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ABSTRACT
The general objective of this study was to determine the factors affecting strategy implementation in service oriented organizations illustrated by a case study of G4S Kenya Limited. The study was guided by the following research questions: How does leadership styles affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited? How does organizational culture affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited? And how does organizational structure affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?

The study population comprised of eight (8) top management staff, sixty two (62) middle management staff and four hundred and twenty eight (428) lower level management staff. A stratified random sampling technique was used to draw a sample of 150 respondents form the population. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. Frequency distributions, percentages and means were used in descriptive statistical analysis while correlation was used for inferential statistical analysis. Regression was used to test the different hypotheses. The statistical program for social sciences (SPSS) was used as a tool for statistical analysis.

The findings of the study on leadership styles and strategy implementation revealed that most respondents (85.4%) believe leadership style has a significant impact on strategy implementation in G4S Kenya Limited. The findings of the study on organizational culture and strategy implementation showed that most respondents (82.6%) agree that organizational culture has a great impact on strategy implementation in G4S Kenya Limited. The findings of the study on organizational structure and strategy implementation revealed that majority of the respondents (81.6%) agreed that organizational structure has an impact on strategy implementation.

The findings from this study showed that leadership style, organizational culture and organizational structure had a great impact on strategy implementation. Therefore there is need for G4S Kenya Limited to put emphasis on these factors during formulation of strategy and most importantly during strategy implementation.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Although formulating a consistent strategy is a difficult task for any management team, making that strategy work – implementing it throughout the organization – is even more difficult (Hrebiniak, 2006). A myriad of factors can potentially affect the process by which strategic plans are turned into organizational action. Unlike strategy formulation, strategy implementation is often seen as something of a craft, rather than a science and its research history has previously been described as fragmented and eclectic (Noble 1999). It is thus not surprising that, after a comprehensive strategy or single strategic decision has been formulated, significant difficulties usually arise during the subsequent implementation process.

The best formulated strategies may fail to produce superior performance for the firm if they are not successfully implemented, as Tincher (2009) notes. According to Alfred (2014) strategy implementation has become the most significant management challenge which all kinds of corporations face at the moment. It is thus obvious that strategy implementation is a key challenge for today’s organizations.

While many people believe that formulating an innovative and unique strategy is critical and by itself sufficient to lead a firm to success in today’s business world, ensuring that such a strategy works is equally as important (Leting, 2009). According to Thompson, Strickland and Gamble (2007), executives should pay careful attention to the implementation of strategies to avoid common pitfalls that result in failure. A number of approaches that greatly enhance the effectiveness of strategy implementation can be employed. Indeed, good strategic management is a function of people actively considering strategy as they make day-to-day decisions in an ever-changing world.

The strategy literature claims that between 50% and 80% of strategy implementation efforts fail (Li & Martin, 2008). Strategy execution is commonly the most complicated and time-consuming part of strategic management, while strategy formulation is primarily an intellectual and creative act involving analysis and synthesis. Thus, it is important to study the properties of successful strategy implementation. According to Cater and Pucko (2010), the implementation of strategies was a key driver of the emergence of strategic management.
in late 20th century. Brenes, Mena and Molina (2008) investigated whether organizations are looking for great strategy or great strategy implementation by analyzing Asian firms that have competed successfully by focusing on the implementation of not so distinctive strategies instead of attempting to develop unique strategies. By comparing US and Japanese semiconductor industries, they found that the frequent repositioning of American firms had a greater impact on other American companies and a lesser impact on Japanese firms that are busy implementing their long-term product line and market segment strategies.

According to Zaribaf and Bayrami (2010), the majority of large organizations had problems with strategy implementation. The literature supports the view that unlike strategy formulation, strategy implementation cannot be achieved by top management alone; it requires the collaboration of everyone inside the organization and, on many occasions, parties outside the organization. While formulating a strategy is normally a top-down endeavour, implementing it requires simultaneous top-down, bottom-up, and across efforts. Strategy implementation is a connecting loop between formulation and control. Herbiniak (2007) argued that while strategy formulation is difficult, making strategy work and executing it is even more difficult. Similarly, Cater and Pucko (2010) concluded that while 80% of firms have the right strategies, only 14% have managed to implement them well.

To determine the relationship between strategy formulation and implementation, Wambui (2012) investigated when it is best for organizations to think about strategy implementation: at the time of strategy formulation or afterward. Another question of even more importance to an organization is whether it is more difficult to formulate strategy than to implement it. In other words, should executives and organizations formulate innovative and perhaps unique strategy that can offer a competitive advantage and then attempt to implement it or identify the organization’s capability first and then formulate a workable and practical strategy? For example, a well-formulated strategy is meaningless if it is not implemented well. However, too much consideration of various aspects of implementation might result in formulating a strategy that is not competitive and, therefore, implementing it would be a waste of time and resources.

Echoing previous studies with similar results, Zaribaf and Bayrami (2010) found that most executives in organizations spend a great deal of time, energy, and money in formulating a
strategy, but do not provide sufficient input to implement it properly. Normally, companies change their strategy to reposition themselves and adapt or react to market opportunities and threats; when considering how to implement a strategy, most probably will constrain any creativity in the new strategy. Therefore, one must strike a balance between an innovative and workable strategy and its successful implementation.

Several studies Ashkenas & Francis, 2000; Beer & Nohria, 2000; Cater & Pucko, (2010) have emphasized the importance of formulating and implementing a strategy, with higher importance given to strategy formulation due to its criticality to the existence and expansion of the organization. However, implementing a strategy is much more difficult than formulating it. The former requires leadership skills, precision planning, and organizing of resources and activities as well as ensuring people’s commitment to the new strategy, while the latter requires creativity and understanding the business and assessing the market opportunities and the firm’s strengths. Mintzberg (2004) suggests that while strategy formulation is usually a function of top management, its implementation is the responsibility of middle and lower level managers. However, the role of top management is vital in preparing a workable strategy and communicating it clearly so that middle managers can more easily implement it. In other words, a successful implementation journey starts in the formulation stage and a failure to find that link between strategy formulation and strategy implementation is a step toward strategy failure.

Strategy formulation is basically entrepreneurial in nature and requires a great deal of analysis, judgment, and innovation. However, implementation requires administrative and managerial talent and an ability to foresee obstacles that might arise in strategy implementation.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The success or failures of strategy implementation revolve around the nature of strategy itself, resource allocation, the fit between strategy and structure, leadership and organization culture. 90% of well formulated strategies fail at Implementation stage Mintzberg (2011). Although formulating consistent strategies seems a difficult task for any management team, making that strategy work through effective implementation is even more difficult Hrebinjak, (2006). According to Mintzberg (2014), effective implementation of strategy results when organization, resources and actions are tied to strategic priorities
and when key success factors are identified and performance measures and reporting are aligned

The major challenge being faced is the implementation of strategies laid down by the top level management in all organizations. There are several obstacles to the implementation of the strategies of a given management with the main one being the communication of the strategic plan to the entire company. Communication of the strategic plan is crucial to the understanding and implementation of the strategic plan. Without the right communication, the entire strategy implementation will be wrongly interpreted and consequently wrongly implemented which leads to lack of achievement of the set objectives (Pearce & Robinson, 2010).

Several researches have been carried out on different aspects of strategy implementation in both the private and public service firms in Kenya. The scholars include Koskei (2003); Nabwire (2014); Ndiso (2015) among others. Fewer researchers like Kemboi (2013) focussed on strategic plan implementation in state corporations. However, there is no empirical evidence that has been conducted on the factors affecting strategy implementation in any private security firm in Kenya. This study will therefore seek to highlight the factors that affect strategy implementation in service oriented firms with specific emphasis on G4S Kenya Limited.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to examine the factors which affect the strategy implementation in service oriented organizations – a case study of G4S Kenya Limited.

1.4 Research Questions
The study was guided by the following research questions;
1.4.1 How does leadership styles affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?
1.4.2 How does organizational culture affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?
1.4.3 How does organizational structure affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?
1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 The Management of G4S Kenya Limited
This study is significant to the management of G4S Kenya Limited in developing effective strategic plan and implementation process that enable the company survive and succeed in the long term while meeting stakeholder expectations.

1.5.2 The Security Industry
This research can be reference for other security companies seeking to develop effective strategic plan and its effective implementation.

1.5.3 Other Practitioners
This research can be a good reference point for other researchers who may want explore the strategy implementation from other perspectives. Upcoming and existing researchers will benefit from this research as it opens a new era of study.

1.5.4 Policy Makers
On policy development, this research will have value whereby recommendations put across will aid in enhancing policy development in the studied organizations and other organizations that practice strategic management. More specifically, this study will put forth recommendations that will see management teams of organizations take keen interest in cultivating conducive environment for strategy implementation and execution through development of supportive policies.

1.6 Scope of the Study
The strategic implementation process is very wide and dynamic. It is critically important that organization’s daily activities and work efforts directly relate to accomplishing strategic plans. The study sought to examine the effectiveness of strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited with focus on three factors namely; leadership styles, organizational culture, organizational structure. The targeted group was top management, middle level management and lower level management across the entire business of G4S Kenya Limited. The research was conducted in the month of March 2018.
1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1. Strategic Plan
A step by step guide, created by a business or organization, to map out how it will reach goals, and set a foundation so the entire company knows what will happen and what is expected of them (Mintzberg, 2004).

1.7.2 Implementation
Translating strategy into action. Involves organization of the firm's resources (programs, budgets, and procedures) and motivation of the staff to achieve objectives (Mintzberg, 2004).

1.7.3 Organization Culture
Organizational culture refers to the leadership style of managers – how they spend their time, what they focus attention on, what questions they ask of employees, how they make decisions; also the organizational culture (Needle, 2004).

1.7.4. Strategy
The direction and scope of an organization over the long-term, which achieves advantage in a changing environment through its configuration of resources and competences with the aim of fulfilling the vision, goals and stakeholder expectations (Pearce & Robinson, 2010).

1.7.4 Leadership
Leadership is a process that helps create the desired change by being able to provide direction setting, aligning people to vision and mission and by galvanizing, inspiring and motivating the people (Kotter, 1990).

1.8 Chapter Summary
This chapter formed the base of the research project by giving a background to the study and making a case for the problem statement. The study seeks to determine the factors affecting effective implementation of strategic plans in organizations; a case study of G4S Kenya Limited. Chapter two focuses on literature review that provide support for the specific objectives of the study. Chapter three focus on the research methodology for this study while chapter four focuses on results and findings. Chapter five will look at discussions, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews both the theoretical and empirical (past studies) frameworks related to implementation of Strategy. The first section of the study reviews literature on how leadership style affects the implementation of strategy. The second section explores the literature on how organizational culture affects the implementation of strategy and the third section analyse literature on how organizational structure affects the implementation of strategy ending with a chapter summary.

2.2 Leadership Effect on Strategy Implementation

2.2.1. Strategy Formulation, Involvement and Ownership

According to O’Brien (2009), successful strategy implementation starts with a good strategy formulation and if the strategy is not well formulated it is deemed to fail from the start. It is therefore important to involve key employees from different levels of the organization in the formulation process and ensure a good strategy is formulated (Pearce & Robinson, 2010). The involvement process aims at ensuring knowledge and skills from all organizational levels of the organization levels are engaged to achieve the organisation’s ultimate goal. Dessler (2004) postulates that top management is responsible for providing directions through strategy development process taking into consideration available organisational resources and prevailing market conditions. Involvement of key personnel in the process is also known to create ownership and support by all actors which is crucial for the success during the implementation stage (Wilson, 2013).

Takeuchi, Shay and Li (2008) emphasises that staff involvement should be at all levels including the detailed planning process to increase their commitment and understanding of their role in implementing the plan. Determination of strategic decisions and planning should also include a thorough analysis of internal and external risks that the organization may face during implementation. Strategies to address key barriers are developed although it is not realistic to expect that all potential risks will be identified. However, the process will give the organization an opportunity to create contingency plans for the identified risks (Tincher, 2009).
2.2.2. Communication

Wolfgang (2006) pointed out that communication is possible only upon a common language between sender and receiver. Pearce and Robinson (2010) identified communication as an important factor in strategic plans implementation. It is important for the leadership team to develop a comprehensive communication strategy to coordinate key elements of the programme. Companies are known for continuous change of their strategies in response to changing business environment which is always as a result of the organization. Takeuchi et al. (2008) notes that the role of the leadership team is to facilitate effective communication between management and employees and translating strategy into periodic implementation plans.

According to Rudd, Greenly, Beatson and Lings (2008), successful companies are differentiating themselves by means of skills and competencies that lie in their staff hence the role of middle managers in strategy implementation was regarded more a less important than strategy formulation since companies and researchers invested in very little resources in it. Tincher (2009) however noted that the process was overlooked because of the assumption that anyone could implement a properly formulated strategy. It has however been confirmed that most people do not actually understand the process (Powell, 1992).

According to Beer and Eisenstat (2005) poor or ineffective communication from top-down, bottom-up and across functions and divisions could negatively affect the strategy implementation. When information is not flowing effectively from bottom to top, top management may not be aware of problems jeopardizing the implementation and therefore not able to provide timely response. The information flow does not only include people communicating with each other but also information systems through which management is monitoring the implementation efforts. These, are in some cases, also not providing adequate information towards top management (Bryson, 2012).

Communication should be a regular rather than a one-off exercise and should be pursued through various channels that management deem fit to access the employees of an organization. People need to be involved in the strategic plan implementation and hence a continuous message effectively communicated will energize people into fully participating in the firm activities (Aosa, 1992). Managers must select those to be involved in communication of organizational needs to avoid skeptics or spoilers who would otherwise
bend the intended aim as stipulated in the strategic plan. This will involve drawing discussions and debates about the right timing plus the freedom to have open talk on how efficient a plan is being implemented.

Pearce and Robinson (2010) have observed that miscommunication occurs between the point where communication starts and the point where it is received. More so, the interpretation of that communication plays a vital role which requires managers to be enforcing a strong culture that embrace clear understanding of communications from all corners of the organization. This means that managers must be aware of people’s beliefs, attitudes, behaviour, demands and arguments in order to communicate effectively the message of strategic plan implementation to the employees (Burnes, 2004).

According to a study by the Hay Group, a global management consultancy, effective communication by leadership in three critical areas was the key to winning organizational trust and confidence (Lamb & McKee, 2004): it helps employees to understand the company’s overall business strategy, and how they contribute to achieving key business objectives. It also helps in sharing information with employees on both how the company is doing and how an employee’s own division is doing, relative to strategic business objectives.

2.2.3. Resources
Sufficient resources are a crucial factor in strategic plans implementation. Lack of or inadequate resources on the other hand may lead to failure of strategy implementation which in most cases takes more time than expected or planned (Lehner, 2014). Hunger and Wheelen (2005), suggests that leadership team sometimes underestimate the time needed to complete a strategy implementation especially if priorities are not properly set out. It should therefore be clear to all employees involved in the implementation priorities set out for execution which includes activity schedules to monitor regular day to day work and other projects. If priorities are not defined properly, it could either compromise attention given to strategy implementation or vice versa resulting to conflict amongst team members (Lehner, 2014).

Inadequate skills and abilities of the leadership team involved in the strategy implementation have also been found to cause problems especially if relevant skills were
not taken not consideration during the board composition period (Beer & Eisenstat, 2005). Important to note is that in most cases employees do not always receive adequate training and instructions to be able to perform their roles effectively especially in strategy related tasks (Bell & Gottschalk, 2010). Sufficient funding is needed for effective communication.

Organizations should ensure leadership team have relevant skills to deliver the strategy and ensure employees have enough time to dedicate the implementation process. They should either be freed from other tasks or they should understand the priorities given to their different tasks. Enough time should in general be allocated to the implementation process (Hantang, 2013). There is no one particular variable that is indispensable of each other but the human resource and financial resources are always ranked higher than the rest. It is through good training and development of human resource that other resources become viable and closely monitored to achieve strategic goals (Pearce & Robinson, 2010). If employees are offered high job security through motivation, empowerment, modern and reliable working systems and a free environment to be innovative, they will tend to guard organization resources and hence work towards achieving long term goals as found in the strategic plans (Hantang, 2013).

Clearly, for effective implementation of strategic plans, employees require to be at particular work stations for a period of good time long enough for implementation to take place. Job security, motivation and empowerment clearly work towards retaining employees over a long period fit enough to participate fully in implementation of strategic plans. The organization with adequate resources will most likely achieve a higher retention of staff if all other variables are not a hindrance.

2.2.4. Ownership
Strategy implementation in most cases fail due to lack of ownership of the strategy and implementation process. Rudd et al. (2008) suggests that if the strategy is not owned by management and employees, the organization may end up achieving very little hence delays in achieving the intended purpose. Moreover, when top management are not monitoring implementation, ownership is lost since they are not in touch with realities and may not be in a position to address factors affecting implementation in good time. This may lead to delays and hence more time and resources are needed for all the implementation, or overall failure of implementation process (Mintzberg, 2014). On the other hand, if affected
employees and managers are not all involved in the strategy formulation, they end up not being adequately prepared hence not owing the process (Takeuchi et al. 2008).

2.2.5. Tasks and Responsibilities
Unclear tasks and responsibilities often results in failure and in this regard, employees tend to focus on departmental structures and operations while organization enhances performance of cross functional systems in order to improve internal coordination mechanisms, Tincher (2009). Lack of clarity on strategic objectives, tasks and activities amongst employees could also have negative impact on the implementation of strategy. When the strategy is not fully understood by those involved in implementation it becomes difficult for them to effectively work towards the set goals. Moreover, if employees are not clear of their responsibilities conflicts may arise between implementing parties or activities may be forgotten all together (Beer & Nohria. 2000).

2.2.6 Exercising Leadership
Ineffective leadership is one of the key hindering factors in strategy implementation due to ineffective coordination. Beer and Nohria. (2000) emphasizes on importance of clear strategic direction, which describes different ways in which top management can be ineffective. In cases where top management bypass middle management to obtain information from employees it causes disharmony within the system and affects performance of the implementing team members. Beer and Nohria. (2000) further notes that leadership in teams does not make the necessary trade-offs during the implementation but instead, they formulate unclear strategic objectives which do not provide clear strategic direction. The level of effort and commitment by all actors determines the success of strategy implementation. However the input of the middle managers levels of competence is underestimated at the formulation stage and is not surprising that Kaplan and Norton (2001) found that as few as five percent of a typical workforce understand their organization’s strategy.

2.2.7 Management Uncertainty
Thompson et al. (2007) emphasizes that middle managers experiences uncertainty during change processes and it is the responsibility of top management to be mindful and manage the process effectively and ensure it does not affect the quality of strategy execution in the end. There is not much evidence on the type of uncertainty experienced but it is apparent
that in most organisations, middle managers are not adequately prepared to manage the uncertainties leave alone strategy implementation (Destimore, Werner & Harris, 2002). What this means is sometimes managers also do not have sufficient time to dedicate to the process as well as guide other employees to rollout the implementation process (McKinley & Scherer 2000).

Leadership team can reduce strategy uncertainties in various ways which include direct involvement in strategy formulation, support from top management, improved communication between all actors, periodic meetings with employees, role clarity and peer interaction. McNamara (2008) however shares a different view because he views uncertainties as a catalyst that encourages innovation and adaptability that in the end prompt manager’s to find ways of dealing with them.

2.3 Organizational Culture Effect on Strategy Implementation
Organizational culture has been defined as the basic beliefs commonly-held and learned by a group, that govern the group members’ perceptions, thoughts, feelings and actions, and that are typical for the group as a whole (McKinley & Scherer (2000). It represents a complex pattern of beliefs, expectations, ideas, values, attitudes, and behaviours shared by the members of an organization that evolve over time (Trice & Beyer, 1993). Pearce and Robinson (2010) refer to organizational culture as the set of important assumptions (often unstated) that members of an organization share in common. Every organization has its culture. An organization’s culture is similar to an individual’s personality – an intangible yet ever-present theme that provides meaning, direction, and the basis for action. In much the same way as personality influences the behaviour of an individual, the shared assumptions (beliefs and values) among a firm’s members influence opinions and actions within that firm (Cater & Purko 2010).

2.3.1 Role of Culture in Strategy Implementation
Ahmadi, Salamzadeh, Daraei, and Akbari (2012) studied the impact of organizational culture while implementing strategies in Iranian banks and concluded that a meaningful relationship exists between organizational culture and strategy implementation. Results of their study showed that all types of organizational cultures have significant relationships with the implementation process, but the extent of the culture’s influence varies from the most effective (clan culture) to the least effective (hierarchy culture).
In 1995, Alpander and Lee investigated how the organizational development program and its application influence a company to change its culture, structure, and operating procedures and concluded that a flexible structure and adaptable employees who are willing to initiate process and procedure changes are necessary to produce high-quality products or services at the lowest possible cost.

In 2008, Ke and Wei investigated the relationship between enterprise resource planning (ERP) implementation and organizational culture and found that the success of ERP implementation is positively related to organizational culture along the dimensions of learning and development, participative decision making, power sharing, support and collaboration, and tolerance for risk and conflicts, which all form part of an organization’s cultural environment. In a study of work-life strategies in the Australian construction industry, Lingard, Francis, and Turner (2012) found the need for effective communication methods about work-life intervention and strategies within the organization during strategy implementation.

2.3.2 Leadership Impact on Organizational Culture
Empirical investigations suggest that the promotion of an innovation enabling culture requires senior leaders’ support and involvement (Drucker, 1985; Ireland & Hitt, 2001; Vera & Crossan, 2004). Farson and Keyes (2002), for example, suggest that fostering failure tolerance is an important means of promoting an innovation enabling culture. And to foster failure tolerance requires that leaders are engaged, show interest in people’s work by asking pertinent questions, express support and give feedback, and are collaborative rather than controlling. By providing employees with opportunities to explore, investigate and experiment, bounded delegation leadership creates an entrepreneurial organization culture that fosters innovative behavior (Amabile, Okinuwe, & Weniyi, 1996; Woodman, Anderson, Hester, & Stringer 2003; Sackmann, 2006; Ulwick, 2002; Anand, Judge & Allan, 2007). In an entrepreneurial culture members of the organization identify opportunities and risks based on their perceptions of the internal and external organizational environment, integrate available resources, and bring in other individuals to enable them to undertake creative and innovative ventures (Sternberg, Kaufman & Pretz, 2003; Mumford & Licuanan, 2004; Chen, 2007).
Bounded delegation leaders also foster innovation by creating a sharing culture that facilitates interaction and information sharing among individuals across the organization (Damanpour, 1991; Ahmed, 1998; McDermott, 1999; Menzel, Churchill, Tulip & Maureen, 2008). This interaction and information sharing is an important means of allowing organization members’ views and opinions to be heard and for knowledge to be transferred (Menzel et al. 2008). Damanpour (1991) notes internal communication as helpful to organizational innovativeness, while McDermott (1999) emphasizes that it is important to develop existing knowledge communities to facilitate information sharing. A sharing culture makes interaction, communication, and knowledge transfer possible (Damanpour, 1991; Ahmed, 1998; McDermott, 1999; Menzel et al., 2008), which in turn, encourages exploratory behaviour and learning. The culture of an organization is expected to be supportive of and consistent with the strategy being implemented (Johnson & Scholes, 1999). Corporate culture gives employees a sense of how to behave and act and hence influencing employees to support current strategy in order to strengthen its implementation. Since it is managers who were involved in developing strategic plans, it is part of their leadership tasks to bring the organization’s culture into alignment with strategy and keep it there.

2.3.3 Effect of Organizational Culture on Organizational Performance
Organizational culture has the potential to enhance organizational performance, employee job satisfaction, and the sense of certainty about problem solving (Kotter, 2012). If an organizational culture becomes incongruent with the changing expectations of internal and/or external stakeholders, the organization’s effectiveness of strategy implementation can decline as has occurred with some organizations (Kotter, 2012). Organizational culture and performance clearly are related (Osborne & Gaebler, 2012), although the evidence regarding the exact nature of this relationship is mixed. Studies show that the relationship between many cultural attributes and high performance has not been consistent over time (Denison, 1990; Sorenson, 2001)

2.3.4 Organizational Culture Obstacles in Strategy Implementation.
Hrebniaik (2006) conducted a study on obstacles to effective strategy implementation and found that poor or inadequate information sharing, unclear responsibility and accountability, and working against the organizational power structure – all part of organizational structure – results in failed implementation processes. Likewise, Lorange
(2008) investigated the importance of human resources in implementing strategies in organizations and found that if a strategy implementation needs to succeed, then top management must be heavily involved in monitoring and reviewing the progress of each strategic program created by the company. In a similar study, Carlopio and Harvey (2012) focused on social-psychological principles and their influence in successful strategy implementation and found that if an organization’s structure and culture are not aligned with a proposed strategy and the new behaviours required, the strategy implementation process will certainly be defeated. In a study involving Latin American firms, Brenes et al. (2008) concluded that organizational culture supportive of principles and values in the new strategy resulted in successful strategy implementation in the sampled firms. They also revealed that 86% of the most successful companies see culture aligned to strategy as highly significant, against only 55% of less successful companies.

A sharing culture makes interaction, communication, and knowledge transfer possible (Damanpour, 1991; Ahmed, 1998 McDermott, 1999; Menzel et al., 2008), which in turn, encourages exploratory behaviour and learning. The culture of an organization is expected to be supportive of and consistent with the strategy being implemented (Zaribaf & Bayrami, 2010). Corporate culture gives employees a sense of how to behave and act and hence influencing employees to support current strategy in order to strengthen its implementation. Since it is managers who were involved in developing strategic plans, it is part of their leadership tasks to bring the organization’s culture into alignment with strategy and keep it there.

Organizational Culture and the Challenges in the Implementation of Strategy
Organizational culture is capable of blunting or significantly altering the intended impact of even well thought out strategies in an organization (Carlopio & Harvey (2012)). It affects most parts of organizational life, such as how decisions are made, who makes them, how rewards are distributed, who is promoted, how people are treated and how the organization responds to its environment (Mullins, 2010). Many organizations are unaware of the cultural diversities within which they exist find themselves unable to successfully implement strategies (Hrebiniaik, 2006).

Thompson et al. (2007) noted that long standing attitudes, vested interests, inertia and ingrained organizational practices do not melt away when managers decide on a new
strategy. According to Brenes et al. (2008) poor analysis of organizational culture results in lack of participation and support of key persons. He further explains that this lack of commitment to the process may severely hurt the implementation process as the individuals opposed to the strategy process may sabotage or simply not perform the tasks required.

A key aspect of the implementation process is institutionalization of that strategy so that it permeates daily decisions and actions in a manner consistent with long term strategic success. The existing organizational culture may promote or impede successful implementation of the new strategy. Sixty-eight percent of organizations identify that their organizational structure impedes implementation of strategy (Menzel et al, 2008).

### 2.4 Organizational Structure Effect on Strategy Implementation

In strategy-structure studies, Alfred (2014) suggests that the organizational structure is influenced by its strategies (Structure follows Strategy). To distinguish between strategy and structure, setting long and short-term goals, finding the path to obtain goals and allocating resources are the strategy components and the formation of these elements to implementing strategies are called structure. Therefore, structure consists of corporate hierarchy, division of labour, delegating and communications. Besides initial information and organization's current issues are included. Allio (2012) says strategy implementing is a process in which all planning and budgeting activities, policies and procedures follows the defined strategy. It may involve some changes in organization's culture, structure and managerial system or even a wide general change in all the mentioned fields. Middle managers specifically operate the strategy after top managers approve it, unless a wide range of changes were essential to the organization.

#### 2.4.1 Link between Organization Structure and Strategy

Many studies have addressed the link between organizational strategy and structure by pointing out that one of the challenges in strategy implementation is weak coordination of activities. Similarly, Eddie (2010) proposed turning poor coordination into teamwork by realigning roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities with strategy. In contrast, Brache (2002) proposed that from an implementation perspective, it is more valuable for an organization to apply cross-functional processes to enforce strategy implementation than to change the organizational structure. Bhimani and Langfield (2007) focused their study on how organizational structure influences strategy implementation and found the process
of strategy implementation to be structured and formal. They also concluded that during the strategy development process greater emphasis is placed on financial information, but during the implementation phase both financial and non-financial information are emphasized.

Every organization has a unique structure. An organizational structure is the reflection of the company’s past history, reporting relationships and internal politics. Every organization needs to take a very close look at its organization structure and evaluate if it supports the strategy. Organizations may need to customize their organizational structure to fit their strategy (Eddie, 2010). The three focus points in relation to identification of the appropriate structure needed for strategy implementation include; first and foremost identification of critical activities in the organization’s value chain. These are the activities that are critical to the strategic process while others are not.

Primary activities have to be performed exceedingly well to develop the organization’s core competencies. For example, a product manufacturing firm has to be good at purchasing, production, merchandising and promotional activities. An insurance company must be good at lead generation, pricing, underwriting and quick and just processing of claims. In all organizations, the support activities include payroll, bookkeeping, IT infrastructure, managing investor relations, PR, etc. Identifying the primary activities is important. In order to identify the primary activities, an organization needs to answer the following: What processes do we need to perform exceedingly well to help us achieve a competitive advantage; and what areas in our business value chain will hurt us if we fare poorly? Answering these questions will immediately enable the organization to see their primary activities. Secondly, the organization needs to decide which of these activities need to be performed internally. Once the organization has identified their mission critical activities, it needs to decide if it’s going to outsource the non-critical. What makes outsourcing attractive is that the non-critical activity is another organization’s critical activity. They will have experts who can efficiently perform the activity. For example, all major airlines outsource in-flight meals while focusing on timeliness, sales and marketing and logistics. In-flight meals are not the airlines’ core business: operating flights on time is. Deciding which activities to perform internally and what to outsource is of strategic importance and an organization should not take it lightly. One of the other advantages of outsourcing (besides lower costs) is that both organizations can benefit from each other’s arsenal of
capabilities. By leveraging collaborative partnerships, the organizations can enhance its
capabilities and build resource strengths that deliver value to its customers (Brache 2002).

Thirdly, the organization needs to build structure around these identified critical activities.
Matching structure to strategy involves making strategy-critical activities the main building
blocks in the organization’s structure. Implementing a new strategy often requires new
resources and skills for new activities. An organization cannot afford a mismatch between
its strategy and structure, since a mismatch can lead to poor strategy implementation. Just
as the organization’s strategy needs to change with changing external environment, so must
the structure change for proper strategy implementation? A word of caution here is that if
the existing structure needs to be radically changed for successful strategy implementation,
then an organization may need to rethink its strategy (Pearce & Robinson, 2010).

2.4.2. Link between Organization Reward Structure and Strategy
Bushardt, Glascoff, and Doty (2011) studied the relationship between organizational
culture and organizational reward structure and found that they are positively correlated.
Feurer, Chaharbaghi and Wargin (1995) article investigated the strategic implementation
process at leading computer giant Hewlett-Packard and proposed that support structures in
the form of formal organizational structures are necessary for employees to act readily on
the knowledge developed to craft and implement strategy. The organizational structure
provides a visual explanation of two main things: the decision-making process and resource
allocation.

2.4.3 Communication Flow in Organizational Structure
In an exploratory study involving corporate communication and strategy implementation,
Forman and Argenti (2005) found that the internal communication within a company has
an overarching hand not only in making strategy, but also in successfully implementing
strategy. Funk (1993) explored the process of product development and implementation
strategies in large Japanese and American companies and concluded that Japanese firms,
in contrast to American firms, implement strategies using a combination of organic and
mechanistic structures. Similarly, Markiewicz’s (2011) study also reflected the importance
of processes and structures in the successful implementation of strategies and proposed that
creativity, innovation, and perception of an organization as processes are very important in
implementing strategies.
In addition to the research described above, Matanda and Ewing (2012) studied multinational personal healthcare company Kimberly-Clark’s implementation strategies and found that brand planning processes, global branding and marketing capabilities, and processes contributed to the company’s success. In line with the above studies, Slater, Olson and Hult (2001) investigated six types of generic strategies and their implementation and concluded that the most influential perspective needed for business success requires a fit between strategy and organizational architecture. Organizational structure and design are important as they entail decisions related to resource allocation for various units and activities within the business ecosystem (Brenes et al. 2008).

2.4.4 Organizational Structure Design

Strategy implementation, sometimes referred to "operational planning" covers all daily decisions about allocating resources. Strategic planning and implementing considered as the two sides of a coin. Some direct effects of primary structure of organization according to Daft (2013) may have probable impact on initial operational structure. General basic policies can influence developed operational level of organization too.

Similarly, a decision about a desired use of a particular design (for example divisional) will often have different outcome in another type of design (functional design). Therefore, to gain more advantages for an organization, one particular type of departmentalization is used. In order to set an adaptive and conforming relationship between structure and strategy, the following points should be considered, measuring the adaptability level of structure, centralization and decentralization, strategy and structure relationship, corresponding to gain and share information all through the organization and lastly clarifying responsibilities.

This structure allows for specialization within the functional areas and facilitates coordination among its members. However, in reality, individuals become insulated in their functional groups and fail to see or understand the other functions’ jobs. This can lead to co-ordination problems. He holds that operating efficiencies afforded by grouping specialists together in functional areas with a traditional chain of command becomes a barrier to the cross-function communication and co-ordination needed effectively to implement multiple product – multiple market strategies (Gupta, 2014)
2.5 Chapter Summary
The literature suggests that the overall aim of strategic plans is to establish a high performance culture in which teams and individuals take responsibility for the continuous improvement of organization productivity. To date, there is an increase in many organizations to develop strategic plans but there is a problem in the implementation to understanding of the whole concept. According to the study, effective implementation of strategic plans was conceptualized as being dependent on Leadership Styles, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Structure. The next chapter explores the research methodology that will be used in collecting data from the case study company; G4S Kenya Limited.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction
This chapter has set out various stages, methods and procedures that were followed in executing the study, thereby satisfying the study objectives. It was aimed at providing a background and justification to the study design and methodology. The chapter was organized in the following structure; the research design, study population, sampling method and procedures, data collection method, data analysis and lastly the chapter summary.

3.2 Research Design
A Research Design is a presentation of the plan, structure, or strategy of investigation, which seeks to obtain or answer various research questions (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Sekaran and Bougie (2013) define research design as a detailed plan for how the research will be conducted. Sekaran and Bougie (2013) further noted that a research design is the structure of the research, it is the ‘glue’ that holds all the elements in a research project together. According to Sanders, Lewis and Thonrnhill (2012), a research design is a plan for collecting and utilizing data so that desired information can be obtained with sufficient precision or so that a hypothesis can be tested properly. It is a framework that guides the collection and analysis of data. Cooper and Schindler (2014) describe the research design as a plan and structure of investigation formed to provide answers to research questions.

This study adopted a descriptive research design because descriptive research design is a type of research method that used when one wants to get information on the current status of a person or an object (Cooper & Schindler 2014). The design was considered appropriate because it provided an in depth and comprehensive inquiry required to be conducted to have a description of the subject under study. The study gathered information from different organs of the organization on strategic plans, identifying influencing factors and challenges if any that are experienced in the process of implementation. Information was also gathered on roles of top management, middle management and lower level management in implementing different components of strategy. Therefore, the study adopted a quantitative approach in investigating the factors affecting implementation of strategic plans as a dependent variable. The independent variables included leadership style, organization culture and organizational structure.
3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Sekaran and Bougie (2013) defines population as a larger collection of all subjects from where a sample is drawn. It refers to an entire group of individuals, events or objects having common observable characteristics (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2010). Cooper and Schindler (2014) observe that a population is the total collection of elements about which one wants to make inferences. A similar view is expressed by Kothari (2013) when he defines a population as the study’s universe. In this research a case study of G4S Kenya limited was considered in the security industry.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Cooper and Schindler (2014) states that the sampling frame or the survey frame is the list of accessible population of people, events or documents that could be include in a survey and from which a study picks a sample to collect data. Sekaran and Bougie (2013) defined sampling as a definite statistical plan concerned with all principal steps taken in the selection of a sample and the estimation procedure. In this study, the sampling frame are all the staff categorised as top management, middle management and lower level management and the information was sourced from G4S Kenya limited human resources department.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

The study adopted a stratified random sampling technique to select the sample size. Stratified random sampling is considered to be a technique that attempts to restrict possible samples to those which are ‘less extreme’ by ensuring that all parts of the population are represented in the sample in order to increase the efficiency. The used subgroups, known as strata together they comprise the whole population. The strata in this study were the various levels of management at G4S Kenya Limited.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

Muganda (2010) describe the sample size as a smaller set of the larger population. According to Kothari (2013), for population approximately 500, 30% of the population should be sampled. At least 30% sample of the population will be considered in such a study with a population size of 498.
A sample size of 150 respondents was therefore selected (Table 3.1). The sample size derived from stratification is denoted by \( n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \)

Where; \( n = \text{Sample Size} \)
\( n_1 = \text{Top Management} \)
\( n_2 = \text{Middle Level Management} \)
\( n_3 = \text{Lower Level Management} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Strata</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level Management</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level Management</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>498</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection Methods
The study used primary data collection method to solicit information from respondents. On the questionnaire, closed ended questions were to elicit quantitative data. Each respondent was asked exactly the same questions, in the same order to ensure consistency, accuracy and comparison of the accuracy of the question responses.

The questionnaire was organized into the following sections; the first section looks at the general information of the respondents. The second section establishes the effect of leadership style on strategic plan implementation. The third section examines the effect of organizational culture on strategic plan implementation. The fourth section determines the effect of organizational structure on strategic plan implementation. A 5-point likert scale was applied consisting of a series of statements that expressed strongly agree to strongly disagree.

3.5 Research Procedures
The researcher started by obtaining permission to conduct the research from the management of G4S Kenya Limited. A meeting was held with management team members to discuss the purpose of study and respondents were called and requested for their time
prior to sending actual questionnaire. A pilot test involving 6 respondents was carried out to evaluate the validity and clarity of the questionnaire. After the amendment of the final questionnaire, the researcher explained the purpose of the research and asked for permission to be allowed to carry out the actual research. The final questionnaires were distributed to the respondents with the help of a research assistant. This enhanced the speed of data collection. Each completed questionnaire was treated as a unique case and a sequential number given to each. Filling the questionnaire took approximately 10 minutes.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods
To ensure easy analysis, the questionnaires were be formulated according to each variable of the study and descriptive statistics used. According to Cooper and Schindler (2014), descriptive analysis involves a process of transforming a mass of raw data into tables, charts, with frequency distribution and percentages, which are a vital part of making sense of the data. In this study, the collected data was coded into a statistical package (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 22) for analysis. Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics which include frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation and inferential statistics which included correlations and regression analysis \( Y=B_0 + B_1X_1+ B_2X_2+B_3X_3 + e \) to test for the relationship between dependent and independent variable. The results of the study was presented using tables and figures.

3.7 Chapter Summary
This chapter presents the various methods and procedures the researcher adopted in conducting the study in order to answer the research questions raised in the first chapter. The chapter was organized in the following ways; the research design, population and sample, data collection methods, sampling design and sample size, research procedures and data analysis. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study while the last chapter will focus on discussions, conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter consists of the results and findings of the study. It starts by presenting the analysis and reports on general information. The second part looks on the reports of the analysis of the organizational strategy implementation, the third part presents the findings on the extent to which leadership style affects strategy implementation in the organization, the forth part covers on the report of the analysis of the extent to which organizational culture affects strategy implementation in the organization, the fifth part covers on the analysis and report of the extent to which organizational structure affects strategy implementation in the organization and finally the last part the correlation and regression analysis tests.

The sample size was 150 respondents and the researcher managed to get data from 116 respondents. This is an indication that the response rate is 78%.

4.2. General Information

General information was collected from the respondents based on gender, age, years of experience in the company, level of management and highest education level.

4.2.1 Gender

From the background information provided by the respondents, it was found that 58.6% were males while 41.4% were female. This is an indication that there were more male respondents than female during the study. The results are as shown in the figure 4.1 below.

Figure 4.1: Gender
4.2.2 Age

The findings from the background information shows that 8.7% of the respondents were of age below 25 years, 39.1% were between 25 and 35 years of age, 37.4% were between 35 and 45 years of age and 14.8% were above 45 years of age. This is an indication that majority of the respondents during the study were between 25 and 35 years of age. The results are as shown in the table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 25 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 25 and 35 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 35 and 45 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Duration at G4S Kenya Limited

The respondents were asked the duration they have been in the G4S Kenya Limited and it was found that 10.4% have been in the company for less than 1 year, 19.1% have been in the company 1-5 years, 34.8% have been in the company for 5-10 years and 35.7% have been in the company for more than 10 years. This means that most of the respondents during the study have been in the company for more than 10 years. The results are as shown in the table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Duration at G4S Kenya Limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 10 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4 Level of Management.

The respondents were asked the level of management they were in the company and it was found that 13% were at the top level, 64.3% were in the middle level and 22.6% were in the lower level. Thus majority of the respondents during the study were in the middle level of management. The results are as shown in the figure 4.2 below.

![Figure 4.2: Level of Management](image)

4.2.5 Highest Level of Education

The respondents were asked their highest level of education and the findings shows that 14% had secondary certificate, 26.3% had diploma, 36.8% had bachelor’s degree and 22.8% had graduate degree. Thus majority of the respondents during the study had bachelor’s degree as their highest level of education. The results are as shown in the figure 4.3 below.

![Figure 4.3: Highest Level of Education](image)
4.3. Strategic Implementation

4.3.1 Rate of Strategic implementation

The respondents were asked to rate the strategic implementation at the G4S Kenya Limited using the Likert scale of 5 where a rating of 1 means bad implementation, 2 means poor implementation, 3 means moderate implementation, 4 means good implementation and rating of 5 means excellent implementation.

The results showed that the rating had a mean average of 3.3552 and a standard deviation of 0.87579 with N= 116. This indicates that majority of the respondents rates the strategy implementation as good in the company. The results are as shown in the table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: Rate of Strategic implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.6552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.87579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Strategic Plan Ownership and Implementation

The research sought to investigate the opinion that Strategic plans ownership and its implementation is strongly felt from G4S Leadership team. The findings shows that 5.1% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 71% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 23.9% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Strategic Plan Ownership and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3. Process of Strategic Implementation
The research sought to investigate the opinion that the process of strategy implementation is well understood and embraced by all staff at G4s Kenya Ltd. The findings shows that 25% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 54.3% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 20.7% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Leadership Style
4.4.1. Effects of Leadership Style on Strategy Implementation
The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the leadership style affects the strategic implementation at the G4S Kenya Limited using the Likert scale of 5. Where a rating of 1 means no extent at all, 2 means to a low extent, 3 means to a moderate extent, 4 means to a great extent and rating of 5 means to a very great extent.

The results showed that the rating had a mean average of 4.27 and a standard deviation of 0.803 with N= 117. This means that majority of the respondents agrees that the leadership style affects the strategic implementation to a great extent in the organization. The results are as shown in the table 4.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.80294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Communication

The research sought to investigate the opinion that the leadership team effectively communicates strategic plans and its implementation across the business. The findings shows that 13.7% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 65.8% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 20.5% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3. Adequate Resources

The study sought to investigate the opinion that the leadership team allocates adequate resources needed for implementation of strategic plans. The findings shows that 18.1% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 56.9% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 25% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8: Adequate Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.4. Tasks and Responsibilities
The study sought to investigate the opinion that the tasks and responsibilities of all staff towards implementation of strategic plans are clearly outlined by leadership team. The findings shows that 9.4 % disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 62.4% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 28.2% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9: Tasks and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5. Organizational Culture

4.5.1. Effects of Organizational culture on strategy Implementation
The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the organizational culture affects the strategy implementation in the organization using the Likert scale of 5. Where a rating of 1 means no extent at all, 2 means to a low extent, 3 means to a moderate extent, 4 means to a great extent and rating of 5 means to a very great extent.

The results showed that the rating had a mean average of 4.13 and a standard deviation of 0.89957 with N= 116. This means that majority of the respondents agrees that the organizational culture affects the strategy implementation to a great extent in the organization. The results are as shown in the table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Effects of Organizational culture on strategy Implementation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Deviation</strong></td>
<td>.89957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2. Flexibility and adaptability
The study sought to investigate the opinion that G4S Kenya Ltd exercises flexibility and adaptability during strategy implementation. The findings show that 13.8% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 67.2% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 19% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.11 below.

Table 4.11: Flexibility and Adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3. Goal Alignment
The researcher sought to investigate the opinion that goals of the organization are well aligned to Strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Ltd. The results indicate that 9.5% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 65.5% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 25% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.12 below.

Table 4.12: Goal Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.4. Organizational Culture Alignment
The researcher sought to investigate the opinion that strategy implementation is well aligned with organizational culture at G4s Kenya Ltd. The results indicate that 15.7%
disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 55.6% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 28.7% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.13 below.

Table 4.13: Organizational Culture Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6. Organizational Structure

4.6.1. Effects of Organizational Structure on strategy Implementation

The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the organizational structure affects the strategy implementation in the organization using the Likert scale of 5. Where a rating of 1 means no extent at all, 2 means to a low extent, 3 means to a moderate extent, 4 means to a great extent and rating of 5 means to a very great extent.

The results showed that the rating had a mean average of 4.0796 and a standard deviation of 0.93676 with N= 113. This means that majority of the respondents agreed that the organizational structure affects the strategy implementation to a great extent in the organization. The results are as shown in the table 4.14 below

Table 4.14: Effects of Organizational Structure on strategy Implementation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.0796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.93676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.2. Existing Structure

The researcher sought to investigate the opinion that existing structure at G4s Kenya Ltd is well coordinated to promote strategy implementation. The results indicates that 13.9% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 66.1% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 20% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.15 below.

Table 4.15: Existing Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.3. Communication on Strategy

The researcher sought to investigate the opinion that communication on strategy implementation is well supported by existing organization structure at G4s Kenya Ltd. The results indicates that 14.8% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 60.8% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 24.3% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.16 below.

Table 4.16: Communication on Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.4. Team Synergy
The researcher sought to investigate the opinion the team synergy is embraced at G4s Kenya Ltd during strategy implementation. The results indicates that 22.6% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 60.8% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 16.5% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.17 below.

Table 4.17: Team Synergy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.5. Decision Making
The researcher sought to investigate the opinion decision making at G4s Kenya Ltd is effective during Strategy Implementation. The results indicates that 15.8% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 57% agreed and strongly agree with the opinion and 27.2% were neutral about the opinion. This is an indication that majority of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.18 below.

Table 4.18: Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7. Correlation Analysis
A Pearson correlation test was done to investigate the relationship between leadership style, organizational culture, organizational structure and energy implementation. The results showed that there was a strong positive significant relationship between leadership style and strategy implementation with (r= 0.584, p=0.000, N= 115).

The findings also showed that there was a strong positive significant relationship between organizational culture and strategy implementation with (r= 0.621, p=0.000, N= 114). The findings further indicated that there was a strong positive significant relationship between organizational culture and strategy implementation with (r= 0.598, p=0.000, N= 113).

The results are as shown in the table 4.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.19: Correlation Analysis</th>
<th>Strategy Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.584**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.621**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.598**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8. Regression Analysis
Regression analysis was done to investigate the extent to which leadership style, organizational culture and organizational structure affects the strategy implementation. From the model summary table below, R= 0.659 meaning that the there is a strong relationship between the strategy implementation and its predictors which are leadership style, organizational culture and organizational structure. R square= 0.435 which means that the predictors can only explain 43.5% of the strategy implementation in the organization.
### Table 4.20: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.659a</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.67404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Structure, Leadership Style, Organizational Culture*

In the coefficient table below the regression model \( Y = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + e \) can be expressed as \( Y = 1.077 + 0.165X_1 + 0.371X_2 + 0.163X_3 \).

Where \( Y = \) strategy implementation, \( B_0 = \) Constant = 1.077, \( X_1 = \) Leadership Style, \( X_2 = \) Organizational Culture, \( X_3 = \) Organizational Structure, \( B_1 = 0.165, B_2 = 0.371 \) and \( B_3 = 0.163 \).

This means that improving leadership style by one unit, then strategy implementation rate will be improved by 0.165 units, improving organizational culture by one unit improves strategy implementation rate by 0.371 units and organizational structure by one unit improves strategy implementation rate by 0.163 This implies that organization culture affects strategy implementation rate of an organization to a greater extent than other predictors of strategy implementation.

### Table 4.21: Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9. Chapter Summary
This chapter presents the results and findings of the study. Findings are presented in frequency tables and graphs/figures. The presentation is aligned to the research objectives and covers on the reports on the extent to which leadership style affects strategy implementation in the organization, extent to which organizational culture affects strategy implementation in the organization, extent to which organizational structure affects strategy implementation in the organization, and lastly the correlation and regression analysis testing statistical significant relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables. The next chapter presents the discussion of findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter concludes the study and it has been divided into different sections that include summary of findings, discussions, conclusions, and recommendations. It provides a clear connection between the objectives of the study and the findings.

5.2 Summary of the Study
The main purpose of the study was to examine the factors that influence strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited. The study was guided by three research questions:
How does leadership styles affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?
How does organizational culture affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?
How does organizational structure affect strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?

A descriptive research design was adopted for the study because of the need to generalize the findings of the study to the larger population. Furthermore, it facilitates a comprehensive inquiry needed to understand the subject under study. The total population considered for the study was 498 people. The sampling frame for the study was all the staff categorized as top management, middle management, and lower management at G4S Kenya Limited human resource department. A sample size of 150 respondents was selected for the study. Data was collected using structured questionnaires. The data was analysed using inferential and descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics is characterized by frequency, mean, mode, and percentages. Inferential statistics helped in drawing inferences. Tables and figures were used to present the findings and make sense of the analysed data.

The findings of the study on leadership styles and strategy implementation revealed that most respondents (mean of 427; standard deviation 0.803) believe leadership style has a significant impact on strategy implementation in G4S Kenya Limited. Most of the respondents (65.8%) agreed that the leadership team has been effective in communicating strategic plans and implementation across all the levels of the business. Most of the respondents (56.9%) agreed that leadership allocates adequate resources for implementation of strategies devised at each level of the organization. Majority of the respondents (62.4%) agreed that the leadership team has done commendable job in defining
the responsibilities and tasks of all the staff members to facilitate implementation of strategic plans.

The findings of the study on organizational culture and strategy implementation showed that most respondents (mean 4.13, standard deviation 0.899) agree that organizational culture has a great impact on strategy implementation in G4S Kenya Limited. Most of the respondents (67.2%) shared the opinion that the organization exercises flexibility and adaptability during strategy implementation. Most of the respondents (65.5%) agreed that the goals of the organization are aligned to the strategy implementation in the organization. Most of the respondents (55.6%) shared the opinion that the organizational culture has been aligned with the implementation of strategies in G4S Kenya Limited.

The findings of the study on organizational structure and strategy implementation revealed that majority of the respondents (mean 4.08; standard deviation 0.94) agreed that organizational structure has an impact on strategy implementation. Majority of the respondents (66.1%) agreed that the existing structure at G4S Kenya Limited has been designed to promote strategy implementation. Majority of the respondents (60.8%) shared the opinion that the communication on strategy implementation is supported by the organizational structure. According to majority of the respondents (60.8%), team synergy is embraced in G4S Kenya Limited during strategy implementation. Decision making has proven (57%) to be effective during strategy implementation at G4S Kenya Limited.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Leadership Styles and Strategy Implementation

The study findings showed that leadership styles have a significant impact on strategy implementation (mean 4.27, standard deviation 0.80). The leadership style in an organization affects resource allocation, attitude and quality of the leadership team, and delegation of task. Majority of the respondents (56.9%) agreed that resource allocation, tasks and responsibilities and leadership team influence strategy implementation. The findings echo the stand taken by O’Brien (2009) when he posits that a successful strategy implementation begins with a sound strategy formulation. Leadership is responsible for formulation of strategies, which means a failure on part of the leadership team means a failure for the entire organization. Pearce and Robinson (2010) recommends the involvement of all employees from different levels in the organization to help achieve the
ultimate goal of the organization. Leadership style has a direct impact on how the leadership team relates to subordinates, which in turn influences the overall quality of strategy implementation. The positive relationship between tasks and responsibilities and strategy implementation is emphasized by Dessler (2004) when he emphasizes that top management has the responsibility of providing directions through the strategy formulation and implementation while considering the resources available to the organization. The involvement of employees in the process through the assignment of tasks and creating time to listen to their suggestions increases the chances of success in strategy implementation.

Majority of the study respondents (65.8%) agreed that the effectiveness of the leadership team in communicating strategic plans across all levels of the organization has been effective. Therefore, the organization owes its success to strategy implementation to quality leadership and strong communication network. Wolfgang (2006) makes it clear that communication is only possible if the sender and the receiver share a common language. Pearce and Robinson (2010) posit that communication is critical to strategy implementation because it is the main connecting medium. The lack of proper communication channels means employees have no chance to understand the strategic plans of the organization. The result is a clueless workforce that are not in touch with the strategic plans and goals of the organization. Takeuchi et al. (2008) are in tandem with the opinion of the majority that the leadership team has the responsibility of facilitating communication between the employees and management. The leadership team is expected to translate strategies into distinct period implementation plans. Beer and Eisenstat (2005) warns about the negative effects of poor communication and the potential impact it has on strategic plans. Poor communication means employees cannot learn about strategic plans on time and hinder subordinates from reporting about the things that might cause problems during strategy implementation.

The study findings revealed that majority of the study respondents (56.9%) consider resource allocation an important factor when it comes to strategy implementation. The findings are in agreement with the perspective of Tincher (2009) who warns that lack of adequate resources and the potential impact it has on strategy implementation. There are cases when leadership underestimates the resources needed for strategy implementation, which makes it hard to successfully implement strategies (Hunger and Wheelen, 2005). In some cases, the lack of adequate resources can be a recipe for confusion and chaos among
employees (Lehner, 2014). The lack of adequate resources can be viewed from the perspective of lacking experienced and quality leadership. Higgins (2005) makes it clear that enough time should be accorded to facilitate a successful process of strategy implementation. Beer and Nohria (2000) argues that the lack of clear roles and responsibilities on the part of employees is a recipe for chaos and confusion in the organization.

5.3.2 Organizational Culture and Strategy Implementation

Majority of the study respondents shared the opinion that organizational culture has a significant impact on strategy implementation (mean 4.13; standard deviation 0.89). Sackmann (2006) defined organizational culture as the common beliefs shared by a group and governs the perceptions, emotions, and actions of the group members. Ahmadi et al. (2012) posits that there is a meaningful relationship between strategy implementation and organizational culture. The extent of influence depends on the type of organizational culture with most impact felt in hierarchy culture. Kei and Wei (2008) established a clear connection between the culture of an organization and strategy implementation. Organizational culture affects the overall communication framework, attitudes, and emotions, which are all very important in the process of strategy implementation.

The leadership team plays a significant role in the promotion and development of a culture that supports strategy implementation. Several empirical investigations confirm leadership can promote an innovation culture as part of the initiative to develop a productive organizational culture (Drucker, 1985; Ireland & Hitt, 2001; Vera & Crossan, 2004). Leadership has the responsibility to create an environment where failure is tolerated to encourage employees to innovate. The same sentiments are shared with the Farson and Keyes (2002) who emphasizes the fostering tolerance for failure. Ulwick (2002) argues that the involvement of employees in the formulation of strategies and development of new ideas helps in nurturing an innovative culture. It sets the organization on a path to success because it has a key competitive advantage. The ability to keep coming up with something new is what makes the differences between successful enterprises and mediocre firms.

The findings of the study revealed (67.2%) that a culture that encourages flexibility and adaptation is good for strategy implementation. According to Wolfgang (2006), an organization that has an incongruent organizational culture is bound to face problems. The
effectiveness of strategy implementation because it makes it difficult for the organization to adapt, allocate resources and find the right people to support the process of strategy implementation. Majority of the study respondents (55.6%) shared the opinion that the organizational culture should be aligned with strategy implementation to make the process successful. Osborne and Gaebler (2012) posit that there is a clear connection between organizational culture and performance. A poor organization culture makes it difficult to implement strategies because it creates barriers in communication, leads to delays, and makes it difficult to coordinate all tasks for the purpose of achieving the goals of the organization. Herbniak (2006) identified a number of obstacles to strategy implementation that stem from culture of an organization. They include poor sharing of information, working against the hierarchy in the organization, unclear responsibilities and the lack of accountability. All these factors make it difficult to create a smooth process of strategy implementation. The chances of mistakes and misunderstandings tend to increase as the quality of communication dwindles. Carlopio and Harvey (2012) argue that strategy implementation is bound to be defeated if it is aligned with the culture of the organization. Brenes et al. (2008) echoes the sentiments when he argues that an organization that shares common values and principles have a greater chance of implementing strategies successfully because the entire organization becomes a machine with each member playing a specific role.

5.3.3 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation

The study findings indicated that majority of the respondents (66.1%) agreed that organizational structure has an impact on strategy implementation. They agreed that organizational structure in G4S Kenya Limited is designed to support strategy implementation. The findings are in agreement with Alfred (2014) who posits that organizational structure is influenced by the strategies implemented in the organization. Strategy includes all the paths and components utilized to achieve organizational goals and structure includes all the elements used to implement strategies. This means that corporate hierarchy, delegating, communications, and division labour all part of the organization structure. They have a direct impact on the quality and effectiveness of the strategy implementation process. Allio (2012) defines strategy implementation is manifested when planning, budgeting, policies and procures are in line with a specific strategy. The distinction between organization structure and strategy is imperative because it clarifies the connection between strategy implementation and organization structure.
Majority of the respondents agreed (66.1%) that the organizational structure at G4S Kenya Limited has been designed to support strategy implementation. Studies have shown that a weak coordination of activities is one of the factors that negatively impact strategy implementation. Eddie (2010) understood the negative impact of poor coordination and suggest the realigning of roles and responsibilities with the strategy to increase the chances of success. The lack of coordination means chaos since many employees are bound to be confused about their roles. It amounts to wastage of resources because resources are utilized but the expected result is not achieved. Bhimani and Langfield (2007) argued that process of strategy implementation is formal and structured, which explains who it is influenced by the structure of the organization. The study concluded that emphasis should be on financial issues during the development of the strategy but during the implementation both financial and non-financial issues should be part of the focus to ensure the process is successful. Feurer et al (1995) concluded that the organizational structure is necessary because it provides the support structures needed by employees to act on the available knowledge and implement strategies. The lack of proper structure means the lack of support structure, which means no strategies are implemented on time. The structure of the organization affects resource allocation and decision making, which have a direct effect on strategy implementation.

Communication is a critical component of the strategy implementation process because it is the link that connects all parts together. Organization structure has a direct impact on the internal communication structure, which defines the way employees and management relate. The study findings revealed that majority of the respondents (60.8%) believed communication strategy is influenced by the organization structure. Forman and Argenti (2005) established that internal communication has a direct impact on strategy formulation and implementation. The communication system should be clear for the management to inform employees about the strategic plans and receive details about the factors that must be handled to improve the strategic implementation process. The design of the organization structure can determine the pace of strategy implementation because it influences planning and resource allocation (Daft, 2013). The move to design the organization structure in a manner that makes strategy implementation simple and direct helps increase the pace of implementation and the overall outcome of the process. It reduces the chances of confusion because communication lines are clear and direct. The structure of the organization
facilitates division of labour and specialization, which ensures that every employee is tasked to handle what they do best. It increases the chances of success.

5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Leadership Styles and Strategy Implementation
Based on the findings of the study, it is plausible to conclude that leadership style has an impact on strategy implementation. The conclusion of the study is that leadership style at G4S Kenya Limited has a positive impact on strategy implementation. The leadership team has shown a positive attitude when it comes to resource allocation, delegation of duties and emphasis on accountability. The study concludes that the leadership allocates adequate resources to support implementation of strategies. All the strategic plans are communicated to employees in a timely and effective manner. The effectiveness of the leadership team is partly responsible for the successful strategy implementation process across all levels of the organization.

5.4.2 Organizational Culture and Strategy Implementation
The study findings reveal that organizational culture has an impact on strategy implementation. According to the findings, G4S Kenya Limited has an organizational culture that is flexible and adaptable when it comes to strategy implementation. The study concludes that organizational goals at G4S Kenya Limited are aligned with the strategy implementation. Also, it concludes that the strategy implementation process has been aligned with organizational culture to ensure that employees have support systems to help them improve accountability. Organizational culture has a direct impact on strategy implementation because it influences communication channels, tasks, and resource allocation.

5.4.3 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation
Based on the findings of the study, the conclusion is that organizational structure has an impact on strategy implementation. The existing organization structure at G4S Kenya Limited has been designed to promote strategy implementation. G4S Kenya Limited has embraced team synergy to support strategy implementation. The study concludes that the organization structure at G4S Kenya Limited supports the communication used for strategy implementation. Organization structure affects flow of information, decision making and resource allocation during strategy implementation.
5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Leadership Styles and Strategy Implementation

The study recommends that G4S Kenya Limited improves the involvement of employees in strategy implementation. The direct involvement of employees in the process creates space for employees to share new ideas. It supports innovation, which is bound to improve the level of effectiveness in strategy formulation and implementation. The management should improve the resource allocation process to ensure timely delivery of resources because it affects the pace of strategy implementation.

5.5.1.2 Organization Culture and Strategy Implementation

The study recommends that G4S Kenya Limited should focus on developing a culture that supports innovation. Employees should be encouraged to share values, ideas, and principles by creating an environment that tolerates failure. Tolerance for failure opens space for sharing of new ideas, which can be useful in improving the performance of organization. The culture of the organization should be monitored to ensure that the organization does not lose the factors that improve strategy formulation and implementation.

5.5.1.3 Organization Structure and Strategy Implementation

The study recommends that G4S Kenya Limited should focus on aligning its corporate hierarchy, defining responsibilities and encouraging accountability to help create a solid structure. A solid structure helps with communication, resource allocation and innovation, which are all good for strategy formulation and implementation. The organization is bound to enhance performance if it keeps streamlining the current structure to ensure communication is very clear and direct.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

The purpose of the study was to examine the factors that influence strategy implementation in G4S Kenya Limited. The findings of this study can be used as a basis for starting similar research in other organization. The findings of this study can be used to justify new research focusing on the factors that influence organization structure design, communication channels, and leadership style. Future studies can focus on the process of strategy implementation to identify the small factors that influence the performance of the organization.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Data Collection Instruments (Questionnaire)

My name is Eric Bett, former Operations manager at G4S Kenya Limited – Kericho Branch. I am a masters (MBA) student at United States International University (USIU-A) studying Factors Affecting Strategy Implementation in Service Oriented Organizations - A case study of G4S Kenya Limited. The information provided will be used for academic purpose only.

Kindly complete the following questionnaire using the instructions provided for each set of question. Tick appropriately.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Gender
   Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Kindly indicate your age bracket
   Below 25 years ☐ Between 25 and 35 years ☐
   Between 35 and 45 years ☐ Above 45 years ☐

3. For how long have you been working at G4S Kenya Limited?
   Less than 1 year ☐ Between 1 and 5 years ☐
   Between 5 and 10 years ☐ Above 10 years ☐

4. Which management level best describe your job level?
   Top Level ☐ Middle Level ☐ Lower Level ☐

5. Which is your highest level of Education?
   Secondary Certificate ☐ Diploma ☐
   Bachelor’s Degree ☐ Graduate Degree ☐
SECTION B: STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION.

1. How do you rate Strategy Implementation at G4S Kenya Limited?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Statements  
   (Tick appropriately)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plans ownership and its implementation is strongly felt from G4S leadership team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of Strategy Implementation is well understood and embraced by all staff at G4S Kenya Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: LEADERSHIP STYLE ON STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

1. In your own view, does Leadership Style affect the successful Strategy Implementation within an Organization?

   Yes  No

2. If yes, to what extent?

   Very great extent  Great extent
   Moderate extent  Low extent
   No extent at all

3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements in relation to Leadership and Strategy Implementation at G4S Kenya Ltd?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statements
(Tick appropriately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership team effectively communicates strategic plans and its implementation across the business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership team allocates adequate resources needed for implementation of strategic plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks and responsibilities of all staff towards implementation of strategic plans are clearly outlined by leadership team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comment………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………

SECTION D: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ON STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

1. In your own view, does an Organization’s culture affect the successful strategy implementation within an organization?
Yes □ No □

2. If yes, to what extent?
Very great extent □ Great extent □
Moderate extent □ Low extent □
No extent at all □

3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements in relation to Organizational Culture Influence on Strategy Implementation at G4S Kenya Ltd?
### Section E: Organizational Structure on Strategy Implementation

1. In your own view, does an Organization’s structure affect the successful strategy implementation within an organization?
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [ ]

2. If yes, to what extent?
   - Very great extent [ ]  
   - Great extent [ ]
   - Moderate extent [ ]  
   - Low extent [ ]
   - No extent at all [ ]

---

**Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Tick appropriately)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4S Kenya Ltd exercises flexibility and adaptability during Strategy Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals of the organization are well aligned to Strategy Implementation at G4S Kenya Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Implementation is well aligned with organizational culture at G4S Kenya Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comment……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………

---

**Additional Comment:**

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………

**SECTION E: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE ON STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION.**

1. In your own view, does an Organization’s structure affect the successful strategy implementation within an organization?
   - Yes [ ]  
   - No [ ]

2. If yes, to what extent?
   - Very great extent [ ]  
   - Great extent [ ]
   - Moderate extent [ ]  
   - Low extent [ ]
   - No extent at all [ ]
3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements in relation to Organizational Culture Influence on Strategy Implementation at G4S Kenya Ltd?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements (Tick appropriately)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing structure at G4S Kenya Ltd is well coordinated to promote Strategy implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication on Strategy Implementation is well supported by existing organization structure at G4S Kenya Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team synergy is embraced at G4S Kenya Ltd during Strategy Implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making at G4S Kenya Ltd is effective during Strategy Implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comment……………………………………………………………………………………………………
Appendix 2: Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>