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ABSTRACT

The general objective of the study was to investigate the influence of effective strategic management practices on the organization’s access to donor funding. The study pursued three specific objectives, viz.; to find out the influence of strategic formulation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding, to scrutinize the sway of strategy implementation on a firm’s ability to access donor funding, and to investigate the influence of strategy evaluation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding.

This study used the descriptive research design. The population that was targeted for this study was managers of four selected NGOs. The chosen sample size consisted of 34 managers. The researcher used the stratified sampling and deployed structured interview schedules to gather relevant information from the managers of the identified NGOs. The data collected was data was treated using SPSS version 21. Through descriptive statistics, the researcher summarized the data into frequency tables, pie charts bar graphs and cross-tabulations, and through the inferential statistics the researcher provided more in-depth analysis of the data through correlations and ANOVA.

As per the first objective it found that effective strategy formulation, lack of ambiguities in running the organization, presence of a formalized central planning, the organizations ability to match resources to opportunities, organizational performance, having vision and principal policies, organizations’ transparency, ability to conduct effective environment scanning and its ability to deliver on its commitments to donors were critical factors influencing an organization’s access to donor funding. In relation to the second objective, it established that strategy implementation, organizational culture, effective leadership traits, organizations ability to operate in a dynamic environment, ability of managers to adopt an executive role, organizations shared values with (potential) donors, organizational reputation and ability to identify strategic priorities all affected organizational access to donor funding.

In relation to the third objective, it found that an organization’s ability to re-align its resources towards attainment of stated goals, its ability to achieve efficiency in its
performance, its ability to attain a competitive advantage, the organization’s ability to 
realize its stated objectives, its ability to maintain a good operational and financial 
health and the effectiveness of its overall strategy evaluation were important factors 
influencing organizational access to donor funding.

This study concludes that strategy formulation affects the manner in which donors 
consider an organization to have clear short and long-term objectives. It also 
concludes that strategy implementation influences donor funding access as it is a 
critical phase in the development of any organization. Additionally, it concludes that 
strategy evaluation has significant influence on organizational access to donor funding 
as it demonstrates to the donors, the organization’s ability to monitor progress and 
make necessary adjustments to attain stated goals. It recommends that he managers of 
the NGOs operating in Kenya should acknowledge the effect that effective strategy 
formulation, implementation and evaluation has on their access to donor funding. It 
also recommends that further studies should be conducted to examine how donors 
perceive strategic practices by organizations and the extent to which this affects their 
funding of organizations.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Literature across the board attempts to define strategic management as a procedure that enables an organization to arrive at managerial decisions and actions that are necessary in reaching high levels of efficiency, effectiveness and overall performance of the organization as it works to deliver its mandate. Actually, a majority of strategic management scholars view it as a process that starts with the analysis of environments within which an organization operates in, then moves to strategy formulation, then strategy implementation and finally strategy evaluation (Allison & Kaye, 2005; David, 2009; Morden, 2007; Pitts & Lei, 2003; Thompson, Jr. & Strickland III, 2014; Wheelen & Hunger; 1998; Wheelen & Hunger, 2006; Wright, McMah, McCormick & Sherman., 1998).

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) benefit remarkably from strategic management practices (Bryson & Roering, 1988). This could be because of the work undertaken by NGOs including providing services to beneficiaries who dwell in environments faced with challenges that are complex, risky at a time of dwindling funding to NGOs by benefactors or donors. This is emphasized further by Lewis (2003) who states that NGOs operate in dangerous, unstable, conflict-prone areas and alongside predatory or ‘failing’ states which may view their presence with suspicion. Without practicing strategic management, NGOs would find it difficult to define their path, think a way through it and deal with rising challenges that only precise strategic approaches can cure (Koteen, 1997).

The significance of effective strategic management practices is further emphasized by writers such as Stone, Bigelow & Crittenden (1999) who compare the correlation between practicing effective strategic management to organizations’ ability to access donor funding. Access to funds or fundraising efficiency is a valid indicator for measuring the financial strength and effectiveness as well as efficiency of service delivery by NGOs. Though the ability to acquire funds is a great plus for most organizations, a comprehensive measurement of NGOs’ financial performance should
combine NGOs declaration of their financial activities and their display of financial pellucidity or limpidity (Keating & Frumkin, 2003).

As Bryson and Roering (1988) assert, in spite of the various differences between NGOs, most of these organizations share a common predicament. Lack of resources which in effect limits the quantity and quality of the important work that they do to serve their beneficiary communities. Managers of NGOs are therefore faced with many unanswered questions that try to find the answer to improving their organization’s ability to access donor funding. They are often forced to pay more attention to finding funds as they do to using the same funds.

In the last two decades, NGOs have increasingly taken the front seat in driving international development, raising their profile as shapers of development policy, facilitating planning and implementation of humanitarian as well as long-term development interventions (Lewis, 2003). Currently, up to 20% of aid support to developing countries is routed through NGOs. Bryson and Roering (1988) posit that funds meant for emergency response still account for a significant portion of total aid though this does not negate the fact that NGOs still control a substantial amount of resources sent to developing countries by their development partners.

The substantial amount of funds channeled through the NGOs have led to calls from many quarters recommending that NGOs not only position themselves as valid alternatives to government projects, but that they also adopt strong management practices due to the rising responsibilities (Bryson & Roering, 1988). It is essential for NGOs to embrace practices that improve their level of service delivery. They need to embrace values held high in management such as integrity, accountability and application of limited resources to achieve great outcomes. NGOs need to focus more on long term strategic approach to management in order to effectively achieve their desired goals if they are to provide worthwhile alternative and play the much-touted role of supplementing government activity in development.

NGOs need to amplify their efforts towards improving on both fronts (Lewis, 2003). This has been opined by some scholars to be possible by adoption of ‘strategy’ and ‘strategic management’. While these two are not completely synonymous, they could
provide NGOs the le way to improving both management and leadership aspects of their operations. Strategic management is the name of an academic field of study while strategy is the main topic of study.

According to Chafee (1985), strategy is multi-dimensional and situational which allows for dynamic improvement of how organizations approach their day-to-day delivery of services. Literature further points that different opinions on strategy can well be categorized within three models namely; adaptive, linear and interpretative. Whichever way we look at strategy, some of the typical problems that been associated with NGOs include lack of knowledge on management practices within the organizations (Aksel and Baran, 2006).

Access to funding is critical for an organization’s survival as described by Bowman (2011) who states that access to donor funding is the base for financial sustainability which in turn is the ability of an NGO to maintain its financial capacity over a prearranged period. On the other hand, Renz (2010) defines financial sustainability as the ability of an NGO to access resources that in turn allow it continued operations even after donors cut funding. The pecuniary sustainability and the survival of an NGO largely depend on its ability to source for and access funding from donor agencies (Renz, 2010). Literature suggests that there are NGOs in the world, which have collapsed due to lack of access to funding.

Alymkulova and Seipulnik (2005) delve that NGOs are unable to sustain and finance their activities when they lack access to funding as they become financially unstable and in effect attract a situation of further reduction in funding by any other existing donors. Though the need to diversify income and remain sustainable financially is fronted by scholars like Renz (2010) who reports that 52% of NGOs in USA which underwent funding cuts due to the economic down turn in the country have resorted to changing their resource mobilization techniques, access to donor funding remains the main source of financial resource remains the main source of income for local NGOs.

According to a study conducted by USAID (2010) on 19 Sub-Saharan African countries, only 6.2% of the NGOs in Africa had continuous access to funding and were consequently financially viable. The study went on to conclude that local
smaller local NGOs provided outstanding service delivery, but were incapacitated due to limited donor funding a situation made worse by their overreliance on external donors as their main and in most cases only source of funding. The study further found that a good number of local NGOs in Africa were found to be weak and unable to compete with international NGOs for donor funding and ended up depending on sub-contracts to be able to meet their funding needs.

The number of NGOs in Kenya has continued to grow and according to the NGO Coordination Board (NGOCB) (2017) there were approximately 10,374 NGOs operating in Kenya. In 2017, the sector contributed Kshs. 120 billion to the Kenyan economy. Karanja and Karuti (2014) indicate in the findings of their study that a majority of NGOs in Nairobi face great funding challenges that are coupled with unreliable sources of funding and are in most cases unable to meet the stringent measures set by donors in accessing the funds. Nairobi County is the capital of Kenya is home to about 374 national, regional and international NGOs registered so far (NGO Coordination Board, 2017).

Some of these NGOs are headquartered in Nairobi while many others have branch offices in the neighboring Kiambu County and this enables them to maintain close proximity to Nairobi City. According to NGOCB (2017), many local NGOs in Nairobi face closure due to poor access to donor funding which has given rise to financial sustainability fears and concerns. More significantly is the fact that NGOs headquartered in Nairobi face significant challenges accessing funding locally leaving external funding as the sole source available to a majority of the organizations. There is need for studies to investigate the factors affecting NGOs access to funds in Nairobi County.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The inability to access donor funds by most NGOs is of great concern to all stakeholders and this is not an exception to the NGOs in Nairobi. Problematic is that without proper funding, NGOs will always find it difficult to deliver on their mandate. However, can practicing strategic management be the missing link between NGOs and their donor funding access? The performance of an organization as a variable is
challenging to measure since NGOs mainly aim to promote a social mission (Drucker, 2010; McHatton, Bradshaw, Gallagher & Reeves, 2011).

Additionally, NGOs work in environments defined by relationships that are hard to understand as they intertwine between complicated beneficiary needs, complex activities and sometimes unclear outcomes in their interventions (Fottler, 1981; Hatten, 1982; Kanter & Summers, 1994). Traditionally, NGOs’ access to donor funds has been used as the main indicator of performance (Pfeffer & Salancik; 1978) as it is taken that donors undertake great effort to ensure that they only fund effective and efficient organizations.

There is a knowledge gap with regard to studies conducted to establish the direct link between strategic management practices and increased access to donor funding by NGOs. While some organizations do well in accessing donor funding, many continue to struggle. When organizations don’t access donor funding they are likely not to meet their objectives this means that their beneficiaries will likely have to endure the conditions from which these NGOs seek to provide services for. Conversely, this study will not limit its scope to NGOs ability of acquiring funds but instead will undertake a comprehensive measurement of NGOs’ financial accountability (Keating & Frumkin, 2003), together with their fundraising ability as collective indicators of success

1.3 General Objective

The general objective of the study was to investigate the influence of effective strategic management practices on the organization’s access to donor funding.

1.4 Specific Objectives

1.4.1 To find out the influence of strategy formulation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding;
1.4.2 To examine the influence of strategy implementation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding;
1.4.3 To investigate the influence of strategy evaluation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding;
1.5 Significance of the Study
This study may benefit government, international and National NGOs. The research supports, enriches and fills the gaps in understanding the influence of strategic practices on access to donor funding.

1.5.1 Epistemological Significance
The study may contribute to literature on the influence of strategic practices to access to donor funding and identify new areas of research. It provides information that may add to the current literature on strategic practices including the processes of strategy formulation, implementation and evaluation. In so doing this study may help in the understanding of how these practices affect how NGOs are perceived by donors. This study may further contribute to extant body of literature on donor funding and what factors affect access to such funds.

1.5.1 Non-Governmental Organizations
The study stands to generate awareness among local NGOs on the significance of practicing effective strategic management practices as a means to increase Organizational performance and in turn increase access to donor funding. It may equip NGOs (especially those operating in Kenya) with information that may help them increase their access to donor funding. It may also equip the NGOs with trends in the sector and what other firms are doing well or wrong with regards to access to donor funding and which may inform how they manage their internal management practices and processes to increase their standing before donors.

1.5.2 NGOs Management Staff
The study may assist senior management staff and directors of NGOs in Nairobi to understand the importance of strategic practices on organizational performance and access to donor funding and understand how strategic plans in place can be improved to enhance organizational performance and in turn access donor funding. It may add to the existing understanding of the top-leadership and management of NGOs of how strategic practices affect how they are perceived by donors and how these affect their access to donor funding. Hence, this study can help the NGOs maneuver their managerial practices to enhance their chances for accessing donor funding.
1.5.3 Policy Makers

The study may help identify gaps in management that hinder organizations from not accessing donor funding. The Government and NGO Board require organizations that are effective and can raise funds to achieve their objectives.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study is limited to National and International NGOs operative in Nairobi County - Kenya in different sectors. These organizations covered in the study were selected on the basis of their experience and size. The study focused on organizations that have been in existence for the past 5 years and have personnel of not less than 20 staff members. This study used quantitative methods of data collection and was conducted over a period of three months between December 2018 and February 2019.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)

NGOs are generally defined as associations, charities, and other voluntary institutions designed to further public, social or cultural service (Bottiglieri, Kroleski & Conway, 2011).

1.7.2 Strategy

It is the pattern or plan that integrates an organization’s major goals, policies and action sequence into a cohesive whole (Mintzeberg & Quinn, 1991).

1.7.3 Strategic Management

According to Nag, Hambrick and Chen (2007), and as applied in this study, strategic management is conceived as the formulation and implementation of key goals and activities that are undertaken by the firm’s top-level managers on behalf of stakeholders, on the basis of resource considerations and evaluation of the firm’s external and internal competitive environment.

1.7.4 Strategic Planning

Mintzberg and Quinn (1991) conceives strategic planning as a firm process that involves defining the firm’s key strategy and direction, as well as decision-making on resource distribution to pursue the stated strategy.
1.7.5 Strategic Implementation
Aaltonen and Ikavalko (2011) define strategic implementation as a process by which policies and strategies are implemented through procedures, budgets and development programs. It is the process that turns strategies and plans into actions to accomplish strategic goals and objectives.

1.7.6 Strategic Evaluation
Strategy evaluation is the assessment strategy implementation process that provides executives and managers performance information about program, projects and activities designed to meet organization goals and objectives (Ackerman & Eden 2011).

1.8 Chapter Summary

Chapter one has provided the setting or background of the study. Intrinsically, this chapter has provided the background of the problem. It has stated the general objective that this study would seek to achieve and identified three specific objectives that were pursued in order to achieve the stated general objective. Chapter one has further discoursed the implication of this study. The scope has also been clarified.

Chapter two encompasses the literature review. The goal of reviewing the literature was to establish familiarity with the concepts of focus and to highlight, compare and analyze what previous studies and scholars have found relating to the objectives that this study sought to realize.

Chapter three explains the research methodology. It explains the research design that was used, and describes the target population for this study. Chapter three also explains the sampling technique that was used, the method of data collection that was deployed in this study and the research procedure that the researcher used to conduct the study. The methods for data analysis that were used are also clarified in chapter three.

Chapter four displays the results and findings. The chapter provides a summary of the results of the study as per every research objective that the researcher sought to
achieve. Chapter four furthermore offers the findings based on the results of the inferential statistics that were deployed.

Chapter five provides the summary and discussions of this study, the major findings, and highlights the conclusion and recommendations. The discussion provides an evaluation of the findings of this research and compares them with the findings of former studies with the intent of determining whether there is congruence or incongruence between the two. The discussions, the conclusion and the recommendations made are based on the specific research objectives of this study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the extant literature on the topic. Specifically, it examines the literature relating to the three research objectives of this study; that is, the sway of strategy formulation on access to donor funding, influence of strategy implementation on access to donor funding, and the influence of strategy evaluation on access to donor funding. The aim of the literature review is two-fold, namely; to familiarize with extant literature relating to the link between strategic practices and access to donor funding, and to analyze and identify possible inconsistencies or congruity in extant literature relating to the association between strategic practices on access to donor funding.

2.2 Strategy Formulation on Access to Donor Funding

2.2.1 Overview of Strategy Formulation

According to Ebner (2013), the framework for formulating and implementing strategies requires a strong support in the formulation process. Literature reveals that the concept of strategy dates back decades when the Chinese military general Sun Tzu authored “The Art of War”. This book describes various military strategies and tactics (Ebner, 2013). However, according to Mintzberg (2004), strategy is a pattern of decisions made by a company that determine and reveal the organization’s objectives, purposes, or goals.

The organization’s strategy becomes the source of principal policies and plans that enable it achieve its goals, while keeping it in line with its intended purposes in the long-term. These are outlined in a strategic plan which specifically outlines steps that should be followed for an organization to achieve its overall as a whole in mind, rather than with the goals of specific divisions or departments (Smith & Swithern, 2014). All in all, the need for strategy formulation as a necessary prerequisite for an organization’s growth has not been disputed. However, there is need for a clear method of formulating a strategy that gives an organization a competitive edge.
2.2.2 Significance of the Strategy Formulation Process

The ambiguity that comes with running of any organization that doesn’t have clearly defined objectives and that manifests in operations undertaken during the period prior to planning, is partially reduced due to the motivational boost to achieve a shared and positive outcome, which is naturally realized by the process of formulating the intent (Carrassi, 2013). Various literatures further indicates that a turbulent environment encourages decentralization of strategic decision-making authority from corporate to business level hence reducing the role of staff planners compared to that of line managers (Ebner, 2013).

Strategies are guided by long-term planning usually characterized by the definition of a vision. A vision should however not be mistaken with a mission statement. While a vision defines an organization’s overall ideal goal, a mission is what the organization does in order to meet its responsibilities on a day-to-day basis (Boyne, 2010) and is usually described within the organization’s mission statement. The process of formulating a strategic plan therefore includes all actions that need to be undertaken to provide a broader picture of what must be achieved on the overall the order in which this must be executed. It also includes how systems within an organization need to be organized in a way that enables them achieve their desired objectives (Smith & Swithern, 2014).

The process of formulating a strategy requires effective strategic thinking. This encompasses the appreciation of a goals system, and that a set of goals comprising multiple and interlinked objectives are required to complete a strategy (Ackermann & Eden, 2011). The process of formulating a strategy therefore involves taking all measures necessary to provide a broader picture of what must be achieved and in which order, including how to organize a system capable of achieving the overall goals. According to Smith and Swithern (2014), the process of formulating a strategic plan often is done prior to implementation of projects ad often times relying on previous experience and expertise.

Strategic planning is therefore fundamental to the success of any organization that seeks to be competitive. A well thought out mission statement should be shared within and outside the organization. It must be shared with staff as well as with other
stakeholders since the vision communicates the direction of the organization and
should be easily understood and concise (Boyne, 2010). Smith & Swithern, (2014)
further state that strategic plans always must include the consideration of the
availability of the resources that implementation of the strategic plan may require.
Strategic planning often focuses on an entire enterprise, although a strategic plan can
also be made for a specific part or department of an enterprise (Leotta, et al., 2015).

2.2.3 Significance of Strategy Formulation for Donor Funding

Literature indicating the relationship between adoption of strategic plans and access to
donor funding in the NGO sector is very limited, and not obvious (Courtney, 2002;
Poister, et al., 2010; Stone, Bigelow & Crittenden, 1999). However, there still exist
few empirical investigations which attempt to check the relationship between the
deployment of formal planning and access to donor funding in NGOs and these
include studies by Crittenden, Crittenden and Hunt (1988), Jenster and Overstreet
(1990), and Odom and Boxx (1988) which indicate that adopting and practicing
formal planning by NGOs can be related to organizational performance in terms of
access to funding.

Additionally, Blackmon (2008) quantitatively investigated the impact of strategic
planning on non-profits performance using the balanced scorecard approach in which
he found a significant relationship between strategic planning and NGOs’ financial
performance. This is further echoed by a study by Smith (2008) which found by
qualitative research sampling of two nonprofits, that strategic management practices
in NGOs result in more productive outcomes in the performance of the organizations.
On NGOs’ ability to deliver on their mandate, Hu, Kapucu and O’Byrne (2014), who
surveyed twenty small CBOs, found that adoption of strategic management practices
had an effect on the manner in which NGOs attended to needs of a community and the
way they delivered their services and programs.

There is a school of thought that points to the concept that larger NGOs are more
inclined to develop strategic plans than smaller NGOs. Scholars such as Odom and
Wolch (1990), and Young and Sleeper (1988), support this concept through various
studies where they attempt to associate an organization’s size and its tendency to
clasp practices of strategic management. These studies indicate that larger NGOs are willing and able to adopt strategic management practices because they have the capacity to carry out strategic planning and coordinate the implementation of a strategic plan.

Another school is pushed by scholars like Stone (1989) who state that the willingness by organizations to adopt strategic management practices is a result of their compliance to donor prerequisites. Young and Sleeper (1988) nevertheless rant that organizations adopt these practices because they have the resources that allow them to. Jenster and Overstreet (1990), Unterman and Davis (1982), and Wolch (1990) on the other hand credit the adoption of strategic management practices by an organization to the availability of qualified and experienced directors and project managers.

Another school as fronted by Schmid (1992) in his study indicates that another trigger that causes an organization to adopt strategic plans is environment. The study indicates that environment also impacts on the nature of the strategy and structural design settled on for implementation by NGOs. The study determined that environments of uncertainty lead to the formation of organizations with relatively informal decentralized structures whereas more stable environments lead to more centralized and formal structures.

2.2.4 Scanning of Environment

According to Kamasak, Yavuz, and Ozturk (2017), environmental scanning allows organizations to establish flexible approaches to issues. As it enables them make wiser investment decisions that determine their priorities according to existing situations and future environmental precautions. According to J. David Hunger in his book, “Essential of strategic management”, environmental scanning is the monitoring, evaluating and disseminating of information from the external and internal environments to key people within the organization. He further defines it as a tool that an organization uses to avoid strategic surprise and to ensure long – term health of the organization. Azhar (2009), states that environmental scanning is the means by which
firms monitor their business environment to pinpoint threats and opportunities influencing their business.

An organization through the process of monitoring the environment through environmental scanning, can consider the impact of the different events, trends, issues, and expectations as it embarks on its strategic management process. The fact that the environment facing any organization can be complex and its scanning absolutely essential, those tasked with the role of strategy, either as individuals or in groups, while attempting to undertake internal or external scanning, have to deal cautiously with the process of environmental scanning. Volberda, et al., (2011) quip that environmental scanning’s importance is derived from the fact that it increases the cognizance of potential change in the environment that can have a significant impact on the organization and pose new opportunities as well as challenges. Strategic management includes environmental analysis that is done of data collected from internal and external information.

Akroush (2012) describes the process of scanning of the broad environment as key to pinpointing probable openings and threats. This is necessary in analyzing environments for strengths and weaknesses when the organization begins strategy formulation. The external environment of non-governmental organizations largely includes technological, social political, ecological, and economic factors, whereas the internal factors includes the available human resources, financial resources, and other core competencies. Notably, non-governmental organizations should take keen interest of these factors to successfully formulate, implement and evaluate its strategic plans.

According to Stavroulakis and Papadimitriou (2017), SWOT analysis is a dynamic instrument that has a number of relevant applications. The scholars further indicate that SWOT analysis has various applications that are utilized by stakeholders across different industries. The process of strategic planning consists of deliberate setting goals and devising plans to achieve those goals. Therefore, SWOT analysis assists an organization to comprehensively evaluate its operating environment and thereby conclude how to plan and implement its strategy (Liu, Wang, & Liu, 2011).
The process of undertaking an effective SWOT analysis includes developing a framework that can be deployed extensively in order to achieve the depiction of pertinent strategic factors within four distinct categories that make up the process of SWOT analysis (Stavroulakis & Papadimitriou, 2017). This process is key to the success of an organization as it helps it understand its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, since these are factors that have an impact on the organization’s operations. Byar (2014) clearly states, in support of this that the identification of key internal and external environment areas where the organization must adapt and effectively seek external resources is of fundamental importance in strategy formulation.

2.3 Strategy Implementation on Access to Donor Funding

2.3.1 Overview of Strategy Implementation

Strategy implementation is a critical phase in the development of any organization. Therefore, effective strategy implementation is paramount in the non-financial performance of a NGO. Even though the concept of strategy implementation may appear to be simple, the actual process of converting strategies into actionable moves is a far more intricate, demanding and challenging task (Aaltonen & Ikavalko, 2011). Strategy implementation is usually a product of several factors of organizational existence that include the organization’s structure, personnel skills and culture of operations. It is worth noting that very few studies have been conducted to determine the influence of the mentioned factors of organization’s presence on efficient strategy implementation.

However, a breakdown of these factors would suggest that organizational culture is created when there is a set of beliefs and values that are shared among employees of the organization (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012), thereby denoting the significance of organizational culture in influencing the implementation of a strategy. Available literature indicates that studies on the subject have mainly focused on the implementation of planning techniques. Several analysts including, Brown and Covey (1987), Crittenden, Crittenden and Hunt (1988), and Wolch (1990) unanimously state that a number of NGOs do not undertake strategic management by implementing strategic plans nor do they subscribe to the strategic planning philosophy. Their
studies further signify that these organizations choose to engage in short-term and informal planning as opposed to long-term strategic approaches.

A look at these studies further indicates that organizations mostly placed focus on other parameters of operation rather than implementation of strategic plans which include focus on the organization’s size, personnel experience and staff management styles, etcetera. Few studies focus on the impact of the adoption of planning and how planning can impact strategy outcomes in terms of the organizational performance, mission, hierarchy and vision. Maybe this is testament to the fact that most organizations are formed for handle short-term issues as opposed to solving long-term needs by the society.

Fredrickson (1986) demonstrated that engaging in implementation of a strategic plan would positively affect the performance of the organization. More literature indicates that proper implementation of a strategy can be the difference between bad or good performance by an organization (Kennedy, Goolsby & Arnould, 2003). Kaplan and Norton (2005) indicate that a failure in strategy implementation can result in a gap between strategy and performance. Bonoma and Crittenden (1988) further indicate that the weaker the strategy implementation phase, the poorer the overall execution of the unabridged strategy will be.

A number of empirical investigations have in the past endeavored to test the liaison between the performance in NGOs and execution of strategic plans. Jenster and Overstreet (1990) and Odom and Boxx (1988) claim that adopting strategic plans by NGOs were related to organizational performance in terms of access to funding. Siciliano (1997) on the other hand demonstrated a clear association between implementation of plans and fulfillment of organization’s financial accountability. Other studies conducted in an endeavour to improve the literature regarding the association between the performance in NGOs and execution of strategic plans by the NGO include Smith (2008) who found, both practices result in more productive outcomes for NGOs.
2.3.1 Process of Strategy Implementation

According to Kamasak, et al., (2017), non-profit making organizations operate in dynamic business environments where political instability, high level of market complexity, financial ambiguity, and risk dominate the whole market and they must therefore develop special capabilities to gain competitive advantage or even survive. It is in view of this that the top management of these organizations must ensure that the set strategies are not only continually evaluated to check their relevance with the current operating environment, but also that the implementation is done with diligence and stays on course according to set plans, while utilizing the proposed approaches.

Implementing a strategy throughout the organization is arduous task. Van Buul (2010) further states that organizational culture is a major determinant of effective strategy implementation. Understanding the relationship between organization culture and strategy implementation could unravel the reasons why many non-governmental organizations fail to implement their studies.

The role of coordination mechanisms is however highlighted as a remedy to stalemates experienced during the implementation of strategies. Ebner (2013) states that in order to effectively integrate and implement strategic planning efforts, organizations must develop and make use of coordination mechanisms. It is critical to appreciate the role played by an organization’s personnel since people are the ones who formulate and implement strategies and this effectively means that their welfare must be considered during the process of implementing a strategy as according to Kaplan & Norton (2011), they are the ones who determine the success or failure of a strategy.

According to Kamasak, et al., (2017), another factor that contributes to successful implementation of a strategy is its flexibility as this enables firms to dynamically manage their resources and thereby adapt to high-velocity environments while reducing their risks. Flexibility also helps organizations exploit the full potential of their key resource stocks. It is therefore of paramount importance for organizations to prioritize the understanding of the strategic issues being faced by the organization by its personnel and how they can effectively work to overcome these issues. Successful
strategy implementation involves permitting others to put the strategy into place and to implement it competently as stated by Thomson, Jr. and Strickland III (2014). Organization’s leaders should therefore establish a culture that supports strategy implementation (Byar, 2014).

2.3.2 Organizational Management and Strategy Implementation

The link between organization management and Strategy implementation has been explored in various literature which opine that the implementation of strategic plans and their objectives therein depends on the determination of senior management to have the strategy implemented. This trait of strategic leadership enables the alignment of personnel to strategy and often times enables smooth implementation of risk management practices in the firm (Kamasak, et al., 2017). Strategy implementation largely depends on shared values and beliefs of an organization’s top management (Rylander & Peppard, 2013).

The ability of managers to utilize information is also key to successful implementation of strategy as how managers utilize information allows for the setting of goals for the organization which further enables it to formulate suitable strategies and policies that meet specific objectives and allow for a more practical implementation and reporting on the results of the actualization of the organization’s strategy as well as its ability to abide by the law (Kitsios & Kamariotou, 2017).

In addition to the ability of managers to utilize information, literature further suggests that the implementation of a strategy also depends on managers’ possession of a set of meta-abilities, which include cognitive skills, self-knowledge, emotional resilience and personal drive, all of which have a significant influence on the growth and development of the organization over a set period of time (Richard, 2011). Literature further indicates that an organization’s leadership is critical to the effective implementation of organizational strategies because leaders can either positively or negatively impact on the strategic direction taken by the organization (Kamasak, et al., 2017).

Additionally, leadership styles are credited with an organization’s ability to focus its on the execution of strategy. One leadership style allows for the focus on adaptation
to complex environments and thorough strategic decision-making which has a bearing on the initiation and implementing of these decisions over time albeit with the involvement of personnel in the whole organization (Kamasak, et al., 2017). This thought is further supported by Miller, Hickson and Wilson (2013) who found that managers are supposed to have a set of diverse skills and abilities that allow them effectively to make strategic decisions. Getz and Lee (2011) also found that managers should also be able to conduct wide interactive dialogue with other stakeholders that not only aims at clarifying the strategic direction of the organization, but also maintains the momentum of implementing interventions.

On the overall, as well suggested by Hanley (2012), managers must adopt an active executive role by linking themselves to the implementation of activities that spell an organization’s strategic direction. The implication of NGOs taking deliberate effort to openly appraise the key competences of their management and maximum utilization of the same can help them gain a sustainable competitive advantage over other organizations especially with regard to ensuring they uphold the practice and tenets of strategic management. This can be seen in an instance where an organization that has solid personnel base and utilizes their skills and competences to enhance the quality of service being offered, undoubtedly leads to better stakeholder contentment.

2.4 Strategy Evaluation on Access to Donor Funding

2.4.1 Overview of Strategic Evaluation

Bielavitz (2012) identified objectives, strategy generation, strategic evaluation and monitoring results as four steps of the strategic planning process. This clearly indicates that evaluating a strategy is part and parcel of strategic management practices. Actually, it is a key process of planning as prescribed by most strategic management theorists such as (Ansoff, Avner, Brandenburg, Portner & Radosevich, 1970). Researchers have over the past two decades or so gained a lot of interest on performance measurement in organizations across various sectors. Practitioners in most organizations have also increased their interest in the design of strategic plan measurement systems, implementation, and proper application of the system and the content of the measurement systems (Rantanen, Kulmala, Lo¨nnqvist & Kujansivu, 2007).
Measurement methods vary from sector to sector and it is widely viewed that public and private organizations require different strategic evaluation systems (Brignall & Modell, 2000). It is believed among scholars that stakeholders in the public sector have many different and conflicting requirements (Brignall & Modell, 2000; Wisniewski & Olafsson, 2004). Aligning evaluation systems to the objectives of an organization as stipulated in the strategic plan and hence its deliverables is key to achieving the envisaged results of the strategic plan.

The benefits of evaluating a strategic plan have been found in various studies including Kaplan and Norton (1996). These include the increased ability by the organization to clearly chat strategic priorities, effectiveness of strategy implementation, effective outcomes measurement, realignment of short-term actions with long-term objectives as well as promoting integration among various organizational processes. Kaplan and Norton (1992) further point that strategy evaluation helps the organization to re-align its efforts and resources to reflect the impact felt from proper implementation of the strategic plan.

It is important to note that strategy implementation remains to be one of the greatest bottlenecks that continue to hinder organizations from realizing their objectives. The management of non-governmental organizations has a role to play in continuously monitoring the implementation of the organizations’ strategies and thereby achieving not only short-term but also long-term goals, giving their organizations efficient performance. Leotta, et al. (2015) posit that the main reasons strategy implementation fails is the lack of monitoring.

According to Mintzberg (2004) in his book ‘Strategy Safari’ strategy evaluation is described as a process that should consider the consistency with which an organization focuses on its policies and goals. He posits that it is essential for such a process to present consonance through adaptive reaction to the acute transformations emerging within it and in the peripheral environment. This, continues the author, creates and maintains sustainable competitive advantage and is feasible in that it neither overtaxes the available resources nor creates unsolvable problems. David (2013) quips that organizations should carry out continuous and consistent review of internal and external issues and take a relevant corrective action.
2.4.2 The Process of Strategy Evaluation

Indeed, all the strategies are subject to future variation due to the influence of internal and external factors are dynamic in nature (Ackerman & Eden 2011). The process and mechanisms of strategy evaluation and control are key to determining whether the selected strategy is achieving the organization's objectives or not. This also goes for risk control as considered by strategy implementers who rely on the same parameters where the strategy evaluation process assists in analyzing how the strategic plan has been implemented and whether the intended goals and objectives have been achieved.

It is noted by Richard (2011) that a strategy should not be over planned and should emerge as part of the interactive process of thought, hypothesis and experimentation and renewed experimentation, as strategies always evolve and continuously deepen. This however does not negate the fact that the strategy should be consciously monitored and evaluated because there is the continuous need to evaluate the strategies that have been put in place as a means of ascertaining clear extent to which the organization’s objectives are being met with clear performance indicators. Non-government organizations should not only define their vision, mission, objectives and goals, they must also develop their performance indicators and performance measures.

An effective strategy needs to communicate compelling purpose to others, connect organizational strengths with environmental opportunities, exploit current success while exploring the opportunities, generate more resources, coordinate and guide activities and respond to new conditions over time (Fitzpatrick, Sander & Worthen, 2004). Great emphasis in certain schools of management indicate that an effective strategy evaluation process should place emphasis on the continuous appraisals of the external and internal situations with the former uncovering threats and opportunities in the environment and the latter revealing strengths and weaknesses of the organization (Mintzberg, 2004).

An effective strategy evaluation system is also a system that encourages shared assumptions which govern how personnel view strategic implementation in an organization (Richard, 2011). Strategy evaluation should be carefully carried out to ensure that the outcome of the evaluation is objective given that strategic management
is a continuous and dynamic process. Strategy evaluation also involves a critical appraisal of how an organization’s internal factors have affected the implementation of practices of strategic management. The process normally has clear performance measurement procedures that allow for the management to take corrective action. According to Hanley (2012), the fundamental strategy evaluation and control activities include a three-step process which is; reviewing internal and external factors that are the bases for current strategies, measuring performance, and taking corrective actions.

**2.4.3 Performance Measurement and Strategy Evaluation**

NGOs continue facing mounting pressure to become more performance-oriented (Ferreira, 2017) as a means to increase access to funding. Even though they do not seek to make profit, strategic planning processes help them achieve and exceed the goals set in the organizations vision and mission and therefore the key aspect is to ensure that all the stakeholders are satisfied by the efficient resource utilization executed by the organization. It has been noted that the uncertainty in the operating environment should always act as a constant reminder that continuous review and evaluation of the performance of the organizations through performance and strategic value of capabilities are properly undertaken using appropriate tools that enhance the visualization of themes such as deployment of appropriate color coding in heat maps, which provide an overview for the stakeholders in the organization to identify capacity gaps that need to be overcome (Roelens, et al., 2017).

Organizations should be able to measure the performance of each key objective in order to perform optimally and within a stipulated time frame (Richard, 2011). Goals need to be SMART. They must be SMART; that is, Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound. Moreover, it is imperative for the organization to ensure use of carefully selected performance measurement tools that accurately measure the performance of the organization in relation to other organizations and work on the non-performing areas in appropriate time. Accountability requires specific time frames are defined along with measurable targets. The organization’s ability to reduce the size of models through prioritization allows them to formulate intuitive visualizations that facilitate understanding by the organization’s stakeholders (Roelens, et al., 2017).
Roelens, et al. (2017) quip that capability heat maps deploy prioritization mechanisms that helps to identify perceived strategic value of an organization’s capabilities. This is a key factor in strategy evaluation as performance measurement further plays a significant role in the identification of key priorities whose achievement would lead to the achievement of other goals set by the organization. Another aspect of strategy evaluation is financial measurement. The financial measurement of a given strategy helps to clearly understand whether the use of the organizational resources have led for example to more performance with limited resources or whether there is need for the cost reduction in some aspects of organizational spending which helps the organization’s management to either transform its total cost-base or increase its competences and the ability to conform to best practice (Richard, 2011).

Measurement of the performance of the Management towards implementation of a given strategy therefore plays a major role in helping the organization realize the role played by top leadership to provide commitment for achievement of the set goals. Organizations with weak values and common goals often find their employees following their own personal goals that may be conflicting with others (Ackerman & Eden 2011). The significant of the contribution of an organization’s leadership towards the realization of its strategy is therefore also premised on the leadership’s attitude towards striving to ensure that the organization’s shared values aim towards the fulfillment of its goals as a means to execute its strategic plan.

2.4.3 Exercising Control in Strategy Evaluation Processes

Exercising control in the process of strategy evaluation means tracking the strategy as it is being implemented as a means of early detection of potential problems that require mitigation when deemed necessary (Pearce & Robinson, 2011). According to Chelimo (2010), strategy evaluation and control practice is the collection of routine data that measures progress towards achieving strategy objectives. It is used to track changes in strategy performance over time. Its purpose is to permit stakeholders to make informed decisions regarding the effectiveness of strategies and the efficient use of resources.

The process of control as suggested by Pappas, Flaherty and Hunt, (2007) involves conducting a research on the joint influence of control strategies and market
turbulence on strategic performance in result-driven organizations. According to Chelimo (2010), who conducted a research on strategy evaluation and control practices at National Social Security Fund Kenya, some organizations use benchmarking, International standardization organization processes, information communication technology, strategic audit, strategy monitoring, performance appraisal and customer survey to do strategy evaluation and control.

2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter examined the views of other scholars on the research objectives. The main objective is to establish the influence of strategic practices on access to donor funding. Indeed, literature review has covered the extent to which strategic formulation affects donor funding, how strategy implementation affects donor funding, how strategy evaluation affects donor funding by reviewing relevant theories, outcomes, suggestions and workable solutions. The next chapter, Chapter three, delivers the research methodology that was used in this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter highlights the research methodology that the researcher will deploy in this study. Hence, Chapter three identifies and justifies the research design for this study. It identifies and describes the population. This chapter further defines the sampling design together with the sampling technique and the sample size. It also describes the data collection method that the researcher was used and highlights the research procedure that was deployed. The data analysis methods are then discussed followed by a summary of this chapter.

3.2 Research Design

Research design refers to the overall or general strategy, plan or outline that a research adopts to combine the diverse elements of the research (Probert, 2006). It is a systematic, logical and coherent method that guides or directs the study and guarantees that the researcher effectively addresses the underpinning precise objectives of the research undertaking (Blanche, Durrheim & Painter, 2006). It is for this reasons that various researchers have deemed the research design to be the blue print of a research process; explaining and highlighting the data collection techniques, the analyses and inspection the collected information for in-depth comprehension and interpretation (Probert, 2006). The standard practice in research is that the research design that the researcher chooses is contingent on the both the problem being studied and the nature of the research being undertaken (Saunders & Thornhill, 2012). Accordingly, it is the research problem that determines or prescribes the research design preferred to operationalize it.

This study used a descriptive research design. This form of design is preferred as it allows for the explication and detailing of the nature of this researcher and the interlink or connection between the variables under study. Blanche, et al., (2006) explains that a descriptive research design is used when the researcher seeks to address the ‘how’ question, that is, how event Y affects event Y or more specifically the effect (s) of Y on X. Bless, Higson-Smith and Kagee (2006, p. 48) observe that this design provides a reliable mean for testing the “factual hypothesis”. These attributes inform the researchers’ choice for this design.
3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

The population refers to the entire group of items, objects, incidences and individuals that possess some unique qualities and values that the researcher is interested in and wants to study (Blanche, et al., 2006; Goldstein, et al., 2015). It is from the population that the researcher obtains research sample population and it is also upon the population that the researcher generalizes and extrapolates the research findings.

It is the homogeneity of the research population is a prerequisite condition for its targeting and inclusion in the study (Bartlett, Kotrilk & Higgins, 2001). What this means is that the research population must both possess and manifest the information and qualities that the researcher is interested in as this adds to the validity of the study findings (Bartlett, et al., 2001).

The population of this study comprised the non-governmental organizations working in Kilimani Nairobi County, Kenya. According to the NGOs Coordination Board, which is the NGOs’ registration, licensing and regulatory body in Kenya, there are four main NGOs operating in Kilimani area. These NGOs are; Mercy USA for Aid and Development, International Rescue Committee, Rural Agency Community Development and Assistance and Finn Church Aid. The target population from these four NGOs included low-level and middle-level managers in each of these NGOs, a population estimated at 38 individuals.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

The sampling design denotes that plan for selection from the population of representative individuals that can actually be reached during the study. The sampling design encompasses of the sampling technique, sampling frame and the sample size. It is from the sample that a researcher collects and infers information as such the validity of the study outcomes is dependent on the appropriateness of the sampling design (Saunders & Thornhill, 2012; Blanche, et al, 2006).
3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

The sampling frame is the list of names, events or cases in the population or a register from which the sample is drawn (Probert, 2006; Blanche, et al, 2006). The sampling frame implies the source or pool of appropriate and accurate population that forms the source of survey sample for the research (Bartlett, et al., 2001). The sampling frame for this study was obtained from the respective offices of each of the NGOs located in Kilimani Nairobi.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

The sampling technique is the procedure or approach, which the researcher deploys to access a sample from the target population (Saunders & Thornhill, 2012). This study used the stratified sampling. According to Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991) stratified sampling allows for all individuals in a population to be included in the sample. As such, this technique added to the generalizability of the findings of this study.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

The proportion of individuals, events or cases that the research actually picks to participate in a study is conceived as the sample size (Saunders & Thornhill, 2012; Bartlett, et al., 2001). The sample size for this study includes the people that are working in the three target NGOs. The appropriate sample size is generated by applying the statistical formula for sample size proposed by Yamane’s (1967 cited in Singh & Masuku, 2014);

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

\[ = \frac{N}{(1 + 38 \times 0.0025)} \]

\[ = 38/[1+38 x 0.0025] \]

\[ = 34.8 \]

The sample size for the study is thus 34 managers. The sample size distribution is as shown in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1: Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Managers of NGOs</th>
<th>Population (Managers)</th>
<th>% Distribution</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrative manager</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finance manager</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procurement manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38 Managers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34 Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Srinivas, 2015

3.4 Data Collection Methods

Bless, et al., (2006), Saunders and Thornhill (2012) clarify that data collection is the strategy, procedure or approach for soliciting and obtaining information from respondents concerning the issue under study. Data collection refers to technique that researchers use be they questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, interview schedules, telephone interview, email, observation or participation to obtain information that is relevant to their study (Blanche, et al., 2006).

In this study, the researcher deployed structured interview schedules to gather relevant information from the managers of the identified NGOs. The choice for this technique was informed by the understanding that the structured interview schedules can be both self-administered when the situation demands or can be used as questionnaires where employees running tight schedules at the time of the data collections can be left with the structured interview schedules to fill in their responses at their convenience. The data collection tool involved a mishmash of Likert scale questions. The questionnaire comprised of five parts, the first part sought to gather background information on the respondent. The other three parts comprised of questions aimed at obtaining information associated with the three-research objective with each part addressing a specific objective.
As such, the second part of the instrument sought to gather information relating to influence of strategic formulation on NGOs’ ability to donor funding access. The third part sought to solicit questions relating to influence of strategy implementation on NGOs’ ability to access donor funding. And the third part of the questionnaire sought to gather information relating to the influence of strategy evaluation on NGOs’ ability to access donor funding. In total, the instrument comprised of 33 questions and took each respondent 15 minutes at most to effectively fill.

3.5 Research Procedures

Procedures for research are the processes, methods or activities deployed by the researcher to collect relevant data from the identified research participants (Bless, et al., 2006). In line with this broader understanding of research procedure, the researcher performed numerous activities to obtain the desired data. After developing the structured interview schedule, approval from the project supervisor was sought after which a formal approval from USIU research office for the research was obtained. The USIU research office issued the researcher with an official letter of approval which was then presented to the management of the respective NGOs in appeal for their contribution in this study.

Following the securing the management’s permission for the research, the researcher conducted a pre-test or pilot study among a select number of employees. At least 15% of the employees (about 5 managers) were approached to participate in the pilot study. The purpose for the pilot study was two-fold; to assess the feasibility of the actual study based on the resources available to the researcher and to test the reliability and suitability of the tool. Any problems and concerns arising from the pilot study, including the need to revise the wording of some questions was effectively addressed.

During the actual study, the researcher visited each of the NGOs and conducted the study. Managers who were busy at the time when the researcher is administering the interviews were issued with the structured interview schedules for them to fill at their own time and convenience. The researcher immediately coded interview schedules that had been fully responded to at the time of the data collection. For the interview schedules that were left with the respondents to fill at their convenience, the
researcher agreed with the respondents when they should be collected. The entire data collection took three weeks.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

This study is quantitative in nature and hence deployed quantitative or statistical data analysis techniques. To facilitate the analysis, the data collected were first coded and uploaded into the SPSS version 21. The data was then examined statistically with the descriptive and inferential analyses. The data analysis procedure incorporated transforming the raw data collected into descriptive statistics including, pie and bar charts, frequency tables and percentages, the underlying objective was to realize three specific objectives. Through inferential statistics, the researcher was able to conduct Cross-Tabulations, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Correlations. These statistical procedures permitted greater understanding of the collected data and effective realization of the specific objectives.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided the research methodology and issued a justification for each approach taken in under each item. It has discussed the research design that the researcher prefers for this study. The chapter has identified the population of the study, discussed and justified the sampling design including the sampling technique. This chapter has also calculated the sample size and described the data collection method, the research procedure and highlighted the data analysis method. The next chapter, Chapter four provides the results and findings of the study using a variety of statically methods principally the inferential and descriptive methods.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

Chapter four offers the results and findings. It integrates descriptive statistical methods and inferential statistics to summarize, present, analyze and make inferences from the data that was obtained. The response rate was 100%; that is, all the 34 respondents that were sampled responded conclusively to the interview schedules that they were issued with and the researcher obtained all the questionnaires back. The rest of the results of this study as per the specific research objectives and items in the interview schedule are presented in the subsequent pages.

4.2 Background Information

Following are the results that were obtained relating to background information.

4.2.1 Respondents’ Organization

Shown in Table 4.1 are the results when the respondents were grouped according to the organization they work for. As shown, 18 respondents (53%) worked for International Rescue Committee, 9 (26%) for Mercy USA for Aid and Development, 5 (15%) worked for Finn Church Aid and 2 (6%) worked for Rural Agency Community Development Assistance.

Table 4.1: Grouping of Respondents by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercy USA for Aid and Development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Agency Community Development and Assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn Church Aid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Respondents’ Tenure in the Organization
Figure 4.1 represents the results of respondent’s tenure in their respective organizations. Fourteen respondents (41%) had worked in their respective firms for “Less than 5 years”, 8 (24%) between 5 and 10 years, 6 (18%) not exceeding 15 years”, 5 (15%) for “15 years and over”, and 1 (3%) had worked in his firm for “Less than 1 year”.

Figure 4.1: Classification of Respondent by Tenure in Respective Organization

4.2.3 Respondents’ Tenure as Manager in the Organization

The respondents were asked to indicate their tenure as managers in their respective organizations. As shown in Figure 4.2, 15 respondents (44%) had been managers for “Less than 5 years”, 8 (24%) for “15 years and over”, 6 (18%) for “5 to 10 years”, 3 (9%) for not more than 1 year and 2 (6%) answered they had been managers for not more than 15 years”.

Figure 4.2: Categorization of Respondents by Tenure as Manager in the Organization

4.2.4 Respondents’ Managerial Role in the Organization
Table 4.2 displays of the classification of respondents according to their managerial positions or role in their respective organizations. 10 respondents (29%) were “Program” managers and another 10 (29%) were found to be “Program Assistant Managers”, 7 (21%) were “Finance” managers, 6 (18%) were “Procurement” Managers, and 1(3%) indicated that he was an “Administrative Manager”.

**Table 4.2: Classification of Respondents by Managerial Role in the Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Manager</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant Managers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2.5 Whether Organization has Access to Donor Funding**

The researcher asked the respondents to indicate where their respective organizations had access to funding over the past fiscal year. As displayed in Figure 4.3, 15 respondents (45%) indicated they had access to donor funding “Most of the time”, 10 (28%) indicated “Always”, 7 (21%) indicated “Sometimes” while 2 (6%) indicated that they had “No” access to funding over the past fiscal year.

**Figure 4.3: Whether Organization has Access to Donor Funding**
4.2.5 Acquaintance with Effect of Strategic Practices on Access to Donor Funding

The researcher asked the respondents if they were acquainted with the effect of strategic practices on access to donor funding. 19 respondents (56%) were “Well acquainted”, 10 (29%) were “Very well acquainted” and 2 (6%) were “Somewhat acquainted” while 3 (9%) indicated they were “Not sure” of the effect of strategic practices on access to donor funding. The results are as displayed in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Respondent’s Acquaintance with Effect of Strategic Practices on Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat acquainted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well acquainted</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well acquainted</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.6 Most Important Strategic Practice Influencing Access to Donor Funding

The respondents were asked to indicate which strategic practice among “strategy formulation”, “Strategy implementation” and “Strategy evaluation” they considered the most important in influencing their respective organization’s access to donor funding. As shown in Figure 4.4, “Strategy evaluation” was considered the most important with 50%, followed by “Strategy implementation” with 44% and “Strategy formulation” at 32%.

Figure 4.4: Most Important Strategic Practice Influencing Access to Donor Funding
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4.3 Strategy Formulation and Access on Donor Funding

The researcher asked the respondents specific questions to gather their opinion on the effect of strategy formulation on access to donor funding. This part provides the results that were obtained.

4.3.1 Effective Strategy Formulation on Access to Donor Funding Link

Displayed in Table 4.4 are the outcomes on whether effective strategy formulation enhances their respective organization’s access to donor funding. As shown, 20 respondents (59%) agreed, 9 (26%) “Strongly” agreed that and 2 (6%) disagreed while 3 (9%) indicated “Neutral” that effective strategy formulation enhances their respective organization’s access to donor funding.

Table 4.4: Effective Strategy Formulation on Access to Donor Funding Link

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Lack of Ambiguities in Running Organization and Access to Donor Funding

The respondent was asked whether lack of ambiguities in running the organization influenced their access to donor funding. The results that were obtained were that 21 respondents (62%) and 10 (29%) agreed and “strongly” agreed respectively. One respondent (3%) disagreed while 2 respondents (6%) indicated there were “Neutral” as to whether lack of ambiguities in running the organization influenced their access to donor funding. The outcomes are displayed in Figure 4.5.
4.3.3 Formalized Central Planning and Access to Donor Funding

The question as to whether the availability of a formalized central planning influenced access to donor funding was put forward to the respondents. As presented in Table 4.5, 14 respondents (41%) agreed, 13 (38%) “Strongly” agreed while 1 (3%) disagreed that availability of a formalized central planning influenced access to donor funding was put forward to the respondents. Six respondents (18%) indicated they were “Neutral” on the question.

Table 4.5: Formalized Central Planning and Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4 Ability to Match Resources to Opportunities and Access to Donor Funding

The respondents were asked their opinion as to whether their respective organization’s ability to match available resources to opportunities influenced their organizations access to donor funding. Indicated by Figure 4.6, 19 respondents (56%) agreed, 11 (32%) “Strongly” agreed while 4 respondents (12%) were “Neutral” to whether their respective organization’s ability to match available resources to opportunities influenced their organizations access to donor funding.
4.3.5 Having Vision and Principal Policies and Access to Donor Funding

Figure 4.7 shows the results when the respondents were asked if having a vision and principal policies in an organization influenced their respective organization’s access to donor funding. As indicated, 16 respondents (47%), agreed, 12 (35%) “Strongly” agreed, 4 (12%) were “Neutral” while 2 (6%) revealed that they disagreed that having a vision and principal policies in an organization influenced their respective organization’s access to donor funding.
4.3.6 Effective Environmental Scanning and Access to Donor Funding

Table 4.6 shows the results that were obtained regarding the respondents’ opinions as to whether effective environmental scanning had an effect on their respective organization’s access to donor funding. As indicated, 16 respondents (47%) and 13 respondents (38%) agreed and “strongly” agreed respectively while 5 (15%) were “Neutral” to whether effective environmental scanning had an effect on their respective organization’s access to donor funding.

Table 4.6: Effective Environmental Scanning and Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7 Delivering on Commitments to Donors and Access to Donor Funding

The researcher asked the respondents their opinion as to whether “delivering on commitments to donors” influenced their organization’s access to donor funding. Figure 4.8 displays the results obtained. As shown, 3 respondents (9%) were “neutral”, 17 (50%) “Strongly” agreed, 9 (26%) agreed, (12%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) indicated that he “Slightly” disagreed that “delivering on commitments to donors” influenced their organization’s access to donor funding.

Figure 4.8: Delivering on Commitments to Donors and Access to Donor Funding
4.3.8 Transparency and Access to Donor Funding

The researcher wanted to find out whether the level of transparency influenced organizations access to donor funding. As shown in Table 4.7, 16 respondents (47%) agreed, 12 (35%) “Strongly” agreed and 2 (6%) revealed that they “Slightly” disagreed that transparency influenced organizations access to donor funding while 4 respondents (6%) answered “Neutral”.

Table 4.7: Transparency and Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.9 Enhanced Organizational Performance and Access to Donor Funding

Figure 4.9 represents the results that were obtained on whether enhanced organizational performance influenced access to donor funding. As is indicated, 15 respondents (44%) agreed, 11 (32%) “Strongly” agreed, 2 (6%) answered that they “Slightly” disagreed that enhanced organizational performance influenced access to donor funding while 2 respondents (6%) were guarded and indicated they were “neutral”.

Figure 4.9: Enhanced Organizational Performance and Access to Donor Funding
4.4 Strategy Implementation on Access to Donor Funding

The second objective of this study was to examine the influence of strategy implementation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding. Hence, in the data collection instrument, the research asked questions with the aim of realizing this objective.

4.4.1 Importance of Strategy Implementation on Access to Donor Funding

The researcher asked respondents to reveal their opinion as to whether they considered strategy implementation as important in influencing their organization’s donor funding access. Seventeen respondents (50%) “Strongly” agreed, 15 (44%) agreed and 1 (3%) disagreed that strategy implementation as important in influences their organization’s access to donor funding. One respondent (3%) was “Neutral”.

Table 4.8: Importance of Strategy Implementation on Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Organizational Culture and Access to Donor Funding

Figure 4.10 displays the results on whether organizational culture influenced access to donor funding. As shown, 17 respondents (50%) indicated they agreed, 11 (32%) “Strongly” agreed, 5 (15%) were “Neutral” while 1 (3%) indicated the he “Slightly” disagreed that organizational culture influenced access to donor funding.

Figure 4.10: Positive Organizational Culture and Access to Donor Funding
4.4.3 Effective Leadership Traits and Access to Donor Funding

The results in 4.9 were obtained when respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed that effective leadership traits influenced their organization’s access to donor funding. As shown, 17 respondents (50%) “Strongly” agreed, 15 (44%) agreed and 1 (3%) disagreed that that effective leadership traits influenced their organization’s access to donor funding while 1 respondents (3%) was “Neutral”.

Table 4.9: Effective Leadership Traits and Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Ability to Operate in Dynamic Environment and Access to Donor Funding

The researcher asked the respondents whether their respective organization’s ability to operate in a dynamic environment affected their organization’s access to donor funding. As indicated in Figure 4.11, 19 respondents (56%) and 8 respondents (24%) agreed and “Strongly” agreed respectively, and 1 (3%) “Slightly” disagreed that their organization’s ability to operate in a dynamic environment affected their organization’s access to donor funding while 6 (18%) indicated they were “Neutral”.

Figure 4.11: Ability to Operate in Dynamic Environment and Access to Donor Funding
4.4.5 Manager’s Adoption of Executive Role and Access to Donor Funding

Table 4.10 shows respondents opinion on whether the manager’s ability to adopt executive role in running the organization affected their organization’s access to donor funding. As shown, 17 respondents (50%) agreed, 12 (35%) “Strongly” agreed, and 1 (3%) disagreed while 1 (3%) indicated that he was “Neutral” on whether manager’s ability to adopt executive role in running the organization affected their organization’s access to donor funding.

Table 4.10: Manager’s Adoption of Executive Role and Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.6 Shared Values with Donors and Access to Donor Funding

The respondents were asked whether they thought their organizations ability to demonstrate “shared values” with potential donors influenced their access to donor funding. As shown in Figure 4.12, 15 respondents (44%) and another 15 respondents (44%) agreed and “Strongly” agreed respectively that their organizations ability to demonstrate “shared values” with potential donors influenced their access to donor funding. Three respondents (9%) were “Neutral” while 1 respondent (3%) “Slightly” agreed that their organizations ability to demonstrate “shared values” with potential donors influenced their access to donor funding.

Figure 4.12: Shared Values with Donors and Access to Donor Funding
4.4.7 Organizational Reputation and Access to Donor Funding

The respondents were asked whether organizational reputation influences their organization’s access to donor funding. As shown, 21 respondents (62%) “Strongly agreed”, 2 (6%) were “Neutral”, 10 (29%) agreed, while 1 respondent (3%) disagreed that organizational reputation influences her organization’s access to donor funding.

Figure 4.13: Organizational Reputation and Access to Donor Funding

4.4.8 Ability to Identify Strategic Priorities and Access to Donor Funding

Tables 4.11 are the responses on whether the ability of the organization to identify strategic priorities influenced their access to donor funding. As shown, 22 respondents (65%) agreed, 10 (29%) “Strongly” agreed while 2 (6%) were “Neutral” the question on whether the ability of the organization to identify strategic priorities influenced their access to donor funding.

Table 4.11: Ability to Identify Strategic Priorities and Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Strategy Evaluation on Access to Donor Funding

In line with the third objective, which sought to determine the influence or strategic evaluation on organizations’ access to donor funding, the researcher asked several questions that would allow her to realize this objective. **4.5.1 Ability to Re-Align Resources towards Goals and Access to Donor Funding**

Figure 4.14 shows the results when respondents were asked whether their organization’s ability to re-align resources towards stated goals affected donor funding. As indicated, 21 respondents (62%) agreed and 9 (26%) “Strongly” agreed while 4 (12%) were “Neutral” on whether their organization’s ability to re-align resources towards stated goals affected donor funding.

![Figure 4.14: Ability to Re-Align Resources towards Goals and Access to Donor Funding](image)

**4.5.2 Efficient Performance and Access to Donor Funding**

The researcher asked the respondents to indicate whether they agreed that efficient performance affected their organization’s access to donor funding. As shown in Table 4.12, 17 respondents (50%) agreed, 14 (41%) “Strongly” agreed, while 3 (9%) were “Neutral” on whether efficient performance affected their organization’s access to donor funding.

**Table 4.12: Efficient Performance and Access to Donor Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3 Ability to Attain a Competitive Advantage and Access to Donor Funding

Figure 4.15 displays on whether their organization’s capability to attain competitive advantage influenced their organization’s access to donor funding. As shown, 17 respondents (50%) agree, 13 (38%) “Strongly” agreed, 1 (3%) disagreed and 1 (3%) “Slightly” agreed while 2 (6%) were “Neutral” on effect of their organization’s ability to attain competitive advantage influenced their organization’s donor funding access.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of respondents' opinions](chart.png)

Figure 4.15: Ability to Attain a Competitive Advantage and Access to Donor Funding

4.4.5 Realization of Stated Objectives and Access to Donor Funding

Table 4.13 shows respondents opinion on the association between organization’s ability to realize stated objective and access to donor funding. As is indicated, 2 respondents (6%) were “Neutral”, 15 (44%) agreed, 15 (44%) “Strongly” agreed, while 1 (3%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) “Slightly” agreed that organization’s ability to realize stated objective influenced access to donor funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Realization of Stated Objectives and Access to Donor Funding
4.4.6 Aversion of Apathy and Access to Donor Funding

The researcher asked respondents to indicate whether they believed their organizations ability to avert apathy influenced their organization’s access to donor funding. As shown in Figure 4.16, 4 respondents (12%) were “Neutral”, 15 (44%) agreed, 13 (38%) “Strongly” agreed, 1 (3%) disagreed and 1 (3%) “Slightly” disagreed that they believed their organizations ability to avert apathy influenced their organization’s access to donor funding.

Figure 4.16: Aversion of Apathy and Access to Donor Funding

4.4.7 Good Operational and Financial Health and Access to Donor Funding

Figure 4.17 displays the results that were obtained on whether respondents agreed that good operational and financial health of their organization enhanced their organizations access to donor funding. As shown, 18 respondents (53%) agreed, 14 (41) “Strongly agreed while 2 (6) answered they were “Neutral”.

Figure 4.17: Good Operational and Financial Health and Access to Donor Funding
4.4.8 Importance of Strategy Evaluation on Access to Donor Funding

The respondents were asked whether strategy evaluation was important in influencing their organization’s access to donor funding. Seventeen respondents (50%) agreed, 15 (44%) “Strongly” agreed, 1 (3%) was “Neutral” while 1 (3%) indicated they disagreed that strategy evaluation was important in influencing their organization’s access to donor funding.

Figure 4.18: Importance of Strategy Evaluation on Access to Donor Funding

4.6 Cross-Tabulations of Variables

A cross-tabulation was conducted between the dependent variable (access to donor funding) and the relevant independent variables infer if there is any relationship between them. This part provides the results of the cross tabulations.

4.6.1 Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Formulation Cross-Tabulation

A cross-tabulation was done between access to donor funding and strategy implementation. As is displayed in Table 4.14, out of the 13 respondents who indicated that their organization had access to donor funding, “Most of the time” in the last fiscal year, 8 agreed that effective strategy formulation influenced access to donor funding compared to 2 who disagreed. Also, out of the 10 respondents who indicated that their organization “Always” has access to donor funding, 6 agreed that agreed that effective strategy formulation influenced access to donor funding.
Table 4.14: Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Formulation Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Donor Funding</th>
<th>Effective Strategy Formulation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 Access to Funding and Strategy Implementation Cross-Tabulation

The researcher conducted a cross-tabulation between access to donor funding and strategy implementation to determine if there was an association between the two. As shown in Table 4.15, out of the 10 respondents who indicated that their organization “Always” had access to donor funding in the last fiscal year, 7 “Strongly” agreed that strategy implementation influenced their organizations access to donor funding. It was also found that out of the 13 respondents who indicated that their organization had donor funding in the last fiscal year “most of the time”, 7 agreed and 5 “Strongly” agreed separately that strategy implementation influenced their organizations access to donor funding compared to just 1 who disagreed.

Table 4.15: Access to Funding and Strategy Implementation Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Donor Funding</th>
<th>Strategy Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.2 Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Evaluation Cross-Tabulation

A cross-tabulation comparison was done between access to donor funding and strategy evaluation. It was found that out the 10 respondents who revealed that their organization “Always” had access to donor funding in the last fiscal year, 7 also “Strongly” agreed that strategy evaluation influenced their organizations access to donor funding while none disagreed. Also out of the 13 who revealed that their organization had access to donor funding in the last fiscal year “most of the time”, 7 agreed and 4 “Strongly” agreed respondents that strategy evaluation impacted on their firm’s donor funding access and only 1 disagreed. These results are displayed in Table 4.16

Table 4.16: Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Evaluation Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Donor Funding</th>
<th>Strategy Evaluation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.3 Access to Donor Funding and Organization’s Ability to Deliver on Commitment Cross-Tabulation

A cross-tabulation was conducted between access to donor funding and organization’s ability to deliver on commitments to donors. Out of the 10 respondents who indicated that their organization “Always” had access to donor funding in the last fiscal year, 3 and 5 agreed and “Strongly” agreed correspondingly that delivering ability to deliver on commitments to donors influenced their organizations access to donor funding compared to just 1 respondent who disagreed. Also out of the 13 respondents who indicated that their organization had access to donor funding in the last fiscal year “Most of the time”, 5 agreed and 4 “Strongly” agreed that ability to honor commitments to donors impacted on their firm’s access to donor funding compared to just 1 respondent who disagreed. See Table 4.17.
Table 4.17: Access to Donor Funding and Organization’s Ability to Deliver on Commitment Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Donor Funding</th>
<th>Delivering on Commitments to Donors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.5 Access to Funding and Shared Values with Potential Donors Cross-Tabulation

The researcher conducted a cross-tabulation analysis between access to donor funding and shared values with donors. It was found that out of the 10 respondents who revealed that their organizations “Always” had access to donor funding, 5 agreed and 3 “Strongly” agreed that their shared values with donors influenced their organization’s access to donor funding. Also, out of the 13 respondents who indicated that their organization had access to donor funding “Most of the time” in the last fiscal year, 7 respondents and 6 respondents agreed and “Strongly” agreed separately that that their shared values with donors shaped their firm’s access to donor funding.

Table 4.18: Access to Funding and Shared Values with Potential Donors Cross-Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Donor Funding</th>
<th>Shared Values with Donors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Correlation Analysis between Dependent and Independent Variables

The cross-tabulation analysis revealed that there exists some relationship between the dependent and the independent variables but did not reveal the nature of that association. To determine the nature of the association between the dependent and the independent variables, the researcher conducted a Pearson Product-Movement of correlation $r$.

4.7.1: Correlation of Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Formulation

A Pearson Product-Moment of correlation was conducted to determine the nature of association between access to donor funding and strategy formulation. As shown in Table 4.19, a weak positive correlation value, $r = .108$, $p > .05$. This correlation was statistically significant and indicated that access to donor funding is positively correlated with strategy formulation. However, the weak positive value may be due to other intervening variables such as transparency and organizational reputation.

Table 4.19: Correlation of Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Donor Funding</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Formulation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.2: Correlation of Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Implementation

The research also conducted a Pearson-Product Moment of correlation between access to donor funding and strategy implementation to determine the nature of association between the two. As shown in Table 4.20, the $r$ value of correlation obtained was .046, $p > .05$. This correlation value was statistically significant given that since $p$ was greater than .05 (it was .795). The weak positive correlation implied that access to donor funding was, to a little extent, influenced by strategy formulation. The weak positive correlation may be attributed to other intervening variables such as organizational culture and ability to realize commitments to donors.
Table 4.20: Correlation of Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Donor Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Implementation</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.3: Correlation of Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Evaluation

A Pearson Product-Moment of correlation analysis was conducted to determine the nature of relationship between access to donor funding and strategy formulation. The $r$ value obtained was .123, $p > .05$. The weak positive correlation implied that access to donor funding is shaped by strategy evaluation. Nonetheless, the $r$ value was a weak positive which indicated that some factors were also at play in influencing organizations’ access to donor funding.

Table 4.21: Correlation of Access to Donor Funding and Strategy Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Donor Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Evaluation</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 Regression Analysis and ANOVA

The analysis Pearson Product-Moment of correlation is important in determining the nature of association between the dependent and the independent variable, however it does not inform about their causal relationship. The causal relationship can be determined through a regression analysis; that is, does the independent variables – strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation account for change in or access to donor funding.
4.8.1 Regression Model Summary for Access to Donor Funding

The researcher conducted a regression analysis to determine the independent variables – strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation account for change in or access to donor funding. As shown in Table 4.22, The R Square value of the model implies that strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation account for that 6.3% of the variance in access to donor funding.

Table 4.22: Regression Model Summary for Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.251(^a)</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Strategy Evaluation, Strategy Formulation, Strategy Implementation

4.8.2 ANOVA for Employee Turnover Intention

The researcher conducted an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine whether the findings were due to sampling error. The ANOVA revealed that access to donor funding (the dependent variable) is accounted for by strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation, given that F (.675, 3) = .574 which suggests that the results cannot be attributed to sampling error hence the model has an explanatory significance. The results of ANOVA are shown in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23: ANOVA Analysis for Access to Donor Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA(^a)</th>
<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></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.574(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30.225</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.265</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: Access to Donor Funding
\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), Strategy Evaluation, Strategy Formulation, Strategy Implementation
4.8.3 Regression Coefficient Analysis for Access to Donor Funding

Multiple regression analysis was done to establish the role of each of the independent variables; strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation play in predicting the most possible value of access to funding (dependent variable). Table 4.24 shows the results that were obtained.

**Table 4.24: Regression Coefficient Analysis for Access to Donor Funding**

<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>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.009</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Formulation</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Implementation</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Evaluation</td>
<td>-.332</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>-1.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Access to Donor Funding

The standard regression formula is;

\[ Y = a + bx, \]

For multiple regressions it is;

\[ Y = bX_1 + bX_2 + bX_3 + a \]

(Where Y stands for access to donor funding; b are coefficients for the independent variables (strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation) and a is the constant.

Thus,

\[ Access \ to \ Donor \ Funding = .295 \text{Strategy Formulation} + .021 \text{Strategy Implementation} - .332 \text{Strategy Evaluation} + 3.009 \]
From Table 4.24 and the above equation for access to donor funding, it is deducible that the constant for strategy formulation is .295, for strategy implementation is .021 and for strategy implementation is -.332. What this implies is that for every increase in strategy formulation, a .295 change is to be expected in access to donor funding controlling for effects of strategy implementation and strategy evaluation. Also for every increase in strategy implementation, a .021 increase is to be anticipated in in access to donor funding controlling for effect of the other two factors and similarly for every decrease in strategy evaluation, a decrease of -.332 is to be expected in access to donor funding controlling for strategy formulation and implementation.

4.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the results of the study based on the specific research objectives that this study sought to realize. The researcher has made use of both descriptive statistics as well as inferential statistics to present and make inferences from the data that was collected. The chapter has shown that the independent variables; strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation account for changes in access to donor funding. The next chapter, Chapter five, provides the conclusion and recommendation of this study based on the results and findings of Chapter four.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is the final chapter of the thesis. It provides the summary of the study as well as the key findings. This chapter also discourses the vital findings in the backdrop of the previous studies that were examined in the literature review. The conclusion and the recommendations are made upon the specific research objectives.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The general objective of the study was to investigate the influence of effective strategic management practices on the organization’s access to donor funding. The study pursued three specific objectives, viz.; to find out the influence of strategic formulation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding, to scrutinize the sway of strategy implementation on a firm’s ability to access donor funding, and to investigate the influence of strategy evaluation on an organization’s ability to access donor funding.

This study used the descriptive research design. The population that was targeted for this study was managers of four selected NGOs. The chosen sample size consisted of 34 managers. The researcher used the stratified sampling and deployed structured interview schedules to gather relevant information from the managers of the identified NGOs. The data collected was data was treated using SPSS version 21. Through descriptive statistics, the researcher summarized the data into frequency tables, pie charts bar graphs and cross-tabulations, and through the inferential statistics the researcher provided more in-depth analysis of the data through correlations and ANOVA.

The study found that most of the respondents indicated that their respective firms “Always” had access to donor funding in the last fiscal year, followed by those who indicated that their organization had access to donor funding “Most of the time” in the last fiscal year. Of the three strategic practices examined in this study; that is, strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation, a significant number
revealed that strategy evaluation was the most important strategic practice influencing
donor funding followed by strategy implementation.

With respect to the first specific objective, this study found that effective strategy
formulation, lack of ambiguities in running the organization, presence of a formalized
central planning, the organizations ability to match resources to opportunities,
organizational performance, having vision and principal policies, organizations’
transparency, ability to conduct effective environment scanning and its ability to
deliver on its commitments to donors were considered by the majority of respondents
as critical factors influencing an organization’s access to donor funding.

Concerning the second specific research objective, this study established that strategy
implementation, organizational culture, effective leadership traits, organizations’
ability to operate in a dynamic environment, ability of managers to adopt an executive
role, organizations shared values with (potential) donors, organizational reputation
and ability to identify strategic priorities were all considered as important factor
affecting organizational access to donor funding.

With regards to the third specific objective, this study found that an organization’s
ability to re-align its resources towards attainment of stated goals, its ability to
achieve efficiency in its performance, its ability to attain a competitive advantage, the
organization’s ability to realize its stated objectives, its ability to maintain a good
operational and financial health and the effectiveness of its overall strategy evaluation
were important factors influencing organizational access to donor funding. The
correlation analysis revealed that all the independent variables were all positively
associated with access to donor funding.

The regression model summary suggested that the R Square value was 6.3%
indicating that the independent variables accounted of the variance in access to donor
funding. The ANOVA revealed that this finding was not due to sampling error. In
essence this study found that strategic practices by NGOs had a significant influences
on their donor funding access ability.
5.3 Discussions

5.3.1 Strategy Formulation and Access to Donor Funding

This study found that effective strategy formulation was considered by more than three-quarter of the respondents as an important factor influencing access to donor funding. This finding is in line with the arguments advanced by Smith and Swithern (2014) who argued that strategies are sources of principal plans and policies that allow an organization to realize its goals. By having an effective strategy formulation process, an organization is able to demonstrate to potential donors its long-term intentions and purposes, which reduce donor apprehension about their funding being embezzled (Boyne, 2010). In fact, in this study, a cross-tabulation of access to donor funding and effective strategy formulation revealed that most of the respondents who indicated that their organization “Always” has access to donor funding also agreed that effective strategy formulation influenced their organization’s donor funding access.

Through strategy formulation, the organization is also able to eliminate any possible ambiguities that in the organizational process (Carrassi, 2013). In this sense, it can be deduced that eliminating any ambiguities has the potential of influencing how donors perceive their potential funding to the organization as being worthwhile. It was found that nearly all the respondents considered lack of lack of ambiguities in running the organization as a significant factor influencing their organization’s access to donor funding. Ebner (2013) has argued that strategy formulation allows organizations outline objectives and realize a positive outcome. This is considerably something that donors would consider when funding an organization.

The presence of a formalized central planning also a very important that influences whether organizations will have access to donor funding. This study found that slightly more than three-quarters of the respondents were of the opinion that having a formal central planning had an effect on access to donor funding. This finding confirms an earlier finding by Schmid (1992) that donors favor organizations that have a more centralized and formal planning structures. This is sensible if taken in the understanding that operational ambiguities are easily eliminated through centralized and formal organizational structures.
Another key finding of this study was that close to 90% of the respondents agreed that the organizations ability to match resources to opportunities influenced their organization’s access to donor funding. Smith & Swither, (2014) further state that strategic plans always must include the consideration of the availability of the resources that implementation of the strategic plan may require. This is perhaps why donors would consider the organization’s ability to ensure that available resources correspond to strategic goals or objectives as important factor while making the decision to donate to an organization.

Another key important finding in this study was that the organization’s ability to deliver on its commitments to donors influenced donors’ willingness to fund the organization. This is in line with Cloud’s (2010) assertion that organizations with weak values and common goals often find their employees following their own personal goals that may be conflicting with others. Donors will certainly be apprehensive about investing in organizations that are not able to honor their commitments. Thus, it can be inferred why this study found that organizational performance and organizational transparency are important organizational aspects, which affect access to donor funding.

5.3.2 Strategy Implementation on Access to Donor Funding

This study established that strategy implementation is an important factor influencing NGOs’ access to donor funding. It established that close to all respondents; that is, ninety-four percent, agreed that strategy implementation was an important factor influencing organizational access to donor funding. This is because strategy implementation is linked to organizational performance as Fredrickson (1986) has asserted. In this study, the cross-tabulation of strategy implementation and donor funding access revealed that most of respondents who indicated that their organization “Always” had donor funding access also agreed that strategy implementation influenced their organizations access to donor funding. Nonetheless, as was stated in the literature review, several analysts including, Brown and Covey (1987), Crittenden, et al., (1988), and Wolch (1990) unanimously state that a number of NGOs do not undertake strategic management by implementing strategic plans nor do they subscribe to the strategic planning philosophy.
Strategy implementation, just like strategy formulation is a combination of many things including, organizational culture, effective leadership traits, organization’s ability to operate in a dynamic environment, ability of managers to adopt an executive role, organizations shared values with (potential) donors, organizational reputation and ability to identify strategic priorities.

Austin (2002) argued that organizational culture influenced strategy implementation. Byar (2014) calls on organizational leaders to establish a culture that supports strategy implementation. This study found that organizational culture was seen as critical factor influencing access to donor funding. More than seventy-five percent of the respondents; that is, eighty-two percent agreed that organizational culture affected their organization’s access to donor funding. Thus, the interpretation is that donors look at the organizational culture as the signifier of the firm’s ability to implement the strategy they have formulated, and will thus consider funding the NGO if the culture is deemed enabling for the implementation of the stated strategy. It was found that effective leadership was deemed by over ninety percent of the respondents as a major factor that influenced donor funding access with just one respondent disagreeing. Kamasak, et al., (2017) argues that leadership trait enables the alignment of personnel to strategy and often times enables smooth implementation of risk management practices in the firm. In this sense, an effective leadership trait demonstrates to the donors, the organization’s ability to effectively implement the strategy.

In fact, leadership is itself linked to another factor that was considered important by respondents as affecting donor funding access which is organization’s ability to operate in a dynamic environment. Slightly more than three-quarters of the respondents (eighty percent) agreed that the organization’s ability to operate in a dynamic environment influenced their organization’s access to donor funding. The importance of this factor is identified by Lewis (2003) who observes that NGOs operate in dangerous, conflict-prone and unstable environments. Thus, for donors, the firm’s demonstration of ability to operate in such an environment is a key factor that influences their decision to fund or not to fund a given NGO. The ability of the organization to have shared values with the potential donors and internally is also important in influencing their access to donor funding.
5.3.3 Strategy Evaluation on Access to Donor Funding

This study made important findings in relation to the influence of strategy evaluation on access to donor funding. It found that ninety-four percent of the respondents considered strategy evaluation and important factor influencing NGOs’ access to donor funding. According to Mintzberg (2004) is important because it is a process considers the consistency with which an organization focuses on its goals and policies. Through effective strategy evaluation system, the organization can attract donor funding by showing that it has the ability to monitor progress of strategy implementation and to integrate adoptive responses (David, 2013; Mintzberg 2004).

Like the strategy formulation and strategy implementation, strategy evaluation is underpinned by key organizational elements that have the potential of showing donors that the organization in question is worth funding (Rantanen, et al., 2007). The key elements of strategy evaluation considered in this study are organization’s ability to re-align its resources towards attainment of stated goals, its ability to achieve efficiency in its performance, its ability to attain a competitive advantage, the organization’s ability to realize its stated objectives, its ability to maintain a good operational and financial health and the effectiveness of its overall strategy evaluation.

Kaplan and Norton (1992) postulate that strategy evaluation helps the organization to re-align its efforts and resources to reflect the impact felt from proper implementation of the strategic plan. In this sense, it can be seen why strategy evaluation is of significant influence on an organizations ability to attract donor funding. The findings of this study are in line with this perspective as it determined that eighty-eight percent of the respondents (more than three-quarter) agreed that the ability of the organization to re-align its efforts and resources towards goals was considered a significant factor influencing access to donor funding. Another important factor that this study found to be important in influencing donor funding access was the organizations ability to achieve efficiency in its performance with ninety-one percent of the respondents agreeing that this factor influenced their organizations access to donor funding. This finding is in line with the point made by Odom and Boxx (1988) that organizational performance is intricately linked with donor funding access for NGOs.
Kamasak, *et al.*, (2017) has stated that NGOs ability to navigate the dynamic environments in which they operate and to attain a competitive advantage or even survive is an indicator of an underlying effective strategy formulation process. This study found that more than three-quarter of the respondents agreed that attaining a competitive advantage was a significant factor influencing their organization’s access to donor funding. Additionally, the organization’s ability to realize its stated objectives has obvious implications for access to donor funding. This study established that eighty-eight percent of respondents believed that this factor influenced their respective organizations access to donor funding.

The correlation analysis revealed that all the independent variables were all positively associated with access to donor funding. However, the $r$ value for these correlations very weak. The regression model summary revealed that the R Square value was 6.3% indicating that the independent variables accounted of the variance in access to donor funding. The $r$ value was very low indicating the strategic practices only account to a small degree for factors that influence NGOs’ access to donor funding.

### 5.4 Conclusion

#### 5.4.1 Strategy Formulation and Access to Donor Funding

Strategy formulation affects the manner in which donors consider an organization to have clear short and long-term objectives. This is because it determines and reveals the organization’s objectives, purposes, or goals. Hence, as a source of the organization’s principal policies, strategy formulation is important for donors when they are assessing whether the organization that is requesting funds is worth financing.

Thus, it can be concluded that donors, consider effective strategy formulation, lack of ambiguities in running the organization, presence of a formalized central planning, the organizations ability to match resources to opportunities, organizational performance, having vision and principal policies, organizations’ transparency, ability to conduct effective environment scanning and its ability to deliver on its commitments to donors as key indicators of an organizations ability to achieve their objective. It follows then that firms that have effective strategy formulation are also the ones that have donor funding access either “Always” or “Most of the time”.
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5.4.2 Strategy Implementation on Access to Donor Funding

Strategy implementation influences donor funding access as it is a critical phase in the development of any organization. Some of the key elements of strategy implementation are organizational culture, effective leadership traits, and organizations ability to operate in a dynamic environment, ability of managers to adopt an executive role, organizations shared values with (potential) donors, organizational reputation and ability to identify strategic priorities. All this factors influence the ability of the organization to access to donor funding.

Strategy implementation has an influence on donor funding access since it follows that the weaker the strategy implementation phase, the poorer the overall implementation of the whole strategy, which in turn negatively influences the organization’s standing before potential donors. Strategy implementation also influences donor funding access as it has a direct impact on organizational performance and fulfillment of organization’s financial accountability.

5.4.4 Strategy Evaluation on Access to Donor Funding

Strategy evaluation has significant influence on organizational donor funding access as it demonstrates to the donors, the organization’s ability to monitor progress and make necessary adjustments to attain stated goals. The key elements of strategy evaluation considered in this study are organization’s ability to re-align its resources towards attainment of stated goals, its ability to achieve efficiency in its performance, its ability to attain a competitive advantage, the organization’s ability to realize its stated objectives, its ability to maintain a good operational and financial health and the effectiveness of its overall strategy evaluation have significant influence on donor funding access for NGOs.

Effective strategy evaluation increased ability by the organization to clearly chat strategic priorities, effectiveness of strategy implementation, effective outcomes measurement, realignment of short-term actions with long-term objectives as well as promoting integration among various organizational processes. Hence, it gives assurance to donors that the organizations strategy implementation is on track, which enhances chances of access to additional donor funding for the organization.
5.5 Recommendations

The following recommendations for improvement and for further studies are made based on the major findings of this study.

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Strategy Formulation and Access to Donor Funding

The managers of the NGOs operating in Kenya should acknowledge the effect that effective strategy formulation has on their access to donor funding. The management of NGOs should therefore take drastic measures including establishing a formal central planning structure, eliminate any ambiguities in their operational process, and establish clear vision and principal policies for their organizations to enhance their access to donor funding. The management of NGOs in Kenya should also ensure that their operations are not only transparent but are in line with their commitments to donors.

5.5.1.2 Strategy Implementation on Access to Donor Funding

The top management of NGOs should identify effective means of demonstrating their organizations ability to effectively implement formulated strategies as a way of attracting donor funding. The management of NGOs should ensure that the managers and leaders are employees who possess demonstrable and relevant leadership traits. The managers should be able to understand the ability of the organization to operate in a dynamic environment directly influences their organizations ability to attract donor funding. The NGOs operating in Kenya need to harness their values and beliefs and align them with those of potential donors to demonstrate to the donors their intention to commit to a cause the donors are interested in.

5.5.1.3 Strategy Evaluation on Access to Donor Funding

The top leadership and management of NGOs should consider strategy evaluation as an effective means of attracting donor funding. The management should take precise steps to improve the underlying elements of strategy evaluation including monitoring, re-aligning resources towards stated goals and achieving efficiency in performance.
5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

Future researchers should conduct longitudinal studies on the influence of strategic practices on organizations donor funding access to determine how strategic practices affect donor funding access throughout the life cycle of an organization. Future researcher should also conduct a study to examine how donors perceive strategic practices by organizations and the extent to which this affects their funding of organizations. Future researchers should conduct studies to account for why the Pearson Product-Moment of correlation for donor funding access and strategic practices, particularly strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation only yield weak positive results.


APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INFLUENCE OF STRATEGIC PRACTICES ON TO ACCESS DONOR FUNDING: A CASE OF NGOS IN NAIROBI COUNTY

Date________________________

Kindly read each question and respond to it the best of your ability and where necessary mark with a tick [✓] in the boxes provided.

There are no accurate or inaccurate responses; your answers are crucial to the study. All replies to this survey are completely confidential. All identifying information if any will be removed during the data entry and analysis; however, you are requested to respond anonymously. The questionnaire will take an average of 20 minutes to fill. Thank you for participating in this study.

PART 1: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. For each of the questions, please select one answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Please indicate which firm you work for.</th>
<th>Mercy USA for Aid and Development</th>
<th>Internationa 1 Rescue Committee</th>
<th>Rural Agency for Community Development and Assistance</th>
<th>Finn Church Aid</th>
<th>Other, specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. Please indicate your tenure in the company</td>
<td>Less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>Less than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>5 to 10 yrs.</td>
<td>Less than 15 yrs.</td>
<td>15 yrs. and over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Please indicate your tenure as a manager in the company</td>
<td>Less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>Less than 5 yrs.</td>
<td>5 to 10 yrs.</td>
<td>Less than 15 yrs.</td>
<td>15 yrs. and over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Which of the following best describes your position in the company?</td>
<td>Administration Manager</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Procurement Manager</td>
<td>Other, specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. What is your level of acquaintance with the effect of strategic practices on access to donor funding?</td>
<td>Not well acquainted</td>
<td>Somewhat Acquainted</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Well acquainted</td>
<td>Very well acquainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Did your organization have donor funding access in the last fiscal year</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the times</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Other, specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In the table is some of aspects of strategic practices that influence access to donor funding. Please rank in order of importance (with 1 being least important and 5 being most important) how you think they can influence donor funding access for your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic practices</th>
<th>Least Important</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategy formulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strategy implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategy evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART II: IMPACT OF STRATEGY FORMULATION ON ACCESS TO DONOR FUNDING**

3. Kindly indicate your perception or level of agreement with each of these statements on the influence of strategy formulation on access to donor funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. I attribute our good donor funding access to our effective strategy formulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Our strategy formulation improves our donor funding access as it shows we’ve eliminated ambiguities of running the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Our strategy formulation demonstrates our formalized and central planning, which attracts donor funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Our strategy formulation is a demonstration to potential donors of our organization's ability to match internal resources and skills with opportunities and risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Our strategy formulation is a show of our vision, principal policies and plans to potential donors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Our strategy formulation allows us to scan our environment and establish flexible approaches to issues, which potential donors find important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Our strategy formulation is a show of our organizations ability to deliver on commitments made to potential donors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Through strategy formulation, our organization is able to demonstrate funding needs and intentions and thus provide transparency which potential donor find crucial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Our strategy formulation is enhancing our organization’s performance and hence enhances our access to donor funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III: IMPACT OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION ON ACCESS TO DONOR FUNDING

4. Kindly indicate your perception or level of agreement with each of these statements on influence of strategy implementation on access to donor funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Our strategy implementation improves our donor funding access as it shows our ability to integrate our organizational structure and personnel skills to achieve formulated strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Our strategy implementation permits us to demonstrate to potential donors our strong organizational culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Our organization is able to attract donor funding through constant effective implementation of strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Through strategy implementation, our organization is able to showcase its strategic leadership trait to potential donors, which increases chances of access to donor funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Our organization is able to access donor funding by showing, through strategy implementation, its ability to effectively operate in a dynamic environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Our strategy implementation allows our managers to adopt an active executive role in the implementation process, which spell our organization’s strategic direction to donors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Our strategy implementation process shows potential donors our shared values, which enhance their perception of funding us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Through effective strategy implementation, we are able to achieve greater performance which in turn increases our reputation and access to donor funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. In general, I attribute our good donor funding access to our effective strategy implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vii. Kindly indicate your perception or level of agreement with each of these statements on influence of strategy evaluation on access to donor funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Our strategy implementation allows us to show potential donors our ability to clearly chart strategic priorities, which donors find important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Through effective strategy evaluation, we can demonstrate to donors our ability to re-align its resources and efforts to achieve intended goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. I attribute our organizations ability to access donor funding to its ability to ensure efficient performance by monitoring the strategy implementation process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Through an effective strategy evaluation process, our organization attracts donor funding by showing it has a competitive advantage over similar organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Our strategy evaluation process enhances our organizations donor funding access as its shows that not only do we have a vision, mission and objective but clearly defined performance indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Through strategy evaluation, our organization is able to show that the stated objectives are being met, and this increases our reputation among donors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Our strategy evaluation allows us to avert donor apathy towards us by showing our organizations ability to integrate adoptive responses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Through strategy evaluation, our organization increases its donor funding access by constantly demonstrating its operational and financial health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. In general, I attribute our good donor funding access to our effective strategy evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END

Thanks for Your Participation in this Study