
together to attain the organization’s vision. It can be concluded that, staff in the organization were motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision, however, they were not able to approach the management with new ideas.

5.4.4 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation

The study concludes that, the organization’s structure was bureaucratic, and it had clear lines of authority. The organizational structure enhanced the organization’s effectiveness and flexibility, but it did not encourage employee participation in decision making. The organizational structure gave clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation, and it did aid the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation from top-to-bottom. The organization’s leadership had selected qualified employees in key positions, and managers had the authority to make most decisions regarding their departments. However, the organization’s structure was rigid and inhibited change, and the organization’s management did not relate well with staff members from the lower levels of management.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Nature and Scope of Strategic Management

The study revealed that organization did not motivate strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process, and thus it recommends the organization to ensure that part of its strategy management plan be driven towards employee inclusion in decision-making so that they too can own the strategy and be motivated to carry out the implementing phase of the strategies.

5.5.1.2 Internal Communication and Strategic Management

The study revealed that the organization’s leadership did not encourage feedback from the staff nor did it communicate with subordinates regularly on strategy matters. This study therefore recommends the organization to improve its communication with employees in terms of strategic plans and decisions, so that the entire organization (management and employees) can work towards a common goal.
5.5.1.3 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation
The study revealed that the organization’s management was not open to new ideas from all levels of staff, this impedes the input of its employees who are at the implementation level. The study recommends the organization to create a feedback system from the employees so that it may have a better foundation in adjusting its implementation plans that will results in lower costs of implementation, as a result of proper resource allocation. The study also showed that employees at the lower levels were not able to approach the management with new ideas. This robs the organization the ability to enjoy innovation and creativity from its members. The study recommends the organization to re-examine its culture, in order to enjoy the maximum potential of its employees.

5.5.1.4 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation
The study showed that the organizational structure did not encourage employee participation in decision-making. The study therefore recommends the organization to ensure that part of its strategy management plan be driven towards employee inclusion in decision-making so that they too can own the strategy and be motivated to carry out the implementing phase of the strategies. The study revealed that the organization’s management did not relate well with staff from the lower levels in the organization. This therefore, hinders the ability of the organization to work collaboratively towards a common goal. The study recommends the organization to formulate a structure that will allow all levels of management and staff to pitch-in their ideas and work towards a common goal.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies
This study focused on Ramani Geosystems Group, which comprises of Ramani Geosystems and Ramani Land Services, located in Nairobi, Kenya. The study was focused on identifying the factors that affect strategy implementation in the geospatial industry in Kenya, and the limitations to this study were that it focused on one organization, which means that the results cannot be generalized to apply to the whole industry. Therefore, the study recommends similar studies to be conducted in other geospatial organizations in the country in order to provide a holistic understanding of the geospatial industry in Kenya.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I – COVER LETTER

Hellen Mwaniki,
United States International University – Africa,
P.O. Box 52616,
Nairobi.


Dear Respondent,

My name is Hellen Mwaniki and I am a graduate student pursuing a Masters’ degree in Business Administration (MBA) at the Chandaria School of Business, United States International University - Africa (USIU). As a requirement of my course, I am writing a research thesis whose title is Factors Affecting Strategy Implementation in Geospatial Firms: A Study of Ramani Geosystems Group.

Given your professional placing in the firm of interest, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the questionnaire provided. The questionnaire is divided into four sections that will require approximately 15 minutes of your time. You are humbly requested to answer the questions honestly. Taking part in this process is voluntary and completion and return of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in this study. The information collected in this study will remain confidential. You are therefore requested to exclude any personal information from the questionnaire.

Your participation in this study highly appreciated as it will ensure that I successfully complete my academic endeavors. In appreciation, I will provide the feedback of my research through presentation of my analysis to the firm. For further information with regard to both the questionnaire and the project study, please contact me using the information below.

Yours sincerely,

Hellen Mwaniki
Mobile no: +254 722 965 134
E-mail address: lenwawira@gmail.com
APPENDIX II – QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly complete the following questionnaire using the instructions provided for each set of questions.

Section A – Background Information (Tick Appropriately)

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

2. Kindly indicate your age group
   Below 25 years [   ]
   Between 25 and 35 years [   ]
   Between 36 and 45 years [   ]
   Above 45 years [   ]

3. Kindly indicate your level of education
   Secondary Certificate [   ]
   Diploma [   ]
   Undergraduate Degree [   ]
   Postgraduate Degree [   ]

4. How long have you worked in the organization?
   Below 1 year [   ]
   1-3 years [   ]
   4-6 years [   ]
   6-9 years [   ]
   10 years and above [   ]
Section B – Nature and Scope of Strategic Management

5. To what extent do you think has the organization implemented its strategies?
   - Not at all [ ]
   - Little extent [ ]
   - Moderate extent [ ]
   - Great extent [ ]
   - To a very great extent [ ]

6. In your opinion, in what do you think influences strategy implementation in the organization?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
7. What is your level of agreement with the following statements regarding nature and scope of strategic management in the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management in the organization involves a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines its long-run performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization monitors and evaluates its external environment in light of internal environment while implementing its strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management in the organization provides direction, vision for the future, accountability mechanism, and governance framework at the various levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a strategy-supportive culture, and structure that links its employees’ performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has mobilized and motivated employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization stimulates its managers and employees to work with pride and enthusiasm toward achieving its goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization motivates strategy implementation through employee involvement in the decision-making process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization ensures that managers and employees understand what it is doing and why, leading to their commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization uses strategic management as an opportunity to empower its managers and employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization recognizes that strategic planning involves lower-level managers and employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C – Organizational Communication

8. To what extent do you think organizational communication influences strategy implementation?
   - Not at all [ ]
   - Little extent [ ]
   - Moderate extent [ ]
   - Great extent [ ]
   - To a very great extent [ ]

9. In your opinion, in what ways do you think internal communication influences strategy implementation?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………
10. What is your level of agreement with the following statements regarding organizational communication and strategy implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is clarity of the organization’s vision, mission and values among staff at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s communication practices enable total understanding of strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership encourages feedback from the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication comes from the top of the organizational structure to the lower levels, and not from the bottom to the top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from staff is used in making decisions at the higher levels of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in the organization’s strategy and structure have been communicated clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership seeks opinions from staff on strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management communicates with subordinates regularly on strategy matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s communication is geared towards getting the staff to work towards a common goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy to be implemented has been broken down into individual actions that when achieved produce success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D – Organizational Culture

11. To what extent do you think the organization’s culture influences strategy implementation?
   
   Not at all [ ]
   Little extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Great extent [ ]
   To a very great extent [ ]

12. In your opinion, in what ways do you think organizational culture influences strategy implementation?

   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
13. What is your level of agreement with the following statements regarding organizational culture and strategy implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a mission statement and a vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization sticks to its mission, vision and values all the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a fun and friendly working environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership motivates staff towards a common goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management are open to new ideas from all levels of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff’s attitudes are closely aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff across all departments understand their roles and work together to attain the organization’s vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff are motivated and enthusiastic about achieving the organization’s vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff at lower levels are able to approach the management with new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a culture of taking risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s management relates well with lower levels in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership encourages the staff’s personal growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization employs leadership that aids and takes into account personal growth and recognizes human dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E – Organizational Structure

14. To what extent do you think the organization’s structure influences strategy implementation?
   - Not at all [ ]
   - Little extent [ ]
   - Moderate extent [ ]
   - Great extent [ ]
   - To a very great extent [ ]

15. In your opinion, in what ways do you think the organization’s structure influences strategy implementation?
   ........................................................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................................................
16. What is your level of agreement with the following statements regarding organizational structure and strategy implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure is bureaucratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current organizational structure has clear lines of authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current organizational structure enhances the organization’s effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure enhances organizational flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure encourages employee participation in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure gives clear procedures, responsibilities and guidelines to staff in strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure aids the free flow of information crucial to strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s leadership has selected the right people for key positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s department managers have authority to make most decisions regarding their departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure is rigid and inhibits change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s structure ensures that each manager has an optimum number of subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure gives members direction during strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU