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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors affecting strategy implementation in the Kenyan humanitarian and corporate sectors. This was guided by the following three research questions; to what extent does communication influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors? To what extent does human capital influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors? And lastly, to what extent does strategic planning influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

The descriptive research design was appropriate for this study as it aims to describe the relationship between independent variables (communication, human capital, and strategic planning) and strategic implementation. The population for this study were the management staff at UNICEF and different corporates in Kenya. The sample size was 79 respondents but only 53 participated on the study by filling the online questionnaire. This gave 67.1% response rate. Data collected was cleaned, coded and analysed using SPSS version 20. The analytical techniques used were both descriptive and inferential analysis.

On objective one, communication (CM) was the independent variable measured on the five likert scale. It looked at both internal and external communication and none of the items were ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. All the items were ranked as ‘agree’ and the skewness was negative. On the regression statistics, for model 1 (combination of humanitarian and corporate organisations), communication influences strategy implementation positively and significantly. For model 2 (humanitarian organisations), communication did not influence strategy implementation. For model 3 (corporate organisations), communication influenced strategy implementation positively and significantly.

For objective two, human capital (HC) was the second independent variable. There was no item ranked as ‘Strongly Agreed’ with mean of 5. On the inferential, for model 1 (combination of humanitarian and corporate organisations), human capital influenced strategy implementation positively and significant. For model 2 (humanitarian organisations), human capital did not influence strategy implementation. For model 3 (corporate organisations), human capital influenced strategy implementation positively and significantly.

For objective three, Strategic Planning (SP) was the independent variable. None of the items under strategic planning was ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. For model 1
(combination of humanitarian and corporate organisations), strategic planning influenced strategy implementation positively and significantly. For model 2 (humanitarian organisations), strategic planning influenced strategy implementation positively and significantly. For model 3 (corporate organisations), strategic planning influenced strategy implementation positively and significantly.

The study concluded that communication and human capital were important factors that influenced strategy implementation at corporate organizations and not at humanitarian organizations. Strategic planning was found to be an important factor in both types of organizations. The study recommended policy development on communication and human capital in corporate organizations, while for humanitarian organizations, the study recommended an evaluation of the communication and human capital strategies used for improvement of their strategy implementation.

The study also recommends continuous review of strategic planning to ensure maximum output on the strategy implementation. For the corporate organization, the study recommends policy formulation and evaluation of human capital to ensure maximum influence of human capital on strategy implementation. Lastly, the study recommends policy stipulation to ensure that developed strategies are implemented to the letter in both corporate and humanitarian organizations.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

The term strategy can be traced from "strategos" which is a Greek word as per Khan and Khalique (2014). The term signifies "the role of a general" as hypothesized by Franklin (2011). The expression “development” in management is a procedure of planning approaches to utilize resources financially and proficiently with the goal that the reason for the organization is accomplished. The strategic process is vital to any authoritative work execution since it determines the organization’s prosperity or failure; a strategy is a planned arrangement to accomplish a specific purpose.

Bryson (2004) observes that in a strategic and planning development process, assets, capital to execute the strategy, people, skill, and offices must be sufficient. Many organizations today are concentrating on becoming more aggressive by implementing focused actions that give them an edge over others; to achieve this, they have to develop workable procedures. Strategy development is spinal critical to the field of strategic management, and is a noteworthy procedure in the lead of the discipline. Franklin (2011) poised that the significance of strategy development can be clarified from four perspectives including natural checking, strategy detailing, and connecting objectives to spending plans and strategic and planning development as a procedure.

In the recent past, as a result of globalization and other forces, a significant number of humanitarian and corporate organizations have faced challenges in their level of performance; these organizations are forced to perform their functions in spite of profoundly difficult external and internal environment factors that could undermine their survival. It is helpful to determine whether these powers are limiting development towards strategic and planning development. These factors include the spending influence of donors, absence of staff, organizational size and scope of tasks, government strategy changes, and shifting client desires. Similarly, they also include the more grounded competition with other existing and upcoming organizations, and rivalry for worldwide sponsors' support.

The government’s inability to fulfil the public needs in general society’s interest is also a force that influences operations of humanitarian and corporate organizations. Eisenberg and
Pieterson (2015) contended that because of these forces, the concept of strategic management became well acquainted between the general population and organizations. This is particularly before the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, keeping in mind the end goal of the humanitarian organizations to address the fundamental responsibilities and social obligation expected from the sector.

Khan and Khalique (2014) expressed that the most strategic planning development, which humanitarian and corporate organizations concentrate on, focuses on developing goals and execution of the objectives that will help attain it. This is notwithstanding of the specific objectives of the development statements, systems, implementation markers and overall vision, which are all critical to the strategy and planning development exercise. Lack of or insufficient strategy development capacity in the humanitarian and corporate sector contributes to insufficient resources and time to help their organizations shape their work around the vision, and measure progress towards attainment – in order to redirect their actions when necessary. Franklin (2011) attested that strategic and planning development is a component of the strategic management process.

The strategic management process enables organizations to detail structures for better execution viability, enhance responsibility / governance measures, and give the organization a sustainable advantage. Thus, they have to embrace formal strategic planning processes into their core tasks. Strategy development is a fundamental piece of an organization’s processes. It is contended that strategy development has been utilized for a significant amount of time, and can be traced back to the military; subsequently, the idea has been broadly adopted in the private sector. Bryson (2004) opined that this idea has likewise been extended to the non-government area to empower organizations with an advantage - similar to the private sector. The ideological system of strategy has gained popularity in the management of organizations, keeping into account that there is no single organization - public or private, humanitarian or corporate, that can overlook or manage without strategic management in the current environment.

According to Gichema (2012), the way in which the strategy is executed can significantly affect whether it will be fruitful or not. The use of strategy remains a learning process to some stakeholders, all the more so in contemporary management - especially in circumstances where the organization’s operations are in the early stages. Strategy execution theories can help organizations to comprehend factors which may impact them, and in addition guide their
strategic management processes to ensure survival in the competitive environment where they have commenced operations.

Throughout the years, humanitarian organizations in Africa have actualized projects to offer services to helpless people, groups and social orders in developing nations around the globe while relying on finances from individual contributors, governments, among other sources. There has been significant incentive for the sector to develop relevant strategies - given the competing priorities for resources available to contributing stakeholders/donors. Given the dynamic conditions in which humanitarian organizations work - mired with unpredictability, effective strategy development and execution is greatly needed for these organizations to face contingencies in their working condition (Khan & Khalique, 2014).

Humanitarian organizations, particularly Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), have become common contributors in assistance activities at all levels in Kenya. They have risen against many challenges to advance their various initiatives that cut across several services including financial, social, and political growth within the country. This can be ascribed to NGO activities that execute social projects, individual development, and community empowerment, especially for the less fortunate and marginalized in society (Bryson, 2004). Khan and Khalique (2014) explain that this responsibility opens up the organizations to focus on interventions that are related to their core requests – which contribute to societal improvement. Consequently, it stimulates the interest of the researcher on factors impacting the planning and execution of activities in the areas they work, especially with the need to meet their objectives and desired goals within a changing and sometimes unpredictable operational environment.

One of the models describing the key variables for effective strategy implementation is the McKinsey’s 7S model (Kaplan, 2005). The ‘7S model’ refers to concepts of strategy, structure, systems, staff, skills, style, and shared values and the interconnections among these seven variables facilitate organizational change and progress. This model depicts the multiplicity of seven variables affecting the organization’s ability to execution of the planned strategies. This model is summarized or distinguished as one which is influenced by the internal factors. Another framework, consisting of external factors has also been proposed to show the factors that influence strategy implementation. David (2011) described the external factors to include political, economic, social, and technological (PEST) and competitive forces.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The management literature shows that firms are not effectively implementing selected strategies. According to David (2011), the strategy implementation is the most challenging and difficult stage in strategic management. Cater and Pucko (2010) concluded that while 80 percent of firms have the right strategies, only 14 percent have managed to implement them well. Others studies claim that between 50 percent and 80 percent of strategy implementation efforts fail (Atkinson, 2006). Studies (Zaribaf & Bayrami, 2010; Cater & Pucko, 2010; Bushardt, Glascoff, & Doty, 2011; Rajasekar, 2014) and others indicate that strategy implementation is far often suffering from lack of involvement of staff, communication, and consultation both top-bottom and bottom-top interactions in the organisation.

There are several studies that have been conducted on strategy implementation in Kenya. Elwak (2013) assessed the challenges of strategy implementation at Mazars Kenya and found that competitive forces had a significant impact on strategy implementation. Kagumu (2016) examined the organizational factors influencing strategy implementation in the Anglican Church of Kenya and found that organisation structure, leadership, resources, and culture had an association with strategies implementation. Aoko (2016) study on the challenges of strategy implementation in non-governmental organizations in Migori County found that management and leadership affected strategy implementation. Awuor (2017) explored the factors influencing strategy implementation and performance of International Non-Governmental Organisations in Kenya at Mercy Corps and found that staff engagement, technological factors, external environment, resources availability, appropriate strategic decision, and inclusivity affected strategy implementation. Abok (2013) examined the factors affecting effective implementation of strategic plans in non-governmental organizations in Kenya and revealed that management styles, organization culture, stakeholders, and organization resources had a great significance on strategic plans implementation whilst communication had a small impact.

These studies although insightful to the issue of strategy implementation; have not investigated the influence of communication, human capital, and strategic planning on strategy implementation in corporate and humanitarian sectors. This study aimed to fill this research gap by undertaking a comparative analysis of these factors (communication, human capital, and strategic planning) on strategy implementation.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors affecting strategy implementation in the Kenyan humanitarian and corporate sectors.

1.4 Research Questions

The study aimed to answer the following research questions;

1.4.1 To what extent did communication influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

1.4.2 To what extent did human capital influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

1.4.3 To what extent did strategic planning influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

1.5 Justification of the Study

1.5.1 Top Management

The researcher hopes that through carrying out the study, top managers in humanitarian and corporate sectors will find a useful provocation to help address challenges facing strategy implementation processes in their work; the research will recommend actions to improve the quality of strategy implementation to the humanitarian sector which performance poorly in terms of strategy implementation than the corporate sector. The recommendations from the study if adopted is expected to contribute to effective and efficient strategy implementation in similar organisations sampled in this study.

1.5.2 Humanitarian Practitioners

In carrying out the study, the research looks towards assisting NGOs in Kenya to overcome challenges of strategy development (and subsequent implementation), to ensure that their strategies are clear, meaningful, addressing evolving needs and beneficiary and donor concerns – including adopting new ways of working. The research will advocate for strategy development that is more visible, coherent and effectively governed, while at the same time recommending commitment of internal resources towards strategy development and implementation. The research is expected to recommend strategies that could be adopted to
ensure that strategy development is not a perennial problem and that good practices learned from the corporate sector are adopted by NGOs.

1.5.3 Scholars and Academia
The study hopes to be of significance to scholars and researchers in the area of strategy management as it will contribute to the body of knowledge on strategy implementation in non-profit and for profit organisations. The study is importance to academic as it suggests area of further research.

1.6 Scope of the Study
The study focused its investigation to employees from a humanitarian and a corporate organisation in Kenya. It also incorporated the management staff of these organisations. Data was collected in August 2018 and specifically sampled senior management, middle management, and low level management staff.

1.7 Definitions of Terms

1.7.1 Communication
Refers the process of transmitting information and common understanding from one person to another (Lunenberg, 2010).

1.7.2 Human Capital
Refers to the knowledge, expertise, and skill one accumulates through education and training (Marimuthu, Arokiasamy, & Ismail, 2009).

1.7.3 Strategic Planning
Refers to the degree in which participants’ responsibilities, authority and discretion in decision making is specified (Kibachia, Iravo, & Luvanda, 2014).

1.7.4 Strategy Implementation
Refer to the actions an organisation takes to meet its strategic goals (Alharthy, Rashid, Pagliari, & Khan, 2017).
1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter introduced the background of the study, the purpose of the study, which recommend approaches that could be adopted to ensure effective strategy implementation in organisations. The section also had research importance which added value to policy, theory as well as practice by establishment of a backdrop against which additional research on problems faced by institutions in strategy development could be undertaken by researchers. The objectives and the scope of study are also discussed in this chapter. Chapter two of the study presented the literature review chapter. It covered the relevant literature on the subject, considering approaches that have been employed. This was followed by the research methodology section that looked into the data collection procedure, and the fourth chapter which presented the findings, analysis and interpretation of the data. Finally, the fifth chapter covered the discussion, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the literature reviewed for this study. The chapter is presented in sections that are aligned to the study research objectives. Under each of these sections, sub-sections are included that highlight some of the dimensions used to conceptualize the study variables, and an empirical review of literature showing the association between the independent and dependent variables.

2.2 Communication and Strategy Implementation

The importance of communication during intended change has been empirically demonstrated and commonly agreed among practitioners. Meaningful communication informs and educates employees at all levels and motivates them to support the strategy Elving (2005) proposed a conceptual framework to study communication in organizations experiencing change. Six propositions were developed that all simultaneously influence readiness for change. The level of readiness in this framework indicates the degree of effectiveness of change. The first proposition stated that low level of resistance to change or high level of readiness for the change is an indicator for effective organizational change. The second proposition stated that communication needs to inform the organizational members about the change and how that change will alter the individual’s work.

The third proposition advocated that communication should be used to create a community which will increase commitment, trust, and identification with the organization and management. The next proposal looked at uncertainty in that high levels of uncertainty will have a negative effect on readiness to change. The fifth proposition focused on the effect of downsizing creating loss of jobs and feelings of job insecurity affecting readiness to change. The last proposition was related to fourth and fifth propositions which stated that communication will show impact on feelings of uncertainty and job insecurity. The literature on distinguishes communication into internal and external communication. Internal
communication represents the communication and interactions between the employees and members of an organization (Elving, 2005).

Traditionally, internal communication was defined as “communication with employees internally within the organization (Cornelissen, 2008). On the other hand, external communication is bringing information from outside into the organization and out of it. External communication consists of the interactive process of exchanging information with market including every company which a firm interacts with (Tankosic, Ivetic, & Mikelic, 2017). Internal communication can be characterized as either formal or informal communication. External communication can be distinguished into promotional, strategies, or operational (Wilcox & Cameron, 2010).

2.2.1 Internal Communication

Communicating internally has taken on major importance in the work of corporate communication departments. Internal communication is crucial for efficient work in any organization, and it is becoming a source of competitive advantage (Tankosic et al., 2017). Internal communication information transmitted up, down, horizontal and diagonal in the organizational structure (Vercic, Vercic, & Sriramesh, 2012). The internal communication is based on communication flow inside the organisation and its segments. Internal communication is key for successful business and good interpersonal relationship. We cannot expect any kind of positive activity into our company if we don't have good communication flow inside of company. The prerequisite for successful external communication is well ordered internal communication (Meng & Pan, 2012).

According to Okuneye, Lasisi, Omoniyi, and Shodiya (2014), internal communication is not just the duty of the public relation officer or the communication and marketing team, all employees are expected to play active part in information dissemination. Internal communication can be divided into formal and informal – internal communication can be formal (objective rules, the main directions of a pre-planned information - meetings, informative material) and informal (talks, discussions, spontaneous meetings, rumours, etc.). Formal communication refers to company’s management planned communicative activities and their implementation. Informal communication activities take place spontaneously, in parallel with the formal communication (Zivrbule, 2015).
Formal communication within an organization according to Larkin and Larkin (1996) can be characterized by three main areas: Downward communication - the flow of information from managers to employees; the upward communication - the flow of information from employees to managers; and Horizontal communication - the flow of information between departments. In academic literature, formal communication is divided into two levels - vertical and horizontal communication. Vertical communication takes place from top to bottom: the highest hierarchical levels report to lower level employees. Horizontal communication takes place between equals (one level) personnel and organizations subdivisions (Wilcox & Cameron, 2010).

### 2.2.2 External Communication

The external communication entered into the organization and amounts outside it. Companies constantly exchange messages with customers, suppliers, distributors, competitors, investors, journalists, representatives of state structures and others (Tankosic et al., 2017). External communications aimed at creating favourable point of view among stakeholders on which the company depends (Oliver, 2008). Iosif (2014) poised that the external communication at the level of the organization has two main directions: communication with the exterior of the organization and the management of changes outside the organization, estimating their impact on the organization. According to Avram (2015) there are three types of external communication: operational, strategic, and promotional.

The operational communication refers to the communication between the employees of the organization and the exterior. This type of communication transforms the employees into promotional agents of the organization in the external environment. Promotional communication refers to everything related to taking promotional and advertising actions in the exterior of the organization. This form of communication allows the organization to send to the exterior only those pieces of information that act as image improvements - referring to goods, services, processes or activities. Strategic communication targets the formation of a communication network. This form of communication is based both on improving the relationship of the organization with the exterior environment, as well as on identifying those changes in the environment that can disturb the activity of the organization in the short, medium or long run (Cheney & Christensen, 2001).

### 2.2.3 Empirical Literature

Olang (2015) conducted a study on the role of communication in strategy implementation: the case of African women in agricultural research and development in Kenya. The study
investigated at the extents to which communication was incorporated by the organization as a component of strategy implementation. The study applied a descriptive research design and collected data through online administration of a questionnaire. The study adopted correlation and regression analysis to determine the influence of communication on strategy implementation. The study found that there was a positive and significant association between communication and strategy implementation whilst the regression analysis indicated that an increase in communication resulted to a sportive and significant increase in strategy implementation.

Mutisya (2016) conducted a study on the influence of communication on strategy implementation among pharmaceutical companies in Kenya. The study aimed to determine the to what extent communication media, communication channels, and communication flow influenced strategy implementation. The sample of the study comprised of 64 managers of different pharmaceutical companies based in Nairobi, Kenya. This study applied a descriptive survey research design. This study used primary data collected using questionnaires. Descriptive and multiple regression analysis were used to analyse the data. The findings revealed that communication media, communication channels, and communication flow had a positive and significant effect on strategy implementation.

Lingard, Francis, and Turner (2012) investigated work-life strategies in the Australian construction industry focusing on the implementation issues in a dynamic project-based work environment. An ‘action research’ approach was adopted using a structured and participatory intervention process. Data was collected from waged and salaried workers engaged in two commercial building projects, one small civil engineering project and corporate office-based work, primarily related to tendering for new projects. The findings revealed a need for effective communication methods about work-life intervention and strategies within the organization during strategy implementation.

Forman and Argenti (2005) conducted a qualitative field study of five firms from diverse industries on best practices in corporate communication. The research aimed at demystifying the association between a company’s corporate communication function, on the one hand, and its implementation of strategy. The research found that internal communication within a company has an overarching hand not only in making strategy, but also in successfully implementing strategy. Rajasekar (2014) analysed the factors affecting effective strategy implementation in a service industry in Oman. The study investigated the influence of communication (internal and external communication). The study adopted a survey method
targeting 150 executives. The respondents held that strategy must be communicated internally and externally. Communication also enhances the clarity of the strategy and people’s involvement and therefore commitment.

2.3 Human Capital and Strategy Implementation

According to Schultz (1993), the term “human capital” has been defined as a key element in improving a firm’s assets and employees in order to increase productive as well as sustain competitive advantage. Human capitals refer to processes that relate to training, education and other professional initiatives in order to increase the levels of knowledge, skills, abilities, values, and social assets of an employee which will lead to the employee’s satisfaction and performance, and eventually on a firm performance (Marimuthu et al., 2009). Pryor, Anderson, Toombs, and Humphreys (2007) poised that people are the key strategic resource; therefore, it is essential for organizations to effectively utilize the know-how of their employees at the right places. It is the challenge of management to allocate available resources for their most useful tasks as well as coordinating and integrating activities of participating employees and functions.

Human capital is a strategic resource. Human capital is composed of individual employees’ knowledge, skills, and capabilities. In turn, human capital partly or largely comprises an organization’s capabilities and is used to deploy them. Thus, based on the firm’s human capital, managers make decisions and take actions assigning tasks to employees that are designed to implement the firm’s strategy. In short, managers leverage the firm’s human capital to engage the organizational capabilities in ways that are designed to implement the firm’s strategy (Greer, Lusch, & Hitt, 2016).

Rastogi (2000) stated that human capital is an important input for organizations especially for employees’ continuous improvement mainly on knowledge, skills, and abilities. Thus, the definition of human capital is referred to as the knowledge, skills, competencies, and attributes embodied in individuals that facilitate the creation of personal, social and economic well-being. Almasarweh (2014) conceptualized human capital as consisting of learning, knowledge, and skills. Ukenna, Ijeoma, Anionwu, and Olise (2010) also identified the dimensions of human capital to include: learning; knowledge; and skills. According to Kaplan and Norton (2004), human capital encompasses strategic capabilities possessed by a firm through the
necessary skills and talents and applied knowledge to carry out the activities required by the firm. These are measured through learning, training, experience, knowledge, and skills.

2.3.1 Competency
A competency is a measurable human capability that is required for effective performance. A competency may be comprised of knowledge, a single skill or ability, a personal characteristic, or a cluster of two or more of these attributes. Competencies are the building blocks of work performance. The performance of most tasks requires the simultaneous or sequenced demonstration of multiple competencies. Competence consists of abilities to apply knowledge on practical problems (Marrelli, Tondora, & Hoge, 2005). Nkosi (2015) highlighted that competencies assist organisations to create an enabling strategy implementation atmosphere for the organisation.

Bossidy, Charan, and Burke (2012) poised that without competencies, either on the top or in the bottom of the organizational structure, even the best strategy with the best environmental factors will have limited chances of success. According to Michlitsch (2010), if employees lack the needed competencies or qualifications to enable them properly execute a company strategy, they have no room for success but will rather fail to do so. In this regard therefore maintaining competencies within organization has a significant role in successful strategy execution (Michlitsch, 2010).

Organizations also need to develop competencies for current employees through development programs such as training and development so as to endeavour to bring success to the organization. The lack of competencies is not solely attributable to lower level managers or employees. This is because even chief executive officers may not be appropriate to execute a new strategy (Kiplagat, 2014). Hrebinia (2008) opined that organizations with developed capabilities or competencies which are consistent with a chosen strategy would perform as compared to those organizations that are yet to achieve this fit between strategy and capabilities.

2.3.2 Knowledge
According to Agresti (2000), knowledge is a mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insights that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information. Knowledge is an insight derived from data, information, and observations, which is usually reflected through action.” To put it more simply, knowledge is
simply actionable information. Actionable refers to the relevant information being available in the right place and the right time, in the right context and in the right way (Goswami & Goswami, 2013).

Knowledge is created by individuals. An organization cannot create knowledge on its own without individuals. As individuals learn, they increase their human capital and create knowledge that potentially forms a foundation for organizational level learning and knowledge accumulation. Knowledge stocks provide a foundation for understanding the role of human capital as a potential source of firm’s core competencies (Choudhury & Mishra, 2010).

Several researchers have shown the importance of knowledge in the strategy implementation process. For example, Haafkes (2015) study on strategy implementation among start-ups found that only top managers (owners) had the knowledge on strategy process and this was not available to regular staff and this hindered effective strategy implementation. Similarly, Hrebiniak (2008) agrees that the lack of shared knowledge with lower-level management and non-management employees creates a barrier to successful strategy implementation. There is therefore need for organisation leadership to develop employees’ knowledge and appreciation of multiple functional areas. There is a relationship between the lack of knowledge necessary to implement the strategy among senior managers and the results achieved by the company.

2.3.3 Skills
Skills refer to the distinctive competencies of the organization; what it does best along dimensions such as people, management practices, processes, systems, technology, and customer relationships (Ngonjo & Sindani, 2013). Skills refer to the distinctive competencies of the organization; what it does best along dimensions such as people, management practices, processes, systems, technology, and customer relationships (Kaplan, 2005). The organization needs to attract employees with necessary experience, technical skills and other soft skills (Badri, Bashiri, & Hejazi, 2013). The skills need to vary depending on the type of strategy the firm is planning to implement. Organisations will not achieve its desired outcomes unless employees have the skills and abilities needed to handle the tasks and decisions at hand

Theoretical frameworks in the field of strategic management have highlighted the important role that employee skills have on strategy formulation and implementation. Waterman, Peters, and Phillips (1980) introduced the ‘The 7S’ model (strategy, structure, systems, staff, skills, style, and shared values) and stated that interconnections among these seven variables
facilitated organizational change and progress. Baroto, Arvand, and Ahmad (2014) study on strategy implementation found that skills of staff were one of the internal factors that enhanced strategy formulation. Skills meant usage of various individual’s skills or competencies to perform some activities that is essential in business process.

2.3.4 Empirical Literature
Mwatsuma, Uzel, and Sasaka (2017) assessed the determinants of effective strategy implementation in private hospitals in Mombasa County in Kenya. One of the objectives of this study was to assess the effect of human resource on effective strategy implementation of private hospitals. A descriptive cross-sectional design was adopted in this study. The study population comprised 11 private hospitals and included top management staff from four randomly selected private hospitals in Mombasa County. The study used a questionnaire to collect primary data. The results showed a positive, moderate weak relationship between human resource and strategy implementation.

Lemarleni, Ochieng, Gakobo, and Mwaura (2017) evaluated the effects of resource allocation on strategy implementation at Kenya Police Service in Nairobi County. A descriptive research design was used for the study. The study targeted a population of fifty-six police officers of the rank of Officer Commanding Police Division (OCPDs) and Officers Commanding Police Station (OCSs) all working in thirteen police divisions and forty-three police stations within Nairobi County. The data was analysed using correlation and regression analysis. The findings showed that human resources also registered strong and positive correlations with strategy implementation and had a positive and significant effect on strategy implementation.

In South Africa, Nkosi (2015) conducted a study on the factors Affecting Strategy Implementation. The study aimed at exploring factors that affect successful strategy implementation. Purposive sampling was used to select 30 senior management employees of a municipality in Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. A structured questionnaire was applied to gather data on the participants’ perceptions. The study used frequencies, descriptive statistics and Principal Component Analysis to analyse the data. The findings indicated that weak continuous professional development policies had a negative impact on strategy implementation.

Rotich and Osodo (2017) examined the influence of employee training on strategy implementation at Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission in Kenya. A descriptive survey research design was used for the study. A sample size of 103 employees and 3 regional
managers were selected through stratified random and purposive sampling methods. The study used the Karl Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient to measure the association between response and predictor variables. The result of the study showed that there existed significant positive relationship between employee level of training and strategy implementation at Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC).

Radomska (2014) examined the role of managers in effective strategy implementation. The aim of the research was to establish whether there was a relationship between individual tasks (which determines the success in the strategy implementation) and the level of effective implementation of this process, as well as to analyse the correlations between the competencies of managers and the effectiveness of the strategy implementation. The survey was conducted using the paper and pencil interview approach, and then Kendall's tau-b correlations were calculated. The sample consisted a sample of managers from 200 companies listed in prestigious rankings. The findings indicated that adequate actions taken by managers were much more important than their competencies.

Kiplagat (2014) analysed strategy implementation challenges among government parastatals in Kenya. A survey design was adopted targeting constituted Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) employees in Nairobi, from which a sample size of 120 respondents were identified through stratified sampling. Primary data was collected from the strategic managers using a combination of questionnaire and structured interviews. The results manifested a positive significant relationship between employee competencies and strategy execution at Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA).

2.4 Strategic Planning and Strategy Implementation

According to Brinkschröder (2014), strategic change needs planning as a lot of issues arise and need to be solved. Studies (Mintzberg, 1990; Miller, 1997) showed that that not more than 50% of planning strategies get executed. Successful chances of strategy implementation occurred when there is a strong team in the planning and execution as well (Alharthy, Rashid, Pagliari, & Khan, 2017). Alharty et al. opined that the involvement of management and staff during the strategy planning stage will provide the commitment from the staff during the plan execution. Furthermore, the planning will provide clear direction to decision makers and it will provide a progress status of the project/initiative with the time scale.
Rylander and Peppard (2003), a standard planning approach to the strategy implementation should be replaced by the idea of realization by instilling shared values and beliefs. Awino, Muturia, and Oeba (2012) conceptualized seven key dimensions of strategic planning, which include internal orientation, external orientation, functional integration, key personnel involvement, use of analytical techniques in planning, creativity in planning and focus on control. Sandada (2015) conceptualized the dimensions of strategic planning to include: mission and vision, environmental scanning, employee participation in the strategic planning process, time horizon of strategic planning, implementation incentives, evaluation and control, formality of strategic planning and source of information about the environment.

2.4.1 Mission and Vision
Vision and mission statements have been strongly considered as a necessary aspect of the process of strategic management for various types of organizations; whether private or public sector, profit or non-profit, multinational or a small, medium and large scale enterprise (Darbi, 2012). The most crucial step in strategic planning is formulating the vision and mission statements. Strategic planning success depends largely on the proper identification and formulation of the vision and mission statements. They add to the organizational identity (Ozden, 2011). Vision and mission statements guide all the activities of organizations and businesses. However, Papulova (2014), argued that many firms do not possess vision or mission statements; some do not know the difference between the two and some are not clear in how both statements may be defined.

2.4.2 Employee Participation
Ali (2016) opined that strategic alignment of employees’ activities throughout strategic planning process is positively impacting the outcomes of the strategic goals and organizational performance. Strategic planning processes solely involve decision making throughout the formulation and implementation stage by top management. Others suggest and call for employees’ participation and engagement. Participation in the decision-making process devotes each employee the opportunity to voice their opinions, and to share their information with other ones (Zafara, Butt, & Afzalc, 2014).

Employee involvement is a ‘softer’ pattern of participation and is asserted to be more flexible and supposes a commonality of concerns between management and employees. Employee involvement is conceiving an environment in which persons have an influence on decisions and activities that sway their jobs. It is not the goal neither is it a tool, as practiced in numerous
organizations. Rather, it is a management and authority beliefs on how persons are most enabled to assist to continuous enhancement and the ongoing achievement of their work organization (Zafara et al., 2014).

2.4.3 Environmental Scanning
Environmental scanning is defined as a management process adopted by organizations to deal with external environmental information, the products of which would assist tactical and strategic decision making. It starts from scanning needs identification and ends at information evaluation and use. The collected environmental information is filtered, interpreted and organized to formulate insights or predictions about the external environments, and then disseminated to its end users for evaluation and use (Xue, Majid, & Foo, 2010).

Wheelen & Hunger (2006, 10) put forwards that environmental scanning is the monitoring, evaluating and disseminating of information from the external and internal environments to key people within a company. The environment scanning allows the enterprise to monitor the implementation process from inside and outside the enterprise (Ivančić, Mencer, Jelenc, & Dulčić, 2017). All in all, environmental scanning (strategic analysis) provides the basis for formulating strategy on each of four possible levels: functional, business, corporate and international.

2.4.4 Evaluation and Control
Kaplan and Norton (2005) concluded that 90 % of well formulated strategies fail at the implementation stage mainly due to inadequacies in the administrative processes of strategy evaluation and control. Strategy evaluation and control is a critical component of the strategic management process in providing learning and feed forward to the strategy formulation stage; and corrective actions and feedback to the strategy implementation process (Wanjohi, 2013). Strategy evaluation and control is an integral part of an organization's strategic management process that achieves advantage in a changing environment to meet the needs of markets and to fulfil stakeholder expectations (Chaneta, 2010).

Strategic control is the process of strategy evaluation after formulation, during and after implementation that seeks to identify whether the existing strategy fits, whether it will fit in the future and whether there is need to change it. It is a critical phase in strategic management that highlights the efficiency and effectiveness of the selected strategies and plans in relation to desired outcomes. This process consists of four fundamental activities namely; fixing a performance benchmark, measurement of performance, analysing variances and taking
 corrective actions. It is on the basis of results from this phase that management may make adjustments in strategy formulation or implementation or both (Wanjohi, 2013).

2.4.5 Formality of Strategic Planning
Formality is the extent in which a strategy is deliberate, documented, communicated and time spent on planning as well as degree and involvement of participants and specifications of the process, resources and responsibilities (Gode, 2009). A formal strategic planning has also been viewed as a technique which involves the identification of future trends, threats, opportunities, and analysis of competition and diversification which may change organisational perceptions based on historical trends (Boateng, Amponsah, Akafo, & Yamoah, 2015). Johnson, Langley, Melin, and Whittington (2007) assert Mintzberg’s concern that formal systems of strategic planning can lead to misunderstanding the purposes of planning, problems in design and put into effect of strategic planning systems and strategic planning systems may fail to gain ownership of the strategy. Elaborate formality in strategy planning could lead to loss of innovativeness and authenticity as well as inflexible and time consuming plans being equated to strategy (Okwako, 2013).

2.4.6 Time Horizon of Strategic Planning
The time horizon is tightly related to the strategic objectives, because all decisions concerning the strategic objectives refer to the given time horizon. It refers to such time frames, within which the strategic objectives are achieved by performing the outlined tasks. The time horizon serves as a future frame-border, whose dimension is time. The time horizon indicated in the strategy becomes a durable future border (Soloduch-Pelc, 2015). Mitchelmore and Rowley (2013) recommend firms to lengthen their time horizon of strategic planning in order to gain better performance.

Musibau, Oluyinka, and Long (2011) found that top performing industries were more likely to plan with longer time horizons than their less successful counterparts, adopting a more proactive approach by attempting to mould the future to their best advantage through the use of scenario-planning techniques. Since uncertainty increases with the time horizon under consideration, the basis for the allocation of decision making is the time horizon for which different levels of the hierarchy are responsible: the corporate office, responsible for the longest item horizon, must focus on managing uncertainty, while operating managers must focus on delivering on commitments (Raynor, 2007).
2.4.7 Implementation Incentives
Incentives are several plans introduced by organizations to motivate individual employees and groups in the organizations. There are many approaches that recommend using such practices as involving employees in strategy development and creating financial incentives for units and employees to achieve better results during strategy implementation phase. The introduction of incentives can guide and motivate positive performance (Zeps & Ribickis, 2015). Čater and Pučko (2010) study on obstacles to strategy implementation for 172 Slovenian businesses reports the lack of adequate incentive systems as the most frequently named implementation problem by the group of companies studied. Other studies (Hrebiniak, 2008; Shah, 2005) or have highlighted their importance for successful strategy implementation.

2.4.8 Empirical Literature
In South Africa, Sandada (2015) assessed strategic planning dimensions in small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in South Africa and their relative importance and variations in selected demographic variables. A quantitative research study was used among a target population of SMEs operating in the Gauteng Province. A structured questionnaire was used by means of self-administration. Descriptive statistics, factor analysis, and Mann Whiney U tests were used to analyse the data. The findings revealed that mission and vision, formality of strategic planning and evaluation and control were the most valued factors.

In Sudan, Ali (2017) conducted a study on employees’ participation and involvement in strategic planning process (formulation and implementation) on performance for Sudanese wheat flour factories. The study was conducted among 120 employees. The study found that employees’ participation in formulating the factory mission and vision statement had an impact on organisation performance. Ndegwah (2014) evaluated the factors affecting the implementation of strategic plans in public secondary schools in Nyeri County, Kenya. The sample was made up of 66 schools’ Principals/ Deputies (32 in Mukurweini and 34 in Othaya) and an interviewer administered questionnaire was used. The data, analysed by descriptive statistical tools, showed that rewards/incentives greatly affected strategy implementation.

Mbaka and Mugambi (2014) conducted a study on the factors affecting successful strategy implementation in the Water Sector in Kenya. The study employed desktop research by reviewing existing literature, government reports, articles, websites, journals and books. The findings indicated that lack of strategy control systems in the organization, Lack of involvement of employees, and non-alignment of employee incentives with the strategy were
some of the constraints to strategy implementation. Kiehne, Ceausu, Arp, and Schüler (2017) conducted a behavioural analysis of middle management’s role in strategy implementation projects. The analysis highlights the necessity of adequate incentive systems for strategy implementation projects. The authors concluded that in order to be able to manage strategy implementation there needs to be an effective incentive structure in place to motivate managers to behave in line with organizational expectations.

2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter was presented in sections that were in line with the research questions. In each of these sections, sub variables of the independent variables were identified and discussed and an empirical literature was shown between these variables in each of the sections. The next chapter of the study presents and discusses the research approaches that the study will adopt to undertake this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the study techniques that the study used in undertaking this research. The chapter was presented in sections that include: the research design, population and sampling design, sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures, and data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Design

A research design is a systematic plan to study a scientific problem. A descriptive research design will be adopted for this study. The purpose of descriptive research is to become more familiar with phenomena, to gain new insight, and to formulate a more specific research problem or hypothesis (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Simply put, descriptive research aims to provide a picture of a situation as it naturally happens. It may be used to justify current practice and make judgment and also to develop theories. The descriptive research design was appropriate for this study as it aimed to describe the relationship between independent variables (communication, human capital, and strategic planning) and strategic implementation.

There are three types of descriptive research that a study can decide to use; observational research, case-study methods, and survey research. The study hopes to use the survey approach which seeks to gather information from respondents using a standard instrument. According to Jackson (2009), using the survey approach requires participants to answer questions administered through interviews or questionnaires. After participants answer the questions, researchers describe the responses given. A survey can either be qualitative or quantitative. Qualitative surveys collect data in an unstructured manner whereas quantitative studies use structured tools to collect information. This study adopted the quantitative survey approach to conduct this study.
3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

A population refers to the entire universe of units that a researcher intends the findings of the study to make inferences to. The target population for this study was management staff of humanitarian and corporate organizations. The study targeted management staff of United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF) and Airtel Kenya. This set of population was picked due to previous work history as well as accessibility to the organisation; the researcher wished to further understand the strategy implementation process in a structured manner.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

A sampling frame defines the members of the population who were eligible to be included in a given sample. The sampling frame of the study was 182 at UNICEF (UNICEF, 2017) and 196 at Airtel (Airtel, 2016), therefore a total of 378 management staff in both organisations as shown in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management level</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level management</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNICEF (2017); Airtel (2016)

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

In order to sample the units of analysis (management staff), stratified random sampling procedure was used. Stratified random sampling procedures allowed the researcher to categorize the sample into specific strata, in this study, these strata were based on the level of management staff in each of the organizations. Within each stratum, the respondents were selected randomly.
3.3.2.3 Sample Size

The researcher used Yamane (1967) to obtain the sample size. Based on research statistics, only 90% of managers were directly involved in strategy development; 90% confidence level and a margin of error = .10 was used to obtain the sample.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

Where

\( n \) = corrected sample size, \( N \) = population size, and \( e \) = Margin of error (MoE), \( e = 0.1 \)

This gave the total sample size of 79 managers

**Table 3.2 Sample size distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level management</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection Methods

The study used a structured questionnaire to collect data from participants. According to Jackson (2009), questionnaires quantitative method of data collection and can be used to collect information from relatively large population quickly and efficiently. Further, an online questionnaire saves time, avoids many physical barriers of face to face meeting with the respondents, and allows the respondents to participate in the study at their free time and preferred geographical location. The online questionnaire was used in this study and proved to be efficient for the managers in both the corporate and humanitarian organization.

The questionnaire had five sections; respondents’ information, communication, human capital, strategic planning, and strategy implementation. Each of the section was measured using likert scale where respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Before the actual data collection, a pilot study was conducted to improve the quality of the questionnaire.
3.5 Research Procedures

The first step of data analysis was to seek a letter of authorization from the university to collect data from the field. The researcher then made contact with the units of observation selected for this study to seek permission to interview their management staff. The researcher conducted a pilot test among the sample of the study to determine if there were any errors, misinformation, confusing statements, or any issues with the instrument. The pilot result was as follows.

Using Cronbach’s alpha, the pilot report showed all the items were reliable with Cronbach value of more than .7. Further, as indicated on table 3.3, the questions deleted or edited based on the pilot report on each of the objectives are presented. To measure the internal validity, the intraclass correlation coefficient was used. In all the objectives of study, the single measure and average measure intraclass correlation was significant (p<.000). Further, the values had minimal difference on the mean comparison on the inter-class hence the internal validity was obtained. This shows that the pilot result had positive reliability and validity output.
### Table 3. 3 Pilot Report Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Deleted/corrected question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1: Communication</strong></td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>The organization relies on external communication to assist in strategy implementation’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To what extent does communication influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2: Human Capital</strong></td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>The staff has the ability to effectively motivate employees to realize the strategy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To what extent does human capital influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3: Strategic planning</strong></td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>The organisation allocates adequate financial resources are allocated towards strategy evaluation and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To what extent does strategic planning influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4: Strategy Implementation</strong></td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>The organisation has developed plans of action for strategy execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– as the dependent variable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The organisation has allocated specific time frames for strategy implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the pilot and correction of the final questionnaire, data was collected from participants using internet platforms. In this case, Google Forms was used to administer the questionnaire to respondents. The researcher approached the human resource managers of both organizations and sought permission to collect data from their organizations by sending the link to their company managers email addresses. Each Google Form had a section that provided the respondents with the purpose of the study, ethical considerations, and instructions on how to complete the survey.
3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Data analysis refers to the process of collecting, capturing, coding, and analysing data to make inferences and conclusions about relationships or trends observed in a sample (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The first phase of data analysis was coding of the questionnaire. Coding refers to an analytical process in which data, often from interview transcripts or questionnaires, are categorized to facilitate analysis (Kothari, 2005). The data was then captured in a computer package, in this case, Microsoft Excel platform, following which the data was pasted in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 23 which was used to analyse the data.

One of the initial steps was to perform frequency distribution, which summarized the data and displays the number of the observations into distinct classes or categories for each distribution. The second step was to conduct inferential statistics which involved using correlation and multiple regression analysis to determine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Correlation analysis studies the joint variation of two or more variables for determining the amount of correlation between two or more variables. Multiple regression analysis was useful to make a prediction about the dependent variable based on its covariance with all the concerned independent variables. The multiple regression model for the study is therefore conceptualized as:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon \]

Where: 
- \( Y \) = Strategy implementation
- \( \beta_0 \) = Constant
- \( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \) and \( \beta_4 \) = Coefficients of independent variables
- \( X_1 \) = Communication
- \( X_2 \) = Human capital
- \( X_3 \) = Strategic planning
- \( \varepsilon \) = Error term

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented and discussed the research techniques that the study proposes to adopt. A descriptive research design was adopted; the sample size was established at 191 from a target population of 378. Stratified random sampling procedure was also presented and discussed in detail as the research design. The online questionnaire was the main data collection instrument.
Lastly, the data analysis framework - including descriptive and inferential statistics, was used. Chapter 4 captures the result and findings of the analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The general objective of this study was to investigate the factors affecting strategy implementation in the Kenyan humanitarian and corporate sectors. This chapter presents the research finding based on the data collected and analysed. The presentation was guided by the specific research questions of the study.

4.2 Response Rate

Using the stratified random sampling, the study sample size was 79 managers. The questionnaire was sent to all the managers randomly via email. The response rate based on the online questionnaire was 53. This gave 67.1% of response rate as indicated on Table 4.1. This indicates data was adequate for analysis since it was more than 50% response rate.

Table 4.1 Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Demographic Characteristics

The demographic information captured were: gender, nature of the organization, the management level, education level, duration worked at the organization and lastly, involvement in strategy development. The descriptive presentation of these were as follows.

4.3.1 Gender of Respondents

The number of female participated in this study were 51.6% and male were 48.4%. This indicates the number of female was slightly more than male. However, this does not mean the female were more in numbers than male in both organizations. Figure 4.1 demonstrates this.
4.3.2 Nature of the Organization

This was a comparative study and data was from two sectors. Figure 4.2 shows 63% of the respondents were working in the corporate sector while the remaining 37% were working in the humanitarian sector at the time of this data collection.

![Figure 4.2 Nature of the Organization]
4.3.3. Management Level

When asked to indicate their management level, 38.7% indicated were middle level managers, 32.3% were low level managers and only 29% were senior managers. This shows majority of the respondents were middle level managers though they were followed by other level of managers closely. This shows equal representation of the managers. Figure 4.3 shows this output.

![Management Level Pie Chart]

4.3.4 Duration Worked at the Organization

The duration worked at the organization was categorized in four year spans. When asked to indicate how long they had worked at their current organization, majority indicated 1 - 4 years at 41.9%. On decreasing level, they were followed by those who had worked for 5 - 9 years at 25.8%, 10 - 15 years at 22.6%, More than 20 years at 6.5% and lastly 16 - 19 years at 3.2%. This presents varied experience at the specific work place as indicated by figure 4.4.
4.3.5 Education Level

On the education level, more than half of the respondents were master’s degree holders (58.1%). Others level of education were as follow; first degree holders were 32.3%, PhD degree holders were 6.5% and certificate holders were 3.2%. Figure 4.5 shows this.
4.3.6 Involvement in Driving Strategy Development

The last question on demographics was on direct involvement in strategy development. The respondents were asked to indicate if they were directly involved in leading or driving the strategy development for their organization. As presented on figure 4.6, majority of the managers indicated they were, 66.7%. While the remaining 33.3% indicated they were not.

![Figure 4.6 Involvement in Strategy Development](image-url)
4.4 Descriptive Analysis of Study Variables

The descriptive statistics run to show the data distribution of both dependent and independent variables were; mean (M), standard deviation (SD), skewness (Skw) and Kurtosis (Krt). The presentation was based on each of the independent variable and lastly the dependent variables as follow.

4.4.1 Communication Factors (CM)

Communication was the first independent variable measured on the five likert scale; Where 1 = Strongly disagreed, 2 = Disagreed, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agreed, 5 = Strongly Agreed. It looked at both internal and external communication and the output were as indicated on table 4.2. None of the items under communication was ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. All the items were ranked as ‘agree’, with mean value of 4. Further, the skewness was negative and for kurtosis test, only one item ‘Specific communications tools are used by the organization to provide strategy information to stakeholders’ had value greater than one.

The presentation of the items ranked as agreed were: ‘The organisation continuously clarifies the organisation strategy to its staff’ \((M= 3.74, SD = .999)\), ‘The organisation makes efforts to communicate with staff to motivate them to implement strategy’ \((M= 3.65, SD = 1.142)\), ‘The organisation uses several mediums to communicate with staff on strategy implementation’ \((M= 3.58, SD = 0.958)\), ‘The organisation allocates adequate resources for support of internal communication’ \((M= 3.48, SD = 1.061)\), ‘The organisation has a communication plan to communicate the strategy to business stakeholders’ \((M= 3.58, SD = 0.923)\), ‘Specific communication tools are used by the organization to provide strategy information to stakeholders’ \((M= 3.65, SD = 0.915)\) an lastly, ‘The organisation uses stakeholder meetings in communicating strategy implementation’ \((M= 3.74, SD = 0.729)\).
Table 4.2 Communication Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skw</th>
<th>Std. error Skw</th>
<th>Kts</th>
<th>Std. error Kts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation continuously clarifies the organisation strategy to its staff</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>-0.661</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation makes efforts to communicate with staff to motivate them to implement strategy</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>-0.958</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation uses several mediums to communicate with staff on strategy implementation</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>-0.488</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>-0.681</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation allocates adequate resources for support of internal communication</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>-0.762</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has a communication plan to communicate the strategy to business stakeholders</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>-0.661</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific communications tools are used by the organization to provide strategy information to stakeholders</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation uses stakeholder meeting in communicating strategy implementation</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>-0.656</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Human Capital Factors (HC)

Human capital was the second independent variable measured on the five likert scale; Where 1 = Strongly disagreed, 2 = Disagreed, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agreed, 5 = Strongly Agreed. Human capital covered the competency, skills and knowledge of the managers. The output was as indicated on table 4.3. None of the items under human capital was ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. Most items were ranked as ‘agree’, with mean value of 4 and only one item SD of more than one. The skewness and kurtosis values varied.
The items ranked as ‘agreed’ with mean value of 4 were: ‘The staff and management experience in the strategy implementation is commendable’ \((M = 3.61, SD = 0.761)\), ‘The staff and management possesses the knowledge required to implement the strategy’ \((M = 3.9, SD = 0.746)\), ‘The staff has an ability to prioritize strategic issues in relation to operational issues’ \((M = 3.77, SD = 0.884)\), ‘The management provides an adequate interpretation of the strategy for implementation’ \((M = 3.48, SD = 0.996)\), ‘The management has a set of diverse skills and abilities that allow them to make strategic decisions effectively’ \((M = 3.65, SD = 0.909)\), ‘There is sharing of knowledge in the organisation for strategy implementation’ \((M = 3.65, SD = 0.95)\) and ‘There is sufficient knowledge among employees and management for strategy implementation’ \((M = 3.48, SD = 1.029)\).

Items ranked as moderate with mean value of 3 were; ‘There is sufficient transfer of knowledge in strategy implementation in the organization’ 3.42 \((M = 3.42, SD = 0.958)\), and ‘The management creates an appropriate organizational culture for implementing strategy’ 3.35 \((M = 3.35, SD = 0.95)\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skw</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>Kts</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The staff and management experience in the strategy implementation is commendable</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff and management possesses the knowledge required to implement the strategy</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff has an ability to prioritize strategic issues in relation to operational issues</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management creates an appropriate organizational culture for implementing strategy</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management provides an adequate interpretation of the strategy for implementation</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management has a set of diverse skills and abilities that allow them to make strategic decisions effectively</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sharing of knowledge in the organisation for strategy implementation</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient knowledge among employees and management for strategy implementation</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient transfer of knowledge in strategy implementation in the organization</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Strategic Planning Factors (SP)

The strategic planning was the last independent variables variable measured on the five likert scale; Where 1 = Strongly disagreed, 2 = Disagreed, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agreed, 5 = Strongly Agreed. It covered; mission and vision, formation of strategic planning and evaluation and controls. The output was as indicated on table 4.4. None of the items under strategic planning was ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. Items were ranked as ‘agree’ and as ‘neutral’ with mean value of 4 and 3. All the items were negatively skewed. The SD and kurtosis values varied.

Items ranked as ‘agreed’ with mean value of 4 were: ‘All managers and high - level staff of the organization are aware of and understand the mission’ ($M=3.97$, $SD=0.795$), ‘The organization have a written and well communicated mission statement’ ($M=3.87$, $SD=1.056$), ‘The organization follows a defined set of procedures in its strategic planning process’ ($M=3.65$, $SD=1.05$), ‘The organization clearly assigns lead responsibility for action plan implementation to a person or, alternately, to a team’ ($M=4.0$, $SD=0.816$) and ‘The organization has set clearly defined and measurable performance standards for each plan element’ ($M=3.58$, $SD=1.119$).

Items ranked as ‘neutral’ with mean value of 3 were: ‘The organisation allocates adequate financial resources are allocated towards strategy evaluation and control’ ($M=3.32$, $SD=0.945$), ‘The organization has an organized system for monitoring how well the strategy is implemented’ ($M=3.42$, $SD=1.119$), ‘The organization reviews the mission and goals in light of the apparent threats/ opportunities and strengths/ weaknesses’ ($M=3.39$, $SD=0.882$) and ‘Strategic plans and prepared at the functional level and other lower management levels’ ($M=3.29$, $SD=1.039$).
### Table 4.4 Strategic Planning Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skw</th>
<th>Std. error Skw</th>
<th>Kts</th>
<th>Std. error Kts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All managers and high-level staff of the organization are aware of and understand the mission</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has a written and well communicated mission statement</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization reviews the mission and goals in light of the apparent threats/opportunities and strengths/weaknesses</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plans are prepared at the functional level and other lower management levels</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization follows a defined set of procedures in its strategic planning process</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization clearly assigns lead responsibility for action plan implementation to a person or, alternately, to a team</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization allocates adequate financial resources towards strategy evaluation and control</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has an organized system for monitoring how well the strategy is implemented</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has set clearly defined and measurable performance standards for each plan element</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.4 Strategy Implementation Factors (SI)

The dependent variable was the strategy implementation. It was also measured on the five likert scale; Where 1 = Strongly disagreed, 2 = Disagreed, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agreed, 5 = Strongly Agreed. The output was as indicated on table 4.5. None of the items was ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. All items were ranked as ‘agree’ with mean value of 4. They were negatively skewed and only one item had more than one SD.

The output presented on the item ranked as ‘agreed’ were; ‘The organisation has developed plans of action for strategy execution’ \((M=3.94, \text{SD}=0.727)\), ‘The organisation has a champion driving the strategic implementation process’ \((M=3.77, \text{SD}=1.006)\), ‘The organisation has committed staff that strive to implement all strategies’ \((M=3.68, \text{SD}=0.945)\), ‘The organisation monitors the progress of implemented strategies’ \((M=3.8, \text{SD}=0.925)\), ‘The organisation has allocated specific time frames for strategy implementation’ \((M=3.97, \text{SD}=0.912)\) and lastly, ‘The organisation has policies and procedures in place for effective strategy execution’ \((M=3.81, \text{SD}=0.91)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. 5 Firm Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \begin{tabular}{lrrrrr}  
The organisation has developed plans of action for strategy execution & 3.94 & 0.727 & 0.1 & 0.421 & 1.014  
The organisation has a champion driving the strategic implementation process & 3.77 & 1.006 & 0.582 & 0.427 & 0.399  
The organisation has committed staff that strive to implement all strategies & 3.68 & 0.945 & 0.551 & 0.421 & 0.771  
The organisation monitors the progress of implemented strategies & 3.8 & 0.925 & 0.975 & 0.427 & 1.726  
The organisation has allocated specific time frames for strategy implementation & 3.97 & 0.912 & 0.497 & 0.421 & 0.534  
The organisation has policies and procedures in place for effective strategy execution & 3.81 & 0.91 & -1.01 & 0.421 & 1.893  
\end{tabular} |
4.5 Inferential Analysis

Inferential statistical tests carried out were divided into two; the statistical assumptions and the regression model. The statistical assumptions were; Inter-item correlation, Normality test, Multi-collinearity tests, and homostadesticity test. The regression model used was the linear regression based on the statistical assumptions. The model answers the objective of this study.

4.5.1 Correlation Coefficient

Correlation analysis was conducted to test the significant association between dependent and independent variables. As shown in table 4.6, all the variables were highly correlated and specifically the dependent to independent variables. The dependent variable ‘Strategy Implementation (SI)’ was positively correlated with ‘CM’ $r = .606, p < .05$; ‘HC’ $r = .613, p < .05$; and ‘SP’ $r = .663, p < .05$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. 6 Correlation Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.5.5 Normality Test

Skewness and kurtosis statistics were used to test the normality. Normality is positive when Skewness and kurtosis statistics are in the range -1.0 and + 1.0. As indicated on table 47, all the items are fitted the normality distribution test and the error term were also less than 1.
### Table 4. 7 Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>SI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.750</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td>-.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>-.427</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5.6 Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test was performed to determine if the values of independent variables and dependent variables had higher similarity that would affect regression model. The normal distribution of the multi-linearity value based the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is more than 1 and less than 10. From table 4.8, the values were above 1 and less than 10 hence the factors were not multi-correlated.

### Table 4. 8 VIF Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SI

### 4.5.7 Homoscedasticity Test

This test established if the dependent and independent variables have similar variance on their distribution. Using Leven statistics at .05, the output indicates that the variance was homogenous and hence fitted for regression analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.6 Regression Model

Having passed the statistical assumptions for regression analysis; normality, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity tests, linear regression model was adopted to answer the research questions of the study. Regression analysis determines the relationship, magnitude of the influence and projection of the influence of independent variable on the dependent variable based on the following research questions:

a. To what extent does communication influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

b. To what extent does human capital influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

c. To what extent does strategic planning influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

#### 4.6.1. Influence of Communication on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors

The model summary table 4.10 shows three model of interest to the study. The first model is the combined data (com), the second is the humanitarian organization (HO), and the third is the corporate organization (CO).

The result for the first model shows the value of variance, $F (1, 51) = 16.789$, p-value <.05. This shows using the linear regression, communication as the predictor can predict the rate at which strategy implementation is influenced. The value of the $R^2 = 0.367$; this shows 36.7% of strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors can be attributed to communication. The remaining 63.3% can be attributed to other factors other than communication.
For the model two covering the humanitarian organization only, the value of variance was not significant, p-value >.05. This shows communication as the predictor cannot predict the rate at which strategy implementation at the humanitarian organization is influenced.

The last model on the corporate organization shows the value of variance, F (1, 27) = 9.769, p-value <.05. This shows using the linear regression, communication as the predictor can predict the rate at which strategy implementation at corporate organization is influenced. The value of the $R^2 = 0.365$; this shows 36.5% of strategy implementation in the corporate sectors can be attributed to communication. The remaining 63.5% can be attributed to other factors other than communication.

**Table 4. 10 Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: com</td>
<td>.606(^a)</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.55982</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: HO</td>
<td>.592(^a)</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.57166</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: CO</td>
<td>.604(^a)</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.59057</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurement of ANOVA on linear regression shows whether the regression model was fit to determine the predictor than using other mean comparison such as t-test. From the ANOVA table 4.11, Model 1 (com) and model 3(CO) were fit for predicting the outcome variable since $p <.05$. For model 2 (HO), it was not fit hence other measurements and tests such as mean comparison can be used.
Table 4.11 ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: com</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.264</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.264</td>
<td>16.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9.089</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.353</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: HO</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>4.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.941</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.525</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: CO</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.407</td>
<td>9.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5.929</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.336</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SI  
b. Predictors: (Constant), CM

Table 4.12 shows the coefficient table output. For model 1 (com) and model 3 (CO), the regression weight on the coefficients model in this study was significant (p<.05).

For model 1 (com), communication influences strategy implementation positively and is significant ($\beta = .551, t = 3.644, p < .05$). An increase in communication factor by one unit leads to increase on strategy implementation by .551. Hence communication is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors.

For model 2 (HO), communication does not influence strategy implementation $p > .05$. Based on this, communication is not an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations.

For model 3 (CO), communication influences strategy implementation positively and is significant ($\beta = .524, t = 2.950, p < .05$). An increase in communication factor by one unit leads to increase on strategy implementation in corporate organizations by .524. Hence communication is an important aspect that influences strategy implementation in the corporate sectors.
**Table 4. 12 Coefficient Table.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Com</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HO</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CO</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>2.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SI

**4.6.2 Influence of Human Capital on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors**

The model summary table 4.13 shows three model of interest to the study. The first model is the combined data (com), the second is the humanitarian organization (HO), and the third is the corporate organization (CO).

The result for the first model shows the value of variance, $F (1, 51) =17.413$, $p$-value $<.05$. This shows using the linear regression, HC as the predictor can predict the rate at which strategy implementation is influenced. The value of the $R^2 = 0.375$; this shows 37.5% of strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors can be attributed to HC. The remaining 62.5% can be attributed to other factors other than HC.

For the model two covering the humanitarian organization only, the value of variance was not significant, $p$-value $>.05$. This shows HC as the predictor cannot predict the rate at which strategy implementation at the humanitarian organization is influenced.

The last model on the corporate organization shows the value of variance, $F (1, 27) =12.613$, $p$-value $<.05$. This shows using the linear regression, HC as the predictor can predict the rate at which strategy implementation is influenced. The value of the $R^2 = 0.426$; this shows 42.6% of strategy implementation in the corporate sectors can be attributed to HC. The remaining 57.4% can be attributed to other factors other than HC.
Table 4. 13 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>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>com</td>
<td>.613(^a)</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.55610</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>17.413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>.512(^a)</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.60917</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>3.195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>.653(^a)</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.56150</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>12.613</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), HC

The measurement of ANOVA on linear regression shows whether the regression model was fit to determine the predictor than using other mean comparison such as t-test. From the ANOVA table 4.14, Model 1 (com) and model 3 (CO) were fit for predicting the outcome variable since \(p<.05\). For model 2 (HO), it was not fit hence other measurements and tests such as mean comparison can be used.

Table 4. 14 ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Com</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>17.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>8.968</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>\n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HO</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>\n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. CO  | Residual | 5.360 | 27 | .315 | \n|        | Total | 9.336 | 28 | \n
\(^a\) Dependent Variable: SI

\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), HC

Table 4.15 shows the coefficient table output. For model 1 (com) and model 3 (CO), the regression weight on the coefficients model in this study was significant (\(p<.05\)). For model 1 (com), HC influences strategy implementation positively and significant (\(\beta = .611, t = 3.027, p<.05\)). An increase in HC by one unit leads to increase on strategy implementation by .611.
Hence HC is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors.

For model 2 (HO), HC does not influence strategy implementation \( p > .05 \). Based on this, HC is not an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations. For model 3 (CO), HC influences strategy implementation positively and significant \( \beta = .635, t = 2.195, p < .05 \). An increase in HC by one unit leads to increase on strategy implementation in corporate organizations by .635. Hence HC is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation corporate sectors.

**Table 4. 15 Coefficient Table.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Com</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>3.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.HO</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>1.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.CO</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>2.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: SI*

**4.6.3 Influence of Strategic Planning on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors**

The model summary table 4.16 shows three model of interest to the study. The first model is the combined data (com), the second is the humanitarian organization (HO), and the third is the corporate organization (CO).

The result for the first model shows the value of variance, \( F (1, 51) = 22.798, p\text{-value} < .05 \). This shows using the linear regression, SP as the predictor can predict the rate at which SI is influenced. The value of the \( R^2 = 0.440 \); this shows 44.0\% of SI in the humanitarian and corporate sectors can be attributed to SP. The remaining 56.0\% can be attributed to other factors other than SP.
For the model two covering the humanitarian organization only, the value of variance, F (1, 20) = 20.006, p-value < .05. This shows using the linear regression, SP as the predictor can predict the rate at which SI is influenced at the humanitarian organization. The value of the $R^2 = 0.690$; this shows 69.0% of SI in the humanitarian organizations can be attributed to SP. The remaining 31.0% can be attributed to other factors other than SP.

The last model on the corporate organization shows the value of variance, F (1, 27) = 22.767, p-value < .05. This shows using the linear regression, SP as the predictor can predict the rate at which strategy implementation is influenced. The value of the $R^2 = 0.573$; this shows 57.3% of strategy implementation in the corporate sectors can be attributed to SP. The remaining 42.7% can be attributed to other factors other than SP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: com</td>
<td>.663a</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.52640</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: HO</td>
<td>.830a</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.39499</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: CO</td>
<td>.757a</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.48453</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), SP

The measurement of ANOVA on linear regression shows whether the regression model was fit to determine the predictor than using other mean comparison such as t-test. From the ANOVA table 4.17, the regression model was fit for predicting the outcome variable since $p< .05$ in all the models.
Table 4. ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: com Regression</td>
<td>6.317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.317</td>
<td>22.798</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>8.036</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.353</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>20.006</td>
<td>.002&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: HO Regression</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>20.006</td>
<td>.002&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.525</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>22.767</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: CO Regression</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>22.767</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.991</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.336</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SI
b. Predictors: (Constant), SP

Table 4.18 shows the coefficient table output for all the models. The first model is the combined data (com), the second is the humanitarian organization (HO), and the third is the corporate organization (CO).

For model 1 (com), the regression weight on the coefficients model in this study was significant (p<.05). From the output, SP influences SI positively and significant (β = .687, t = 2.533, p<.05. An increase in SP by one unit leads to increases SI by .687. Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors.

For model 2 (HO), the regression weight on the coefficients model in this study was significant (p<.05). From the output, SP influences SI positively and significant (β = .960, t = .430, p<.05. An increase in SP by one unit leads to increases SI by .960. Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations.

For model 3 (CO), SP influences strategy implementation positively and significant (β = .789, t = 1.447, p<.05. An increase in SP by one unit leads to increase on strategy implementation in corporate organizations by .789. Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the corporate sectors.
Table 4. 18 Coefficient Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:com</td>
<td>(Constant) 1.337</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:HO</td>
<td>(Constant)  .338</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>4.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: CO</td>
<td>(Constant) .891</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SI

4.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter covered the analysis output of the data collected. The first presentation was descriptive on the response rate and the demographic information. The first objective finding indicated CM can influence SI in corporate organizations and not in humanitarian organizations. The second objective indicated HC influences SI in corporate organizations and not in humanitarian organizations. The last objective indicated SP can influence SI in both corporate and humanitarian organizations. The next chapter presents the chapter summary, discussions, and recommendations based on the research findings presented on this chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the general overview of the study as summary of the study, discussion of the findings based on chapter four (analysis results) and two (literature review) and also conclusion of the study. The recommendations for study covers the recommendations for further study and recommendation based on the output of the study.

5.2 Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors affecting strategy implementation in the Kenyan humanitarian and corporate sectors. The study was guided by the following research questions; to what extent does communication influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors? To what extent does human capital influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors? And lastly, to what extent does strategic planning influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors?

The descriptive research design was appropriate for this study as it aims to describe the relationship between independent variables (communication, human capital, and strategic planning) and strategic implementation. The population for this study were the management staff at UNICEF and different corporates in Kenya. The sample size was 79 respondents, but only 53 participated on the study by filling the online questionnaire. This gave 67.1% response rate. Data collected was cleaned, coded and analysed using SPSS version 20. The analytical approach used both descriptive and inferential analysis.

On objective one, communication (CM) was the independent variable measured on the five likert scale. It looked at both internal and external communication and none of the items were ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. All the items were ranked as ‘agree’ and the skewness was negative. The results were; ‘The organisation continuously clarifies the organisation strategy to its staff’ \((M= 3.74, SD = .999)\), ‘The organisation makes efforts to communicate with staff to motivate them to implement strategy’ \((M= 3.65, SD = 1.142)\), ‘The organisation uses several mediums to communicate with staff on strategy implementation’ \((M= 3.78, SD = 1.099)\), ‘The organisation makes efforts to communicate with staff to motivate them to implement strategy’ \((M= 3.65, SD = 1.142)\).
3.58, \( SD = 0.958 \)), ‘The organisation allocates adequate resources for support of internal communication’ (\( M= 3.48, SD = 1.061 \)), ‘The organisation has a communication plan to communicate the strategy to business stakeholders’ (\( M= 3.58, SD = 0.923 \)), ‘Specific communications tools are used by the organization to provide strategy information to stakeholders’ (\( M= 3.65, SD = 0.915 \)) an lastly, ‘The organisation uses stakeholder meeting in communicating strategy implementation’ (\( M= 3.74, SD = 0.729 \)). On the regression statistics, for model 1 (com), communication influences strategy implementation positively and significant (\( \beta = .551, t = 3.644, p<.05 \)). Hence communication is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors. For model 2 (HO), communication does not influence strategy implementation \( p>.05 \). Based on this, communication is not an important aspect that influences strategy implementation in the humanitarian organization. For model 3 (CO), communication influences strategy implementation positively and significant (\( \beta = .524, t = 2.950, p<.05 \)). Hence communication is an important aspect that influences strategy implementation in the corporate sectors.

For objective two, human capital (HC) was the second independent variable. There was no item ranked as ‘Strongly Agreed’ with mean of 5. Items ranked as ‘agreed’ with mean of 4 were: ‘The staff and management experience in the strategy implementation is commendable’ (\( M= 3.61, SD = 0.761 \)), ‘The staff and management possesses the knowledge required to implement the strategy’ (\( M= 3.9, SD = 0.746 \)), ‘The staff has an ability to prioritize strategic issues in relation to operational issues’ (\( M= 3.77, SD = 0.884 \)), ‘The management provides an adequate interpretation of the strategy for implementation’ (\( M= 3.48, SD = 0.996 \)), ‘The management has a set of diverse skills and abilities that allow them to make strategic decisions effectively’ (\( M= 3.65, SD = 0.909 \)), ‘There is sharing of knowledge in the organisation for strategy implementation’ (\( M= 3.65, SD = 0.95 \)) and ‘There is sufficient knowledge among employees and management for strategy implementation’ (\( M= 3.48, SD = 1.029 \)). Items ranked as moderate with mean value of 3 were; ‘There is sufficient transfer of knowledge in strategy implementation in the organization’ 3.42 (\( M= 3.42, SD = 0.958 \)), and ‘The management creates an appropriate organizational culture for implementing strategy’ 3.35 (\( M= 3.35, SD = 0.95 \)). On the inferential, for model 1 (com), HC influences strategy implementation positively and significant (\( \beta = .611, t = 3.027, p<.05 \)). Hence HC is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors. For model 2 (HO), HC does not influence strategy implementation \( p>.05 \). Based on this, HC is not an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations. For model 3 (CO), HC
influences strategy implementation positively and significant \( \beta = .635, \ t = 2.195, \ p<.05 \). Hence HC is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the corporate sectors.

The last objective, Strategic Planning (SP) was the independent variable. None of the items under strategic planning was ranked as ‘strongly agree’ with mean value of 5. Items were ranked as ‘agree’ and as ‘neutral’ with mean value of 4 and 3. Items ranked as ‘agreed’ with mean value of 4 were: ‘All managers and high - level staff of the organization are aware of and understand the mission’ \( (M=3.97, \ SD= 0.795) \), ‘The organization have a written and well communicated mission statement’ \( (M=3.87, \ SD= 1.056) \), ‘The organization follows a defined set of procedures in its strategic planning process’ \( (M=3.65, \ SD = 1.05) \), ‘The organization clearly assigns lead responsibility for action plan implementation to a person or, alternately, to a team’ \( (M=4.0, SD=0.816) \) and ‘The organization has set clearly defined and measurable performance standards for each plan element’ \( (M=3.58, \ SD= 1.119) \). Items ranked as ‘neutral’ with mean value of 3 were: ‘The organisation allocates adequate financial resources are allocated towards strategy evaluation and control’ \( (M=3.32, SD=0.945) \), ‘The organization has an organized system for monitoring how well the strategy is implemented’ \( (M=3.42, SD= 1.119) \), ‘The organization reviews the mission and goals in light of the apparent threats/ opportunities and strengths/ weaknesses’ \( (M=3.39, \ SD= 0.882) \) and ‘Strategic plans and prepared at the functional level and other lower management levels’ \( (M=3.29, \ SD= 1.039) \).

For model 1 (com), the regression weight on the coefficients model in this study was significant \( (p<.05) \). From the output, SP influences SI positively and significant \( \beta = .687, \ t = 2.533, \ p<.05 \). Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors. For model 2 (HO), the regression weight on the coefficients model in this study was significant \( (p<.05) \). From the output, SP influences SI positively and significant \( \beta = .960, \ t = .430, \ p<.05 \). Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations. For model 3 (CO), SP influences strategy implementation positively and significant \( \beta = .789, \ t = 1.447, \ p<.05 \). Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the corporate sectors.
5.3. Discussion

5.3.1. Influence of Communication on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors

From the regression model, communication positively influence SI; \( F(1, 51) = 16.789 \), p-value <.05. The value of the \( R^2 = 0.367 \); this shows 36.7% of strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors can be attributed to communication. The remaining 63.3% can be attributed to other factors other than communication. Similarly, for the coefficient, communication influences strategy implementation positively and significant \( (\beta = .551, t = 3.644, p<.05). \)

For the model two covering the humanitarian organization only, the value of variance was not significant, p-value >.05. For the coefficient, the result showed communication does not influence strategy implementation \( p>.05. \) Based on this, communication is not an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations.

For model three covering the corporate organization model only, the value of variance, \( F(1, 27) = 9.769 \), p-value <.05. The value of the \( R^2 = 0.365 \); this shows 36.5% of strategy implementation in the corporate sectors can be attributed to communication. On the coefficient output, communication influences strategy implementation positively and significant \( (\beta = .524, t = 2.950, p<.05). \) Hence communication is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the corporate sectors.

The importance of communication has been discussed and agreed among practitioners as an important aspect that keeps the organization moving on day to day basis. According to Elving (2005), meaningful communication has several impacts on the strategy. First, communication informs the employee of the strategy, it educates the employees at all levels on the strategy and lastly, communication motivates employees to support the strategy. The importance of communication on this supports the results of the findings that communication is an important factor that influence strategy implementation in both corporate and humanitarian organization as depicted on model one.

While the internal communication limits the communication within the internal systems, “communication with employees internally within the organization” (Cornelissen, 2008), it facilitates the understanding of the strategy within the internal systems of the organization. Internal communication information transmitted up, down, horizontal and diagonal in the
organizational structure (Vercic, Vercic, & Sriramesh, 2012). This means with proper internal communication channels, the strategy will be communicated and implemented whether formally or informally; while the absence of proper internal communication affects the communication of strategy - hence the implementation will be poor. Researchers have shown that internal communication is crucial for efficient work in any organization, and is becoming a source of competitive advantage (Tankosic et al., 2017). Such competitive aspect is achieved for successful business and good interpersonal relationship. The prerequisite for successful external communication is well ordered internal communication (Meng & Pan, 2012). Based on the result, the first model shows that communication influences SI in both corporate and humanitarian organizations. However, for model two, communication does not influence SI this means the channel of communication in not complete internally or externally within the humanitarian organization. This is supported by Meg and Pan (2012) statement ‘cannot expect any kind of positive activity into our company if we don't have good communication flow inside of company.’

On the other hand, external communication is bringing information from outside into the organization and out of it. External communication consists of the interactive process of exchanging information with market including every company which a firm interacts with (Tankosic, Ivetic, & Mikelic, 2017). Similar to internal communication, clear communication externally builds on effective implementation of strategy. According to Wilcox and Cameron (2010) and Acqui (2007), external communication can be distinguished into promotional, strategies, or operational. Promoting strategy as external communication method is useful on the implementation of the strategy while the operational controls day to day activities. Organizations constantly exchange messages with strategic partners such as customers, suppliers, distributors, competitors, investors, journalists, representatives of state structures and others (Tankosic et al., 2017). External communication is aimed at creating a favourable point of view among stakeholders on which the company depends (Oliver, 2008). Hence the implementation of organization strategy is greatly influenced by this communication.

Research by Olang (2015) on African women in agricultural research and development in Kenya found out there was a positive and significant association between communication and strategy implementation whilst the regression analysis indicated that an increase in communication resulted to a sportive and significant increase in strategy implementation. Similarly, Mutisya (2016) research found out that communication media, communication
channels, and communication flow had a positive and significant effect on strategy implementation.

5.3.2. Influence of Human Capital on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors

The result for the first model shows the value of variance, $F(1, 51) = 17.413$, p-value < .05. The value of the $R^2 = 0.375$; this shows 37.5% of strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors can be attributed to HC. On the coefficient output, HC influences strategy implementation positively and significant ($\beta = .611$, $t = 3.027$, $p < .05$). Hence HC is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian and corporate sectors.

For the model two covering the humanitarian organization only, the value of variance was not significant, p-value > .05. The coefficient output model shows HC does not influence strategy implementation $p > .05$. Based on this, HC is not an important aspect to influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations.

The last model on the corporate organization shows the value of variance, $F(1, 27) = 12.613$, p-value < .05. The value of the $R^2 = 0.426$; this shows 42.6% of strategy implementation in the corporate sectors can be attributed to HC. The coefficient output shows, HC influences strategy implementation positively and significant ($\beta = .635$, $t = 2.195$, $p < .05$). Hence HC is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the corporate sector.

Pryor, Anderson, Toombs, and Humphreys (2007) poised that people are the key strategic resource in any organization and organizations need to effectively utilize the know-how of their employees at the right places. Based on this, for the strategy to be fully implemented, the organization needs to allocate available resources for their most useful tasks as well as coordinating and integrating activities of participating employees and functions. Such resources can be processes that relate to training, education and other professional initiatives in order to increase the level of knowledge, skills, abilities, values, and social assets of an employee - which will lead to the employee’s satisfaction and performance, and eventually on a firm performance (Marimuthu et al., 2009). Such skills are key and determines an organization’s capabilities and capacity to fully implement a strategy. In short, managers leverage the firm’s human capital to engage the organizational capabilities in ways that are designed to implement the firm’s strategy (Greer, Lusch, & Hitt, 2016). It is clear HC is a key aspect that influences strategy implementation in organizations.
The result indicated HC influences strategy implementation at the corporate sector and not at the humanitarian sector. Researchers who have studied HC at the corporate sector found that competency may be comprised of knowledge, a single skill or ability, a personal characteristic, or a cluster of two or more of these attributes. Such competencies are the building blocks of work performance of most tasks that requires the simultaneous or sequenced demonstration of multiple competencies (Marrelli, Tondora, & Hoge, 2005; Nkosi, 2015).

However, this also applies to the humanitarian organization which indicated HC does not affect SI. Research shows lack of competitive HC affects SI in any organization. Bossidy and Charan (2012) poised that without HC either on the top or in the bottom of the organizational structure, even the best strategy with the best environmental factors will have limited chances of success. According to Michlitsch (2010), if employees lack the needed competencies or qualifications to enable them properly execute a company strategy, they have no room for success but will rather fail to do so. In this regard therefore maintaining competencies within organization has a significant role in successful strategy execution (Michlitsch, 2010). The lack of competencies is not solely attributive to lower level managers or employees. This is because even chief executive officers may not be appropriate to execute a new strategy (Kiplagat, 2014). However, other researchers opined that organizations with developed capabilities or competencies which are consistent with a chosen strategy would perform as compared to those organizations that are yet to achieve this fit between strategy and capabilities. Similarly, Hrebiniak (2008) agrees that the lack of shared knowledge with lower-level management and non-management employees creates a barrier to successful strategy implementation. This shows organization can have competitive HC but with flowed internal process, HC may not the effective on strategy implementation.

Research by Mwatsuma, Uzel, and Sasaki (2017) found out positive, moderate weak relationship between human resource and strategy implementation. Lemarleni, Ochieng, Gakobo, and Mwaura (2017) study findings showed that human resources also registered strong and positive correlations with strategy implementation and had a positive and significant effect on strategy implementation. In South Africa, Nkosi (2015) study found out weak continuous professional development policies had a negative impact on strategy implementation. These research findings were correlational to this research finding; HC affects SI in organizations.
5.3.3. Influence of Strategic Planning on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors

The result for the first model shows the value of variance, $F (1, 51) = 22.798$, $p$-value $< .05$. The value of the $R^2 = 0.440$; this shows 44.0% of SI in the humanitarian and corporate sectors can be attributed to SP. From the output, SP influences SI positively and significant ($\beta = .687$, $t = 2.533$, $p < .05$). An increase in SP by one unit leads to increases SI by .687. Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in both the humanitarian and corporate sectors.

For the second model, on humanitarian organization only, the value of variance, $F (1, 20) = 20.006$, $p$-value $< .05$. The value of the $R^2 = 0.690$; this shows 69.0% of SI in the humanitarian organizations can be attributed to SP. From the output, SP influences SI positively and significant ($\beta = .960$, $t = .430$, $p < .05$). An increase in SP by one unit leads to increases SI by .960. Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the humanitarian organizations.

The last model on the corporate organization shows the value of variance, $F (1, 27) = 22.767$, $p$-value $< .05$. The value of the $R^2 = 0.573$; this shows 57.3% of strategy implementation in the corporate sectors can be attributed to SP. For the regression output, SP influences strategy implementation positively and significant ($\beta = .789$, $t = 1.447$, $p < .05$). An increase in SP by one unit leads to increase on strategy implementation in corporate organizations by .789. Hence SP is an important aspect that influence strategy implementation in the corporate sectors.

Strategic planning is the key aspect for strategy implementation. Awino, Muturia, and Oeba (2012) looked at strategic planning on dimensions; internal orientation, external orientation, functional integration, key personnel involvement, use of analytical techniques in planning, creativity in planning and focus on control. Similarly, Sandada (2015) conceptualized the dimensions of strategic planning to include: mission and vision, environmental scanning, employee participation in the strategic planning process, time horizon of strategic planning, implementation incentives, evaluation and control, formality of strategic planning and source of information about the environment. While this implies the importance of strategy, according to Brinksschröder (2014), strategic change needs planning as a lot of issues arise and need to be solved. Studies (Mintzberg, 1990; Miller, 1997) showed that there were not more than 50% of planning strategies that get executed. Successful chances of strategy implementation occurred
when there is a strong team in the planning and execution as well (Alharthy, Rashid, Pagliari, & Khan, 2017).

Vision and mission statements have been strongly considered as a necessary aspect of the process of strategic management for various types of organizations; whether private or public sector, profit or non-profit, multinational or a small, medium and large scale enterprise (Darbi, 2012). The most crucial step in strategic planning is formulating the vision and mission statements. Strategic planning success depends largely on the proper identification and formulation of the vision and mission statements. They add to the organizational identity (Ozden, 2011). Vision and mission statements guide all the activities of organizations and businesses. Ali (2016) opined that strategic alignment of employees’ activities throughout strategic planning process is positively impacting the outcomes of the strategic goals and organizational performance. Strategic planning processes solely involve decision making throughout the formulation and implementation stage by top management. Others suggest and call for employees’ participation and engagement. Participation in the decision-making process devotes each employee the opportunity to voice their opinions, and to share their information with other ones (Zafara, Butt, & Afzalc, 2014).

In South Africa, Sandada (2015) assessed strategic planning dimensions in small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in South Africa and their relative importance and variations in selected demographic variables. The findings revealed that mission and vision, formality of strategic planning and evaluation and control were the most valued factors. In Sudan, Ali (2017) conducted a study on employees’ participation and involvement in strategic planning process. The study found that employees’ participation in formulating the factory mission and vision statement had an impact on organisation performance. Another study by Mbaka and Mugambi (2014) on factors affecting successful strategy implementation in the Water Sector in Kenya found out that lack of strategy control systems in the organization, lack of involvement of employees, and non-alignment of employee incentives with the strategy were some of the constraints to strategy implementation. This researches supports the finding that SP affects SI in both corporate and humanitarian organizations.
5.4. Conclusions

5.4.1. Influence of Communication on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors
The findings show that communication can influence strategy implementation in corporate organizations and not in humanitarian organizations. The study concludes that communication is an important factor in all the organizations. On comparison based on type of organization, communication is an important factor that influences strategy implementation at corporate organizations. However, it is not an important factor that influences strategy implementation in humanitarian organizations.

5.4.2. Influence of Human Capital on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors
The findings show that human capital can influence strategy implementation in corporate organizations and not in humanitarian organizations. The study concludes that human capital is an important factor in all the organizations. On comparison based on type of organization, human capital is an important factor that influences strategy implementation in corporate organizations. However, it is not an important factor that influences strategy implementation in humanitarian organization.

5.4.3. Influence of Strategic Planning on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors
The findings show that strategic planning can influence strategy implementation in both corporate and humanitarian organizations. The study concludes the strategic planning is an important factor in both types of organizations. On comparison based on type of organization, strategic planning is an important factor that influences strategy implementation in organizations within both the corporate and humanitarian sector.
5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1. Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.5.1. Influence of Communication on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors
The study recommends policy development on communication regarding strategy implementation in corporate organizations. The study recommends an evaluation of the communication strategies currently used by humanitarian organizations; if these are not yet in place, it is recommended that the organizations develop specific communication strategies that will directly contribute to improved strategy implementation for the humanitarian sector.

5.5.5.2. Influence of Human Capital on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors
The study recommends an evaluation of human capital at humanitarian organizations so as to understand why human capital is not of significant influence in strategy implementation; this evaluation can consider the factors reviewed for this study. For corporate organizations, the study recommends evaluation and subsequent policy formulation; this will ensure that influence of human capital on strategy implementation is improved and harnessed to the maximum to the advantage of the organization.

5.5.5.3. Influence of Strategic Planning on Strategy Implementation in the Humanitarian and Corporate Sectors
The study recommends continuous review of strategic planning; with significant output results from the study, reinforcing the strategic planning factors within the organization will further contribute to strategy implementation. Further, there is need for policy stipulation to ensure that developed strategies are implemented to the letter in both corporate and humanitarian organizations.

5.5.2. Recommendations for Further Research
The research found communication and human capital not to be influential on strategy implementation at the humanitarian organization. It calls for further research on communication and human capital at the humanitarian organizations using qualitative method for detail understanding of these factors. Further studies should also be done on other humanitarian organizations, and not limited to UNICEF.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTER

Dear Respondent,

I am a Masters student at the United States International University - Africa pursuing a Global Master’s in Business Administration (MBA). I have designed a questionnaire to gather information on FACTORS AFFECTING STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION IN THE HUMANITARIAN AND CORPORATE SECTORS IN KENYA. Your organisation and you have been randomly selected to participate in this study. I request you to assist me by answering the questions in the questionnaire as accurately as you can.

Kindly note that any information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality and at no time will it be used for any other purpose other than for this project. Your name will also not be used in this research but rather the research number given to you by the researcher. Your assistance is highly appreciated. I look forward to your favorable response. Please tick as appropriate.

Yours Faithfully,

Mark Bonyo

Email: mark.bonyo@gmail.com

Phone No: +254 722 990371

Student ID. 642944
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1: Respondents’ Information

1. Kindly indicate your management level at your organisation?
   - Senior Management ( )
   - Middle level management ( )
   - Low level management ( )

2. How many years have you been at this organisation?
   - 1 -4 Years ( )
   - 5 to 9 years ( )
   - 10 to 15 years ( )
   - 16 to 19 years ( )
   - More than 20 years ( )

3. Please indicate your education level?
   - Certificate ( )
   - Diploma ( )
   - First Degree holder ( )
   - Masters ( )
   - PhD degree ( )

Section 2: Communication

The following statements refer to the internal and external communication association with strategy implementation. Please indicate to what extent you agree with these statements. Where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=moderately agree, 4=agree, 5=strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation continuously clarifies the organisation strategy to its staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation makes efforts to communicate with staff to motivate them to implement strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation uses several mediums to communicate with staff on strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation allocates adequate resources for support of internal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### External communication

| The organisation has a communication plan to communicate the strategy to business stakeholders |
| Specific communications tools are used by the organization to provide strategy information to stakeholders |
| The organisation uses stakeholder meeting in communicating strategy implementation |
| The organisation relies on external communication to assist in strategy implementation |

### Section 3: Human Capital

The following statements refer to human capital factors in your organisation. Please indicate to what extent you agree with these statements. Where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=moderately agree, 4=agree, 5=strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human capital factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff and management experience in the strategy implementation is commendable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff has the ability to effectively motivate employees to realize the strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff and management possesses the knowledge required to implement the strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff has an ability to prioritize strategic issues in relation to operational issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management creates an appropriate organizational culture for implementing strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management provides an adequate interpretation of the strategy for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management has a set of diverse skills and abilities that allow them to make strategic decisions effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The is sharing of knowledge in the organisation for strategy implementation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient knowledge among employees and management for strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient transfer of knowledge in strategy implementation in the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Strategic planning

The following statements refer to strategic planning factors in your organisation. Please indicate your level of agreement with these statements. Where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=moderately agree, 4=agree, 5=strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission and vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All managers and higher-level staff are aware of the mission and understand it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization have a written and well communicated mission statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization reviews the mission and goals in light of the apparent threats/ opportunities and strengths/ weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality of strategic planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plans and prepared at the functional level and other lower management levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization follows a defined set of procedures in its strategic planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization clearly assigns lead responsibility for action plan implementation to a person or, alternately, to a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation allocates adequate financial resources are allocated towards strategy evaluation and control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has an organized system for monitoring how well the strategy is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The organization has set clearly defined and measurable performance standards for each plan element

Section 5: Strategy implementation
The following statements refer to the process of strategy formulation in your organisation. Please indicate your level of agreement with these statements. Where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=moderately agree, 4=agree, 5=strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has develop plans of action for strategy execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has a champion driving the strategic implementation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has committed staff that strive to implement all strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation monitors the progress of implemented strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has allocated specific time frames for strategy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has policies and procedures in place for effective strategy execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3: SAMPLE SIZE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>