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ABSTRACT

The general objective of the study was to identify the influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A. The specific objectives of the study is to find out the influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A. To establish how technical barriers influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A and to assess the influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

This study was done using the Survey research design with an aim of gathering information on factors influencing the strategy implementation process negatively or positively. In this study, the total population of employees is four hundred and seventy two (472). This research sampled a third of the respondents resulting into a sample size of fifty one (51) respondents. This study used primary data, which offered a first-hand account of information from the respondents using a questionnaire. The data was analyzed statistically using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) as most of the data was in quantitative form. The study sought to highlight relationships and trends using calculations such as correlation, regression, ANOVA and the data was then be presented in graphical format.

The first objective sought to determine the influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. The study established that a majority agreed that the behavior of the people working within USIU-Africa played an important role in implementation of strategies. USIU-Africa employees enjoy job security and they are willing to adjust to organizational culture. The second objective sought to determine the influence of technical barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. Majority also agreed that USIU-Africa employees have technical knowledge and employees understand the requirements of USIU-Africa. The third objective sought to determine the influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. It was agreed that USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures for employees, USIU-Africa has preventive maintenance schedules, and the institution has adequate working tools. The fourth objective sought to determine the influence of strategic barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. The study established that USIU-Africa focuses on long term planning.

The study concluded that behavior of staff at USIU-Africa plays a crucial role in the implementation of strategies. To ensure employees are motivated to take up the task, the
institution has ensured that employees enjoy job security and are willing to adjust to organizational culture. In addition, the firm’s employees have the necessary education and this has led to adequate achievement of the set objectives. Most employees possess the technical knowledge and therefore have an understanding of the requirements on strategy implementation. To mitigate any eventuality, USIU-Africa has set up a preventive maintenance schedules, and the institution has adequate working tools. Lastly, the study concluded that USIU-Africa has focused on long term planning.

It was recommended that employees need to be involved fully in the process and this should be an agenda driven by the top management in order to increase commitment levels at the firm as well as reduce employee apathy towards strategy implementation efforts. Secondly, there is a need for the institution to offer motivation to the employees, and such incentives would lead to more commitment to the firm’s strategic plans. Thirdly, USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures for employees therefore through the various departmental heads, closer supervision should be done to ensure all employees adhere to the set SOPs. Lastly, USIU-Africa needs to invest a lot of time to educate the employees about set policies and set objectives. The structure of USIU-Africa should be analyzed and recommendations made towards ensuring that it supports successful implementation of strategies.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Strategy has become a buzzword used by any and all who wish to show themselves adept at operating within the current environmental turbulence of the twenty first century and this can be seen through the numerous Strategic Plan launches done by companies, and broadcasted through various media for the purpose of creating perceived competitive advantage. Even more recently, some organizations have dedicated entire departments with own budgets to strategy development and execution.

The history of Strategy as a discipline can be traced back to SunTzu, the Chinese military genius. He revolutionized war through his famous book, *The Art of War* whose basic premise was the importance of gathering intelligence on one’s enemy. His writings have not only influenced military strategies to date, but have also been used to guide corporate strategy. Mintzberg, Ahlstrand and Lampel (1998) defined Strategy as: Plan – A directed course of action that would achieve an intended set of goals; Pattern – Consistency of past behavior leading to a strategy being realized over time; Position – This involves locating brands, products or companies within the market thereby having a strategy substantially determined by market/external forces; Ploy – A maneuver to outwit the competitor and Perspective - Strategy being an extension of the ideological perspective of the organization.

Pearce and Robinson (2012) defined Strategy as the agreed upon choices and activities that lead to the creation of plans intended to accomplish a firm’s goals. In this regard, strategy is *not* the act of writing down plans to be pasted on a wall, but a process of developing an organizational guide towards the known or unknown business environment. Obviously, I cannot underestimate nor overemphasize the critical nature of the strategic formation process due to the overall impact that a well-crafted strategic plan is intended to make. Azhar Kazmi (2008) supposes that a nicely drafted strategic plan, prepared through a sophisticated process by a team of accomplished management consultants or a group of top managers, is hardly likely to fail by itself. The author continues to note that failure, when it occurs, almost always happens during the implementation of the strategic plan.
Organizations focus so much on the strategy formation process and forget that the implementation process is not just a cut and paste affair between top management and employees, but an equally important activity requiring a plan (Omondi, Ombui and Mungatu, 2013). Yes, strategy implementation needs a plan. This begs the question, “what is Strategy implementation and how does it look like?” Harrington and Ottenbacher (2011) suggest that strategy implementation looks at the tactics used by a firm or firms to execute ends and means. The authors further simplify this definition by asking the question, “what implementation tactics or steps are used to promote the manifestation of a strategic plan?”

Strategy implementation is a subject which has not benefited from numerous works of research and study and only recently, the past decade have authors begun to look at this area as critical to organization performance. The most recent work in this areas is by Elbanna and Fadol (2016) who define strategy implementation as a multifaceted and complex process which can be defined as ‘the communication, interpretation, adoption and enactment of strategic plans. Expectations of improved performance in one way or the other develop way before the conceptualization of implementation meaning that there has to be a measurable output during and after the implementation of a strategy. No wonder Jaaskelainen and Laihonen (2013) defines performance as the organization’s ability to achieve its objectives. Success in strategy formulation can only be determined by comparing the organization’s objectives and the actual performance.

According to Brenes, Mena and Molina (2008), suggest that successful strategy implementation is the development of conscious, systematic, participatory processes directed toward explicitly analyzing and formulating business strategy. Though hard to achieve precise implementation of strategy is frequently seen as a key ingredient for successful organizations according to Lee and Puranaman (2015) who also note that precise implementation of strategy cannot guarantee superior performance. However, Sterling (2003) emphasizes that an effective implementation of an average strategy, beats mediocre implementation of a great strategy every time. Generally, strategies are usually implemented through programs, projects and initiatives leading using a reductionist approach and building up to the implementation of the larger strategy. In Africa however, Ika (2009) notes that failures in project implementation seem to be the rule rather than the exception. If strategy implementation could be viewed from
the smaller view of projects implemented across the continent, then only fifty percent of strategies would succeed according to Muganda, Kandiri and Johnson (2014).

USIU-Africa was initially set up as USIU in 1970 (Onsongo, 2007). In 1927 Leland Ghent Stanford chartered a private graduate institution called Balboa Law College in San Diego (USA), which later changed its name to Balboa University in 1945. In 1952, Balboa University again changed its name to California Western University, and a year later Dr. William C. Rust became the university’s president. Dr. Rust had a vision of international education that would see students and faculty share and embrace knowledge around the world. In 1968, he relocated the university’s undergraduate and graduate programs to Scripps Ranch in northeast San Diego, and then formally changed the university’s name to United States International University – Africa. Soon after, began his search for an African campus, travelling to Nigeria, Ghana and Kenya, before finally settling on Nairobi.

The United States International University – Africa was registered under the Companies Act (Cap 486) on 18th September, 1969. In 1970, he signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Kenya that allowed him to offer business programs and any other degree programs that were not being offered by the existing public universities. Rust’s journey was not an easy one. There were many challenges to his vision including convincing the Kenyan government that an American education was just as good as a British one. He also had to convince the U.S. accrediting body (Western Association of Schools and Colleges – WASC) of the viability of an international multi-campus system. He went on to establish campuses in Mexico City, London and Tokyo. In 1977, the university began to offer accredited full degree programs in Business Administration, Psychology and International Relations. Unlike earlier graduating classes that completed their degree requirements in San Diego, the first students to graduate from the Nairobi campus did so in 1979 (USIU, 2018).

Dr. Dee Aker’s term as Executive Director began in 1981 and lasted for three years, when Dr. Lillian K. Beam succeeded her. The ten-year term of Dr. Beam coincided with major shifts in the regulation of higher education in Kenya. To comply with the new quality assurance standards enshrined in the Universities Act of 1986 and the rules and regulations that followed in 1989, Dr. Beam purchased 20 acres of property in Kasarani, Nairobi where the campus moved to in 1991. The temporary buildings built then to accommodate current students, were
completed in time to accommodate a sudden influx of students from Kenyan public universities, desperately seeking to complete their college education, following a prolonged faculty labor dispute in Kenyan public universities. The new students, as well as many faculty members from public universities stayed on, forming the foundation for USIU-Africa’s fledging new campus (USIU, 2018).

In 1994, then USIU President Dr. Garry B. Hays, offered Dr. Freida A. Brown, then USIU Coordinator of international campuses, a chance to take over from the retiring Dr. Beam as Executive Director. She moved to Nairobi to find a campus with mounting debts, almost no fulltime faculty and no Charter. Dr. Brown solved the debt crisis through prudential financial management, and did it so well that in four years, the university’s finances has recovered enough to purchase an additional 60 acres, thereby meeting the minimum land requirement for accreditation by the Commission for Higher Education. A year later, the university was granted its Charter by then Kenyan President H.E. President Daniel T. Arap Moi, at a ceremony that also featured the inauguration of Dr. Brown as USIU-Africa’s first Vice Chancellor (USIU, 2018).

By the turn of the century, USIU-Africa’s School of Business Administration and School of Arts and Sciences were offering 11 programs at both undergraduate and graduate level, all of which were dually accredited in Kenya and the United States. The university has also completed construction of a 450-seat auditorium, a recreation center and a second campus housing block. In 2001, USIU merged with the California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP) forming the Alliant International University. USIU-Africa successfully sought to separate itself from the new entity, becoming an independent institution in 2005, and receiving its own accreditation as United States International University, from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 2008. In 2014, the university rebranded, reverting to its former United States International University – Africa (Kairu, 2014). A year later, construction of the new home for the School of Science and Technology, and the new School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences was completed. Kenyan Deputy President H.E. William S. Ruto opened the Science Center in March 2015. In December 2014, the Board of Trustees announced the impending retirement of long-serving Vice Chancellor Prof. Freida Brown. The search for her successor culminated in the installation of Prof. Paul T. Zeleza as USIU-Africa’s second Vice
Chancellor on Thursday, April 7, 2016. Over 70 nationalities are represented among the diverse student population undertaking 25 undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programs at USIU-Africa (USIU-Africa, 2018).

1.2 Problem Statement

Although numerous studies acknowledge that strategies frequently fail not because of inadequate strategy formulation, but because of insufficient implementation, strategy implementation has received less research attention than strategy formulation (Omondi, Ombui and Mungatu, 2013). However, Andrews et al. (2011) assert that a key reason for strategy implementation failure is the separation of strategy formulation from implementation. Brenes et al. (2008) maintain that successful strategy implementation requires the deliberate and systematic management of several dimensions, namely, the strategy formulation process; the systematic execution of the strategy; strategy control and follow-up; the leadership of top management; suitable, motivated managers and employees; and corporate governance.

Frameworks such as the Balanced Score Card by Kaplan and Norton (1992) and McKinsey 7s Framework first highlighted in Peters and Waterman (1982) have provided a basis for assessing strategy implementation but generically, looking at key indicators without going in depth to identify barriers that could apply to specific industries and organization types. This leaves organizations precariously fumbling in the dark during this critical stage of strategy implementation. No wonder research has shown that 66% of corporate strategy is never implemented (Johnson, 2004).

How employees work within the organization greatly impacts implementation of strategy. It is the commitment, involvement and support of the top management and employee which results in the successful implementation of TPM (Panneerselvam, 2012). Strategy implementation in higher learning institution has been a study of interest for instance Njiri (2016) assessed the role of strategic leadership in the implementation of strategies at KCA University in Kenya. The study found out that respondents were young and with a possibility of a high level of attention in and knowledge around, strategic leadership and implementation of strategies at KCA University.

Omuse, Kihara and Munga (2018) study was examined factors determining strategic plan implementation in the context of public institutions of higher learning. Communication was a
significant determinant of strategic plan implementation in public universities. Resource allocation was found to be a significant determinant of strategic plan implementation in public universities. The current study intends to identify the influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A.

1.3 General Objective

The general objective of the study was to identify the influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A.

1.4 Specific Objectives

1.4.1 To find out the influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A.
1.4.2 To establish how technical barriers influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A.
1.4.3 To assess the influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A.
1.4.4 To explore the influence of strategic barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The benefits of this study include:

1.5.1 To the USIU-A University Management

The higher education sector in an increasingly competitive environment requiring a critical evaluation of the strategic planning and implementation process. Emphasis needs to be placed on the implementation which is key to ensuring that the institution meets its objectives and thrives in the current environment. This study therefore gives the USIU-A University management an opportunity to not only reconsider its strategy formulation, but it’s execution at all levels of the organization.

1.5.2 Scholars of strategy

As highlighted earlier, there has been very little research done on strategy implementation (Omondi et al, 2013). There is therefore a real need for this kind of research to advise further studies by scholars of strategy.
1.5.3 Higher Education sector

Organizations are increasingly recognizing the need for collaboration in research and continued learning. Similarly, institutions of higher education in Kenya can no longer continue to work in isolation trying their best to beat each other in a seemingly heated race. With the understanding that they each have something unique to offer and that they attract different types of students, Universities would be able to benefit from each other’s learnings.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study focused on a population of junior staff, middle level, and managerial level staff of USIU-A University. The choice of respondents is guided by the need to incorporate the different levels of implementers of strategy in the organization in this research so as to have balanced responses that gives more information on the overall feeling across the different levels of implementation rather than a skewed perspective derived from a few respondents at specific levels. The target population were 50 respondents as a reliable representation of staff in the institution. The study was administered during the months of May and June 2016. The study was limited by fear of consequences by employees and as such, a confidentiality clause included on the questionnaire as a way of reassuring respondents. Names and specifics was also not be requested so as to further reassure respondents of the academic nature of the study.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Strategy

The agreed upon choices and activities that lead to the creation of plans intended to accomplish a firm’s goals (Pearce & Robinson, 2012).

1.7.2 Strategy implementation

A multifaceted and complex process which can be defined as ‘the communication, interpretation, adoption and enactment of strategic plans’ (Elbanna & Fadol, 2016).

1.7.3 Performance

The organization’s ability to achieve its objectives (Jaaskelainen & Laihonen, 2013).
1.7.4 Barriers to strategy implementation

Impediments to the actualization of strategy exhibited by the lack of or insufficient job-related competencies including knowledge, skills, or behaviours that are critical for successful job performance (Noe, 2009).

1.8 Chapter Summary

This study seeks to identify barriers to strategy implementation with a focus on USIU-A University. In the background of the study, I have highlighted that strategy implementation has received very little research and as such, more needs to be done to benefit the stakeholders who have been identified in the relevance of the study.

The study will cover all levels of staff at USIU-A University and the target number has been identified. The data collection tool to be used will be a self-administered questionnaire. The respondents will be assured of confidentiality to encourage response. In chapter two, I will look at studies that other scholars have conducted as well as frameworks which have been developed in regards to strategy implementation. Chapter three will highlight the actual research execution based on the design, sample and data collection and analysis which will then be presented in chapter four and discussed in chapter five.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will therefore seek to review previous research work on the area of strategy implementation and also highlight higher education specific works which would make this study more relevant to administrators of institutions of higher education. The information will be outlined as per the specific objectives highlighted in chapter one by discussing behavioral, technical, operational and strategic barriers.

2.2 Behavioural Barriers and Strategy Implementation

How employees work within the organization greatly impacts implementation of strategy. It is the commitment, involvement and support of the top management and employee which results in the successful implementation of TPM (Panneerselvam, 2012). Top-level management in an organization integral to the entire strategic process, from formulation to execution. They determine and maintain the reputation by creation of an enabling culture. They are the ones who raise the organization to newer heights in a competitive scenario (Grover, Agrawal, & Khan, 2007).

Failure of many corporate change programs is often directly attributable to employee resistance (Bovey & Hede, 2001) and no wonder when the word resistance is mentioned, the first thought that comes to mind is employees. However, some of the benefits of resistance to change accrue from the questioning that employees would engage management in as a result of the uncertainty of outcomes as well as the overall strangeness that a new strategy brings with it.

Strategy implementation in higher learning institution has been a study of interest for instance Njiri (2016) assessed the role of strategic leadership in the implementation of strategies at KCA University in Kenya. The Study sought to establish the influence of strategic direction, human capital development and organization structure on strategy implementation at KCA University. The study found out that respondents were young and with a possibility of a high level of attention in and knowledge around, strategic leadership and implementation of strategies at KCA University. Most of the respondents in this study had attained academic qualification
above diploma education which could have translated to mean that they have extra knowledge and skills well enough to formulate strategic plans and provide leadership during strategic execution.

Omuse, Kihara and Munga (2018) study was examined factors determining strategic plan implementation in the context of public institutions of higher learning. Specifically, the study sought to determine how leadership styles, communication, resources and technology influence strategic plans in public universities in Kenya. The study adopted a descriptive research survey design involving 13 universities in Nairobi. In each University the research sampled employees in the order of VC, DVCs, Registrars, CODs, HODs, PO,FO and Administrative Officers totaling to 279 respondents. Communication was a significant determinant of strategic plan implementation in public universities. Resource allocation was found to be a significant determinant of strategic plan implementation in public universities. Technology and innovation was identified as a critical factor determining strategic plan implementation in public universities.

Research has been done on employee commitment to strategy implementation and Chijioke, Helena and Olaunji (2018) study on mobile telecommunication sector in Nigeria examined the relationship between employee commitment to strategy implementation and employee satisfaction in mobile telecommunication firms in Nigeria. The survey method was used to collect data from four mobile telecommunication firms in Nigeria. The results showed that employee commitment to strategy implementation had a positive and significant relationship with employee satisfaction. Employee commitment to strategy implementation is correlated with employee satisfaction, the more committed employee’s are to their firm’s strategy implementation, the higher their level of satisfaction with their firms. Thus, employee commitment to strategy implementation had a positive impact on employee satisfaction.

Sarah, Shou-Yih, Bryan, Marshall, Michael and Cynthia (2015) sought to establish how top managers’ support increases middle managers’ commitment to innovation implementation in healthcare organizations. The study used 120 US health centers to assess whether top managers’ support influences middle managers’ commitment directly, by allocating implementation policies and practices, or by moderating the influence of implementation policies and practices on middle managers’ commitment. Results suggested that top managers
increase middle managers’ commitment by directly conveying to middle managers that innovation implementation is an organizational priority; allocating implementation policies and practices including performance reviews, human resources, training, and funding as well and encouraging middle managers to leverage performance reviews and human resources to achieve innovation implementation.

2.2.1 Employee Resistance
The behavior of the people working within a firm play an important role in implementation of strategies. Makina and Kengeru (2018) study looked at Managing Strategic Change of an Organization's Performance at Nzoia Sugar Company, Kenya. The study employed census approach with target population of 44 staff members due to convenience and sensitivity of the information in the sugar industry. The research design was descriptive. The data for the study was both primary and secondary. Structured and unstructured questionnaires were the main tools for collecting primary data. Data was analyzed using multiple correlation analysis and descriptive statistics. Data was presented through graphs, pie-charts, and frequency tables and figures. The findings showed that most of the workers who resisted change were subordinates comprising 67.7% while managers who resisted comprised 6.5%. There was positive correlation between improvement in performance and implementation of the strategies. There was a negative correlation between resistance to change and involvement in resistance to change. The study recommends involvement of all stakeholders in strategy formulation implementation and control.

Jos, Marjolein and Caniëls (2012) investigated how resistance to change might be a consequence of differences in professional discourse of professional groups working together in a change program. The paper used discourse analysis and rubrics to study the implementation of a new ICT system for an airline. Data for this case study were collected in semi-structured interviews, desk research, and participant observations and a diagnostic workshop. The data suggested that the non-aligned interaction between different professional discourses can be a source of resistance to change, in addition to other well-known sources of resistance to change in the change management literature. Future research regarding change management should incorporate linguistics and discourse analysis. Investigating resistance to change could be done comprehensively, paying attention to differences in professional cultures
in cross-functional (project) teams. A managerial implication of the study is that making differences in professional discourses explicit is a constant point of attention in (project) teams.

Derya and Gökhan (2013) aimed to handle the concepts regarding pressures for organizational change, resisting forces and causes of resistance to change, and ways for school administrators to overcome resisting forces. Continuous developments and range of triggers force school organizations towards change initiatives. Even though change is implemented for positive reasons like adapting to volatile environment conditions and remaining competitive, organization members often react to change efforts negatively and resist change. Some common reasons for resistance to change within school organizations included interference with need fulfilment, selective perception, habit, inconvenience or loss of freedom, economic implications, security in the past, fear of the unknown, threats to power or influence, knowledge and skill obsolescence, organizational structure and limited resources. Six specific methods helping in overcoming resistance to change that school administrator can use are education and communication, participation and involvement, facilitation and support, negotiation and agreement, manipulation and co-optation, explicit and implicit coercion.

2.2.2 Job Security

Job security is defined as the assurance in an employee’s job continuity due to the general economic conditions in the country (James, 2012). It is concerned with the possibility or probability of an individual keeping his/her job (Adebayo & Lucky, 2012). It deals with the chances of employees keeping their jobs in order not be unemployed (Simon, 2011). Jobs which are not backed by indefinite contract or cannot be guaranteed for reasonable period are deemed to lack job security. It is also seen as the employees free from the fear of being dismissed from his/her present employment or job loss. Some professions and employment activities have greater job security than others. Job security is an employee's assurance or confidence that they will keep their current job for a longer period as they so wish (businessdictionary.com). It is the assurance from the company or organization that their employees will remain with them for a reasonable period of time without being wrongly dismissed (Huang, Wang, Chen & Yien, 2011).

Quite a number of factors such as employment contract, collective bargaining agreement, labor legislation and personal factors such as education, work experience, job functional area, work
industry, work location, etc., play an important role in determining the need for an individual's services and impacts their personal job security (Iwarere & Lawal, 2011). In another extreme, essential or necessary skills and past experience required by the employer’s and subject to the current economic condition and business environment could also guarantee individual’s job security (Kessy & Temu, 2010).

Generally, certain type of jobs and industry jobs has been perceived to have high job security. For instance, government jobs, educational jobs, healthcare jobs and law enforcement jobs are deemed to be very secure while on the other hand, jobs in the private sector are widely perceived to offer lower job security which may also be according to industry, location, occupation and other factors (Kessy & Temu, 2010). However, in the final analysis, Samson and Mary (2012) noted that people's job security eventually depends on whether they are employable or not and if businesses have a need for their skills or not. Although, employment laws can offer some relief against unemployment risk, they only have a marginal contribution to the job security of individuals. The fact remains that, individuals need to have the right skill set to have good job security (Lucky & Minai, 2011).

Job security is also critical to strategy implementation and according to Adebayo and Lucky (2012), quite a number of factors such as employment contract, collective bargaining agreement, labor legislation and personal factors such as education, work experience, job functional areas etc. play an important role in determining the need for an individual’s services and impacts their personal job security.

2.2.3 Organisational Culture
Organizational culture includes the shared beliefs, norms and values within an organization. It sets the foundation for strategy. For a strategy within an organization to develop and be implemented successfully, it must fully align with the organizational culture. Thus, initiatives and goals must be established within an organization to support and establish an organizational culture that embraces the organization’s strategy over time (Ahmadi, Salamzadeh, Daraei & Akbari, 2012).

Organizations that remain flexible are more likely to embrace change and create an environment that remains open to production and communication. This provides a model that
welcomes cultural diversity and helps clarify strategy implementation. Culture within an organization can serve many purposes, including to unify members within an organization and help create a set of common norms or rules within an organization that employees follow (Janicijevic, 2012).

Flexible, strong and unified cultures will approach strategy implementation and affect implementation in a positive manner by aligning goals. Goals can come into alignment when the organizational culture works to focus on productivity and getting the organization’s primary mission accomplished. This may include getting products delivered to customers on time, shipping out more products than the organization’s chief competitor or similar goals. This will create a domino effect in the organization that ensures that all work performed by each individual in the company and work group focuses on performance and on the strategic importance of the company (Jones & George, 2011).

In Kenya there have been several attempts to understand the role of organization culture during the strategy implementation process. Abok et al., (2013) in her study on Culture's role in the implementation of strategic plans in non-governmental organizations in Kenya results indicate that organizational culture affect implementation of strategic plans in Kenyan NGOs. Based on the findings, the study has recommended that organizational cultures be promoted to enhance the spirit of embracing strategic plans implementation at all stages. The study interrogated the influence of culture in the implementation of strategic plans in 258 NGOs in Kenya revealed that valuable organization culture is better for effective implementation of strategic plans than a non-effective culture.

Muthoni (2013) in her study on Effects of Organizational Culture on Strategy Implementation in Commercial Banks in Kenya found that 75% of commercial banks in Kenya uphold culture of dynamism, entrepreneurship and creativity at work. Majority of these commercial banks in Kenya have adopted the cultures that are flexible in dynamic work environments. This culture is grounded in strategy supportive values, practices and behavioral norms add to the power and effectiveness of a company’s strategy execution effort. The study which used both primary and secondary data showed that majority of commercial banks are more interested in upholding their organizational cultural values than work.
Nyariki (2012) in his study on Challenges of Strategy Implementation at the University of Nairobi identified culture as a component of strategy implementation indicating that the university has put in place measured to recruit and constant training of staff in all operational areas to build capacity as well as the right culture. The study also established that University of Nairobi adopts a formal strategic planning process which involves members of the management team, while other staff members are represented by respective trade union.

2.3 Technical Barriers and Strategy Implementation

An appreciation of the fact that institutions of higher education operate in complex environments needs to be made. From the accrediting bodies, to the various governing bodies which pull and tag on all side’s and in cognizance of stiff competition locally and internationally, the university is left to manage varied stakeholder needs while working to maintain the institution’s core purpose for existence. This tension could be the reason behind why attempts to analyze strategies according to planning either showed that strategy is more a ceremonial act of compliance with environmental demands, or that it only partially reflects the complexity of the organizational endeavor to produce coherent actions (Fumasoli & Lepori, 2011).

2.3.1 Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) Implementation Barriers Model

This study has borrowed a graph theoretical analysis from the implementation of total productive maintenance (TPM) implementation barriers model. Some of the barriers identified include lack of top management commitment, organization resistance to change, unwillingness to commit resources, work culture, resistance by employees, long term commitment of management and manpower costs, non-Involve of non-management staff, lack of a suitable reward mechanism, lack of knowledge of TPM, need for training, improper constitution of teams and non-availability of Standard Operating Procedures (Poduval, Pramod & Raj, 2013).

In this framework therefore, the barriers inhibiting TPM implementation identified were too numerous and as such, proved challenging to perform their quantification. These barriers were therefore grouped to make computing easier (Anand & Bahinipati, 2012). For this graph
theoretic analysis, barriers are grouped into five categories (Figure 1): Behavioral, Technical, Human and Cultural, Strategic and Operational (Attri et al., 2014).

**Figure 2.1: Barriers to Strategy Implementation**

Source: (Attri, Grover, & Dev, 2013)

**2.3.2 The McKinsey 7s Model**

McKinsey 7s model is a tool that analyzes firm’s organizational design by looking at 7 key internal elements: strategy, structure, systems, shared values, style, staff and skills, in order to identify if they are effectively aligned and allow organization to achieve its objectives (Ravanfar, 2015). This model was first introduced in 1982 by Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman (Higgins, 2005).
Gyepi-Garbrah and Binfor (2013) have defined the framework as consisting of seven interdependent elements which are categorized as either “soft” or “hard”. The ‘soft’ elements include: shared values, skills, style, and staff; while the ‘hard’ elements comprise: strategy, structure, and systems.

Figure 2.2: McKinsey 7S Framework
Source: (Gyepi-Garbrah & Bifor 2013)

Teh and Corbitt (2015) have described each of these elements based on their themes as below. Strategy is a plan of action that defines the firm and allocates firm’s scarce resources, over time, to transform an organization from the present to the desired position. Structure is the coordination and decision-making authority that is characterized by the organizations chart (i.e. functional, centralized or decentralized). Systems are the internal processes supported by numerous interconnected systems, which include but are not limited to typical business functions. Shared values are dominant values, beliefs and norms that are commonly shared within an organization, which make the organizational culture unique. These should be espoused in the vision, mission and objectives of the organization. Skills refers to distinctive technical, conceptual and relational capabilities of key personnel or the firm as a whole. Staff is the personnel with the skills and competencies within the organization. Staffs are critical to
the success of any organization. Style is the type of leadership style, commitment and management.

Since the introduction, the model has been widely used by academics and practitioners and remains one of the most popular strategic planning tools (Ravanfar, 2015). Ideally, all these elements should be considered during the strategy implementation process to enhance harmony. For example, if the strategy is implemented without consideration of the shared values, staff and style of management, a disconnect is likely to take place. This will also make the change management process all the more challenging. Ideally, a firm using the McKinsey 7S framework would need to consider all the seven aspects, and even map out their implementation plan in matrix form to ensure that tactics specific to each element are considered and deployed.

Challenges posed by lack of skills and less educated workforce can only be solved through continuous training aimed at cumulatively equipping employees with the technical knowledge required to do the right actions (Speculand, 2014). Training is an activity that changes people's behavior (Ghosh, Joshi, Satyawadi, Mukherjee and Ranjan, 2011) and refers to a planned effort by a company to facilitate employees' learning of job-related competencies including knowledge, skills, or behaviours that are critical for successful job performance (Noe, 2009).

2.3.3 Technical knowledge

To carry out a specific activity or task therefore, benefits of training and development both for employer and employee’s are strategic in nature and hence much broader (Sattar, 2011). Employee training aims to change behaviour at work place in order to increase efficiency and higher performance standards. It is defined as function that includes all forms of planned learning experiences and activities whose purpose is to effect changes in performance and other behaviour through the acquisition of new knowledge, skills, beliefs, values and attitudes (Chandra, 2009). Chandra (2009) used a case study research design to investigate human resource management practices at Wadia Institute of Himalayan Geology, the researcher utilised a questionnaire which is not applicable in case study methodology. The current study utilised questionnaires and interview to collect data on the influence of employee competencies on strategy implementation.
In the implementation process, the nature of the information exchange relationship determines the conditions under which an employee receives knowledge or has experience using the new idea (Enz, 2012). Several different information-exchange strategies can be used, including those focused on individuals, typically, individual counseling by managers or change agents, and those at the group level, such as staff meetings, crossfunctional teams, and focus groups. Other strategies for implementing innovations noted in the literature include creating a crisis to enlist support and critical analysis of problems with current approaches (Kotter 1996 in Enz, 2012). The study determined how training was provided at Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission employees in western Kenya.

Schmidt and Keil (2013) suggested that competent employee’s training and their capabilities is essential ingredient for successful strategy implementation. They are important for the organization to develop human resource competencies. The organization needs to attract employees with necessary experience, technical skills and other soft skills (Badri, Bashiri, & Hejazi, 2013). The skills need to vary depending on the type of strategy the firm is planning to implement. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2005) further suggested that a strong management team with the right skills that works closely is important in strategy implementation. Firms need to challenge their employees to innovate and be creative, and motive them to upgrade their skills continuously (Kaifeng, Lepak, Jia, & Baer, 2012).

In the implementation of strategy hiring and retaining competent employees helps to develop core competencies. However, Enz (2012) cautions that the organization’s core competency emerges incrementally as the firm goes about business. It is prudent to be proactive about what implementation of strategy entails and build competencies and capabilities that are scalable. Building core competencies is an inter-regional effort. Each department performs complementary activities across the organization’s value chain. In the implementation of strategy, the management team’s role is to concentrate enough resources and management attention on activities that strengthen employees’ core competencies (Johnson Scholes & Whittington, 2005). Badri, Bashiri and Hejazi (2013) also acknowledged that the effectiveness of strategy implementation is, at least in part, affected by the quality of people involved in the process.
Kihanya (2013) investigated challenges influencing the implementation of business strategies in public sector firms in Kenya: A survey of parastatals in the Ministry of Agriculture. The study adopted a descriptive research design and involved a sample size of eight (8) parastatals. Data was collected through a questionnaire from a sample size of sixty five (65) respondent’s that was obtained using census procedure. Kihanya found out that lack of skilled personnel result to failure in business strategy implementation in public sector organizations and the management team needs to take the effort to screen and evaluate potential employees and make sure these recruits can work within the organization’s work environment and culture.

2.3.4 Education and Training
The level of education attained by USIU-Africa employees is adequate to achieve set objectives. In the implementation of strategy hiring and retaining competent employees helps to develop core competencies. Enz (2012) however cautions that the organization’s core competency emerges incrementally as the firm goes about business. It is prudent to be proactive about what implementation of strategy entails and build competencies and capabilities that are scalable. Building core competencies is an inter-regional effort. Each department performs complementary activities across the organization’s value chain. In the implementation of strategy, the management team’s role is to concentrate enough resources and management attention on activities that strengthen employees’ core competencies (Johnson Scholes & Whittington, 2005). Badri, Bashiri and Hejazi (2013) also acknowledged that the effectiveness of strategy implementation is, at least in part, affected by the quality of people involved in the process.

Schmidt and Keil (2013) suggested that competent employee’s training and their capabilities is essential ingredient for successful strategy implementation. They are important for the organization to develop human resource competencies. The organization needs to attract employees with necessary experience, technical skills and other soft skills (Badri, Bashiri, & Hejazi, 2013). The skills need to vary depending on the type of strategy the firm is planning to implement. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2005) further suggested that a strong management team with the right skills that works closely is important in strategy implementation. Firms need to challenge their employees to innovate and be creative, and motive them to upgrade their skills continuously (Kaifeng, Lepak, Jia, & Baer, 2012).
Employee training refers to the process to obtain or transfer KSA (knowledge, skills and abilities) needed to carry out a specific activity or task; therefore, benefits of training and development both for employer and employees are strategic in nature and hence much broader (Sattar, 2011). Employee training aims to change behaviour at work place in order to increase efficiency and higher performance standards. It is defined as function that includes all forms of planned learning experiences and activities whose purpose is to effect changes in performance and other behaviour through the acquisition of new knowledge, skills, beliefs, values and attitudes (Chandra, 2009).

2.4 Operational Barriers and Strategy Implementation

According to Attri et al (2014), operational barriers may stem from lack of standard operating procedures, lack of preventive maintenance schedules, poor workplace environment, inadequate use of tool, techniques and methodologies and poor and non-encouraging workplace environments. All these need to be tackled to create the right atmosphere for the launch and implementation of strategy. In this digital era, company management has to develop a good information system that will help managers to obtain the highest quality of knowledge and thereby ensure that supportive structures are in place to help individuals access easily what they need for facilitating the implementation process (Al-Ghamdi, 1998).

According to Mintzberg, Ahlstrand and Lampel (1998) agree with this when they say that Learning organizations assume that the managers and workers closest to the design, manufacturing, distribution, and sale of the product often know more about these activities than their superiors. Mobilizing this knowledge is a high priority in the learning organization. People working for the organization and being served by the organization are a source of strength.

2.4.1 Standard Operating Procedure

Standardization is defined as an activity that gives rise to solutions for repetitive application to problems in various disciplines. Generally, the activity constitutes the process of establishing (determining, formulating, and issuing) and implementing standards. Thus, standards are the perfect result of a standardization activity and inside the context of quality systems consist of quality documents or documents related to the quality system. High levels of quality are
important to accomplish company business objectives (Manghani, 2011). Quality, a source of competitive benefit, should stay a symbol of company products and services. High quality is not an additional value; it is an important elementary necessity. Each employee in all organizational units is responsible for guaranteeing that their work processes are effective and continually getting better. Top management should provide the training and an appropriate motivating environment to support teamwork both inside and across organizational units for employees to advance processes. Ultimately, everyone in an institution is responsible for the quality of its products and services.

Levine and Toffel (2010) adds that Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) is a process document that describes in detail the way that an operator should perform a given operation. SOPs involve the purpose of the operation, the equipment and materials required, how to perform the set-up and operations required for the process, how to perform the maintenance and shutdown operations carried out by the worker, a description of safety issues, troubleshooting, a list of spare parts and where to find them, illustrations, and checklists. The SOP is one of many process documents which is needed for consistent operation of a given process, with other documents involving process flow charts, material specifications, and so forth.

The purpose of SOPs today is to guarantee that all workers are performing tasks in the same way, which is a needed for condition to get expected output from the process. When all workers perform their tasks constantly, it becomes possible to run controlled experiments to test the impact of changing various process parameters. When a process change is shown to improve process performance, SOPs are updated and workers are trained to the new procedures. All over the process, it is adorable to involve workers in SOP development and to praise worker ideas for the SOP improvement (Manghani, 2011). For constant organizational advance, organized processes need to be constantly improved, hence necessitating ideas from those workers using those procedures. Ideas are not creative simply because they deviate from organized knowledge; ideas are creative when they are novel and suitable to the task at hand (Almeida, 2014).

Workers may have many ideas; nevertheless, what they choose to do with their ideas will depend on various organizational and individual-difference factors. The most important factor, however, for the advancement of creative behaviors is worker intrinsic motivation. All
organizations, businesses, etc. should have SOPs (Jain, 2008). SOPs support employees with the information necessitated to perform their jobs regularly and help guarantee consistency in the quality of performance (Frank, 2010). The improvement and use of SOPs promotes quality through consistent implementation of a process or procedure within the organization reduced work effort, along with advanced data comparability, credibility, and legal defensibility (Almeida, 2014).

Among the aim of an SOP is creating a good preventive maintenance schedule is essential to perform an efficient shutdown. Manaar, Saad and Suliman (2017) offered a mathematical non-linear model that is formulated for the turnaround maintenance scheduling problem, and proposing an algorithmic optimization approach that combines the scheduling and workforce allocation in one phase. The strategy used mainly involved the filtering of uncompleted tasks from the tasks set and then to filter again from the resulted uncompleted tasks the ones which are satisfying the precedence constraint. If a task is not completed because of its preceding task, then it is put under hold until the precedence is finished. Israfil, Avizit, Rifaul and Omar (2014) also adds that in industries, Preventive Maintenance (PM) is not a new practice to minimize the sudden breakdown of production machine. PM will be performed at predetermine intervals to provide a balance between failure cost and component utilization (aging) rather, they wait for equipment failure to occur and then take whatever actions are necessary to repair or replace the equipment.

Due to production loss productivity decreases and which results in the decrease of profitability. Repair/Replacement cost is required to restore the equipment in functioning condition. Since equipment’s are subject to breakdown then the reliability of the equipments to remain in functioning condition is low. Lower reliability and loss of production lead to take longer lead time of delivery. Moreover bottlenecking and more work in process inventory occur due to this practice (Kamran & John, 2011).

One of the main management strategies of the organizations is to invest in employees. Organizations are seeking to develop, motivate and increase the performance of their employees in a variety of human resources applications (Gungor, 2011). Thus, performance management should be an important step in the organization's HRM system and influences employee performance and then to organizational performance.
Performance management is a process for ensuring employees focus on their work in ways that contribute to achieving the organization's mission is indispensable for a business organization. Actually, performance management includes various types or system. Performance management system is a kind of performance management forms. Supervisors and managers are responsible for managing the performance of their employees. Each organization's policy should specify how the performance management system will be carried out. Organizations should adopt performance management practices that are consistent with the requirements of this policy and that best fit the nature of the work performed and the mission of the organization (Aguinis, Joo & Gottfredson, 2011). This therefore calls for managers to ensure an adequate supply of staff that is technically and socially competent and capable of career development into specialist departments or management positions (Afshan, Sobia, Kamran & Nasir 2012).

2.4.2 Workplace Environments

The workplace environment is a significant aspect in discussing performance and health of human resources in an organization. An optimal workstation design is where the workplace environment supports the needs of the workers and where a worker operates in a conducive environment to the individual's abilities. The common features of the industries now-a-days are improper workplace design, ill-structured jobs, mis-match between worker abilities and job demands, adverse environment, poor human-machine system design and inappropriate management programs. These conditions lead to workplace hazards, poor workers' health, and disabilities and will reduction in workers' productivity and products' quality. Designing the workplace environments with a firm's understanding of ergonomics can produce huge benefits. The payoffs come in terms of reduced costs for compensation and insurance, increased productivity and enhanced employee morale. Even more important, it can help employees to avoid injuries that cause pain and at the same time improve the health outcomes. Musculoskeletal Disorders (MSDs), the main threat of occupational health can be minimized by the implementation of effective ergonomics programs (Zafir, 2012).

The workplace environment impacts employee morale, productivity and engagement - both positively and negatively. The work place environment in a majority of industry is unsafe and unhealthy. These includes poorly designed workstations, unsuitable furniture, lack of ventilation, inappropriate lighting, excessive noise, insufficient safety measures in fire
emergencies and lack of personal protective equipment. People working in such environment are prone to occupational disease and it impacts on employee’s performance. Thus productivity is decreased due to the workplace environment. It is the quality of the employee’s workplace environment that most impacts on their level of motivation and subsequent performance (Samson, Waiganjo & Koima, 2015).

How well they engage with the organization, especially with their immediate environment, influences to a great extent their error rate, level of innovation and collaboration with other employees, absenteeism and ultimately, how long they stay in the job (Sehgal, 2012; Oyetunji, 2014). Creating a work environment in which employee’s are productive is essential to increased profits for your organization, corporation or small business. The relationship between works, the workplace and the tools of work, workplace becomes an integral part of work itself. In view of this, Leblebici (2012) noted that one of such conditions that enhance employee engagement is a well-designed, user friendly and quality workplace. The authors noted that employees' are at their best when they have personal control of their work roles, perceive that the workplace is safe and comfortable and appropriate to their well-being.

Studies have shown that a conducive physical workplace environment reduces absenteeism, determines retention, enhances job performance, (Chandrasekar, 2011), increases job satisfaction and productivity (Samson, Waiganjo & Koima, 2015), ensures employee engagement, and facilitates group cohesiveness (Public Health England Report, 2015).

Similarly, studies have been conducted in Africa on the predictive role of the physical work environment. For instance, Samson, Waiganjo and Koima (2015) studied the effect of workplace environment on the performance of commercial Banks in Nakuru Town, Kenya, Ajala (2012) examined the influence of workplace environment on workers' welfare, performance and productivity in Nigeria, while Taiwo (2010) examined the influence of work environment on workers' productivity in Lagos, Nigeria. However, in spite of the overwhelming importance of the physical work environment and employees’ engagement to work organizations respectively studies that address the association between these constructs appear fragmented.
2.5 Strategic Barriers and Strategy Implementation

In today’s world of business and services, competition is very high, therefore, in order to function effectively and profitably organizations have to find ways that would enable them to achieve their goals and to compete in the market successfully. When choosing the most appropriate strategy, one of the most important steps is the application of planning activities (Petkovic, Jasinskas, & Laima, 2016). The Richardson model by Stewart K.S, (2002) is the most comprehensive one on planning and covers eight levels of strategic planning: 1. The mission of an organization. 2. The objectives of an organization. 3. The external analysis of an organization. 4. The internal analysis of an organization. 5. The creation of alternative strategies. 6. The choice of organization strategy. 7. The implementation of organization strategy. 8. Control. These are key planning issues.

There are three structural dimensions that influence communication, coordination, and decision-making which are key to strategy implementation (Olson, Slater, & Hult, 2005). These dimensions are: formalization, centralization, and specialization. Formalization is the degree to which decisions and working relationships are governed by formal rules and procedures. Centralization refers to whether decision authority is closely held by top managers or is delegated to middle and lower level managers. Lines of communication and responsibility are relatively clear in centralized organizations, and the route to top management for approval can be traveled quickly. While fewer innovative ideas might be put forth in centralized organizations, implementation tends to be straightforward once a decision is made. Specialization refers to the degree to which tasks and activities are divided in the organization. Highly specialized organizations have a higher proportion of specialists who direct their efforts to a well-defined set of activities.

In the new organizational context, the role of strategy has been accentuated, mainly due to its importance both at a micro-economic level, but also at a macro-economic level, thus generating effects on both plans, and determining, at its turn, even new changes (Cruceru, 2018). Strategic alignment to organizational objectives is therefore critical. The organization needs to align its strategy with systems that support the organization objectives as defined by the strategic plan. The alignment as a process is important for the organization performance. Alignment is not a
trivial task at the organization and management should guard against being a challenge to/by itself (Cross & Lynch, 1992).

2.5.1 Long term planning

Generally, the need for a business turning from reactive to proactive is increasing. Proactive enterprise leads to increased situation awareness capabilities even ahead of time. This will lead to a new class of enterprise systems, proactive and resilient enterprises, that will be continuously aware of that what “might happen” in the relevant business context and optimize their behavior to achieve what “should be the best action” even during stress and balancing on demanding margins. Proactive enterprise systems will be able to suggest early on to the decision makers the most appropriate process adjustments to avoid singular system behavior and optimize its performance (Magoutas et al., 2014).

Strategic decision-making belongs to the one of the most important areas of current management and plays a crucial role in achieving success and survival of the company. In this connection, many researches are pointing out two important areas: the role of top management (Mussoa & Francioni, 2012) and the process of making strategic decisions. There is always an interest to improve strategic decision-making among both managers and researchers. Interest in improving the strategic decision-making is related to changes in current environment and to the difficulty that managers have to face in decision-making nowadays. The environment is constantly changing and is much more dynamic and less predictable than in the past.

Decision-making is undoubtedly one of the basic management functions despite the fact that the founders of management theory (especially by Fayol) set the basic functions of management as planning, organizing, leading people and controlling (Robbins & Coulter, 2013). Various techniques were created also for decision-making at the strategic level. Especially, the theory of strategic management provides us with many tools and techniques suitable for strategic analysis and for creating variants and appropriate solutions (Savanevicien et al., 2006). In strategic management, we usually recognized strategic management process, in which strategic decisions are based on understanding and prediction of environment development as a part of strategic analytical phase (Papula & Papulova, 2015). Strategic analysis is the initial step for formulation of strategy and other strategic decisions. Based on
results of analysis of external and internal environment, we are able to develop a strategy that will guide our progress in achieving the strategic objectives (David, 2013).

With the development of decision-making theory, managers have begun to apply analytical methods and procedures based on rational and logical thinking beside the traditional use of intuition. Methods and procedures proposed by theory were developed not only in detail but also verified in practice. Therefore they are recommended by theory as trustworthy. In a relatively stable environment of the past, they were also effective. But many of these techniques were created under different conditions and more stable environment as we face today. The amount of analytical methods and techniques that have been created only in the first half of the twentieth century, but especially in the fifties and sixties were widely applied. In countries with centrally planned economies, they were still widely used for nearly two decades to come (seventies and eighties).

It was not only the analytical techniques developed within traditional financial analysis, but also the methods and techniques developed through operational research, which was based on economic-mathematical modeling and had a wide application particularly in the operational management (Robbins & Coulter, 2013) Ongoing changes in environment from the mid-seventies greatly restricted the application until quite successfully propagated and applied quantitative analytical calculations. Their implementation boosted the emergence and development of modern computer technology. Emerging petroleum, energy and economic crises in the mid-seventies strongly affected the application of analytical methods and techniques (Papula & Papulova, 2015).

Many other changes and developments in the world nowadays are shaping environment that is usually characterized as dynamic, unstable and unpredictable. Monitoring, researching and predicting development of environment has become increasingly difficult, and the difficulty affects decision-making of managers. The world becomes ever more unstable, more disordered and more uncertain and hence requires more and more and better and better analytical tools for strategic decisions making (Bhushan & Rai, 2004) and better approach to strategic analysis. Changes in the environment have begun to put ever greater demands on the ability to predict future trends in the environment. In addition to previously successful and efficient rational and logical thinking, there is a need to apply more suitable approach called "strategic thinking".
2.5.2 Organizational objectives

Launched in 1954 by Peter Drucker in "The Practice of Management" MBO - Management by Objectives - is the management tool that enables the increase in performance of by focusing on results, not on the work itself, providing cascade and align the company goals with individual goals of managers who are at different levels within the organization (Popescu, 2013). Management by objectives is based on the rigorous determination of the objectives up to the executors’ level, who participate directly to their establishment and the close link between rewards and sanctions with the achievement of the established objectives (Deac, 2014). This method was generated by the need to ordering actions based on the idea that the success in implementing a development strategy for the unit depends on the correlation of the general objectives with the ones of organizational subdivisions and the interest of the entire personnel of the economic unit.

For an organisation to gather strength via accrued knowledge in regions of economic and political governance, there is a consensus to the verdict that for any institution to be able to realise the set objectives, it should have in place, a trustworthy mechanism for constructing policies and strategies for executing the policy options (Ige, Adeyeye & Aina, 2011). Mazolla and Kellermanns (2010) assert that middle management having low or negative commitment to strategies developed by top level management stands as hindrances to effective implementation of strategy.

In the same vein, Greunig and Richard (2010) note that implementation of new strategy calls for recruitment of competent employee’s and continuous professional development. Successful implementation depends on the shoulders of managers with the capacity to motivate employees to supportively function at high level of duty that is difficult to conduct when the right employees are absent or the leader lacks interpersonal skills. One of the best practices in change management is to assume trust in organisational workforce from the start unless proven otherwise to best facilitate collaborative and cooperative behaviour and to communicate defined values by which decisions will be made (Levin, 2010). Levin and Green (2010) suggest that organizational leadership define each benefit in the plan and link the benefits to demonstrate the value of benefits to the stakeholders.
According Ofojebe (2014) conducted a study to determine the extent to which the stipulations and visions of Management by Objectives (MBO) would be integrated in higher education institutions in South Eastern Nigeria to enhance higher education transformation in a globalized world. Findings indicated that in the views of the respondents, various MBO stipulations would be integrated in transforming the areas of administration, curriculum, quality assurance and committee works as well setting visions for future directions in the institutions. The acceptability of MBO was the same across the Universities, Colleges and Polytechnics. This implies that it is imperative to integrate MBO and improve the ability of the institutions to attain the objectives of higher education. It was thus recommended among other things that the management of the institutions should adapt and integrate MBO principles and practices so as to transform their institutions to compete favorably in a globalised world. This study therefore seeks to establish if USIU Africa has a clear policy and objective towards strategy implementation.

2.5.3 Structure to support strategy

Strategy implementation determines the success of an organization because it actualizes the plans that have been set by the organization. Implementation phase of the strategy presents the greatest challenges because it involves interplay of several variables, both internal and external to the organization. The internal variables such as the organizational structure are within the control of the organization and the management can manipulate them to suit the required purposes. Equally the strategy drawing process influences the strategy implementation and hence appropriate participative procedures should be adopted by an organization in coming up with the strategy (Moinkett, 2015).

Ng’enoh (2015) did a study to establish the influence of organization structure on strategy implementation in major banks in Kenya. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and collected primary data by use of questionnaires and secondary data from audited financial reports, news bulletins and official websites of the selected major commercial banks in Kenya. The research was conducted through a descriptive survey design and a total of 54 respondents made of 18 top managers, 18 middle level managers and 18 line managers formed the sample size. Questionnaires were administered to each of the respondent’s at their work stations and collected within two working days. Major research findings indicated that the nature of
organization structure had a high effect on the performance of employees, compliance with regulations and attainment of community expectations. The findings also indicated that the nature of organization structure had a moderate effect on the attainment of bank communities’ expectations and growth of investments of major commercial banks in Kenya.

2.6 Chapter Summary

Chapter two has looked at studies and literature from different writers highlighting varied perspectives and approaches in relation to the three research questions looking at the barriers to strategy implementation, the role of top-level management as well as the benefits to be accrued from successful strategy implementation. Chapter three discusses the research methodology including the research design and tools for collecting data and the findings will then be presented in chapter four.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the specific research methodology that used to carry out the study. This includes the research design, the target population and its specific constituents, the sampling design that will be used, looking at the sampling frame, technique and size. Data collection methods, research procedures used and data analysis methods are discussed.

3.2 Research Design

According to Cooper and Schindler (2014) research design constitutes the blueprint for the collection, measurement, and analysis of data and expresses both the structure of the research problem. It aids the researcher in the allocation of limited resources by posing crucial choices in methodology. Sobh and Perry (2006) define methodology as only one of the three elements of a paradigm that researchers either explicitly or implicitly work within – a paradigm includes the other elements of ontology and epistemology. Essentially, ontology is “reality”, epistemology is the relationship between that reality and the researcher, and methodology is the techniques used by the researcher to discover that reality.

This study was therefore done by using the Survey research design with an aim of gathering information on factors influencing the strategy implementation process negatively or positively. With strategy implementation being the dependent variable and barriers being the independent variables, the survey allowed comparisons to be made in helping the identification of relationships.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Population refers to the full set of cases from which a sample is taken; this full set of cases need not necessarily be people (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2003). In this study, the total population of employees is four hundred and seventy two (472). The number of full time employees, staff and faculty, in USIU-A University is three hundred and sixteen (316) while part time employees are one hundred and fifty six (156).
Table 3.1: Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Categories</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty staff</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USIU Human Resource, 2018

3.3.2 Sampling design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Sampling frame refers to the listing of all population elements from which the sample was drawn (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). The sampling frame of this research was the list of full time employees of USIU-A University which was solicited from the Human Resources Department.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

For the purpose of this study, the sampling technique adopted was a stratified one and simple random sampling was used to identify the targets. Stratification is the process of segmenting the members of the population into homogenous subgroups before the sampling starts. For this study the stratification was done based on the three staff categories: Faculty staff, Support staff and Adjunct faculty (Cooper et al., 2014).

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

This research sampled a third of administrative staff (thirty nine) and a third of full time faculty (twelve). This gave a total to a sample size of fifty one (51) respondents. This sample was bases on Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) stating that with a study population that is less than ten thousand (10,000) a sample size of 10% to 30% is a good representation.
Table 3.2: Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Full time</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection Methods

Data collection specifies the details of the task. In essence, it answers the questions who, what, when, how and where (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). This study used primary data, that is, a first-hand account of information from the respondents using a questionnaire.

A questionnaire is a general term to include all techniques of data collection in which each person is asked to respond to the same set of questions in a pre-determined order (deVaus, 2002). The questionnaire was divided into four sections: Demographic data, Section one for research objective one which sought to establish behavioural barriers affecting strategy implementation, section two for research objective two which sought to establish technical barriers affecting strategy implementation, section three for research objective three which sought to establish operational barriers affecting strategy implementation, and lastly, section four for research objective four which sought to establish strategic barriers affecting strategy implementation. The questionnaire was self-administered because the sample is literate and the questions that require little or no explanation to respond to as they were mostly close ended using Likert scales.

3.5 Research Procedures

The study ran as pilot to five persons with one of them being in a relevant position in relation to this study. The purpose of the pilot was to ascertained the validity of the tool and reliability of the data collected in answering the three research objectives. The pilot results were then evaluated and corrections made to the final questionnaire for the actual survey.
Data collection was done in the field, specifically, USIU-A University, and as such, approval will be required from the relevant authorizing office there. A letter requesting access and support in conducting this research was sent ahead of time, immediately after the go ahead to collect data is given and follow up done as often as politely possible to ensure approval from USIU-A University does not drag the process.

A pilot study was undertaken to establish reliability of the questionnaires. The pilot study was done and random sample selected among 5 employees at the United States International University. By use of Cronbach’s Alpha in SPSS a reliability analysis was done to evaluate internal consistency of the variables.

According to Sekeran (2008) the minimum acceptable Alpha value is 0.7, thus any value of 0.7 and above is considered reliable. The findings in Table 3.3 shows that influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A had the highest reliability ($\alpha=0.891$), followed by influence of strategic barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A ($\alpha=0.833$), influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A. ($\alpha=0.805$), and influence of technical behavioral barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A ($\alpha=0.799$). This illustrates that all the three variables were reliable as their reliability values fell above 0.7 therefore no editing was done on the questionnaire.

**Table 3.3: Reliability Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral barriers on strategy implementation</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical barriers on strategy implementation</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational barriers on strategy implementation</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic barriers on strategy implementation</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a successful reliability test results, the questionnaires were distributed to all respondents and the data collected was then entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for analysis. To ensure a high response rate the heads of the various departments were used to distribute questionnaires to their constituencies. The research was
conducted in the month of June with a target of completing the data collection process and data analysis by end of June.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

The data was analyzed statistically using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) as most of the data was in quantitative form. Graphical representations of the frequency tables will be done to give an overview of the data. Measures of central tendencies was then be applied to highlight the mean, mode, median and range of the data to give the general trend of the data. Dispersion parameters was also calculated to indicate the general direction and dispersion of the data against the mean (Cleff, 2014). These include Standard deviation, variance, co-efficient of variation, skewness and kurtosis.

The final analysis sought to highlight relationships and trends using calculations such as correlation, regression, ANOVA, T-test, F-Test and Chi Square. The data was then presented in tables and figures.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter delved into the choice of methodology for the study which is survey research design with a defined population and sampling frame and sample size. The tool for collecting data has been defined as a questionnaire and the data analysis methods have also been discussed. In the coming chapter four looks at the findings of the research based on the research objectives and in chapter five, discussion of the findings and recommendations are presented.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presented the research findings on influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A and the results were analyzed and presented in the following section.

4.2 General Information

4.2.1 Response Rate

The research issued a total of 51 questionnaires and a total of 49 were filled and returned giving a response rate of 96% and this was considered sufficient for the study as indicated in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled and returned</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Respondents Gender

An analysis of the respondent’s gender established that majority of respondent’s accounting for 59.2% were female while male accounted for 40.8% as shown in Figure 4.1 as follows. This indicated a balance in gender, therefore implying low bias in the response received.
Figure 4.1: Respondents Gender

4.2.2 Respondents Age

As indicated in Figure 4.2, an analysis of the respondent’s age established that a majority of respondents accounting for 22.4% were aged between 30-34 years while 20.4% were aged between 34-38 years. It was also established that those aged between 39-43 years accounted for 18.4% of the total, while those of 44-48 years represented 14.3%, those of 48 and above were 16.3%, and those aged 25-29 years represented 8.3%. This finding implied that the most of the employees in the institution were young therefore able to offer their services to the stakeholders for many years thus minimizing turn over.

Figure 4.2: Respondents Age

4.2.3 Duration of Employment

To establish the number of years respondents have worked for the firm, the findings revealed that majority had 6-10 years experience representing 53%, those who had 3-5 years were
28.6%, and those of 6-10 years were 20.4%, and those of 11-14 years and those above 15 years were 18.4% respectively, the least represented were respondents with 1-2 years experience who had 14.3% representation. This implied that respondents had the necessary experience in the sector.

**Figure 4.3: Duration of Employment**

**4.2.4 Respondents Education**

An analysis of the literacy levels was done and the result established that majority of respondent’s accounting for 65.3% were Masters Degree holders while 14.3% had a Doctoral degree, in addition 12.2% had a degree and diploma holders accounted for 6.1%, at the same time post graduate diploma holders accounted for 2% a shown in Figure 4.4.

**Figure 4.4: Respondents Education**
4.2.5 Position in the Organization
A review of the respondents position I the firm revealed that administrative staff were the majority and accounted for 77.6% of the total, at the same time faculty staff represented 22.4% of the total as shown in Figure 4.5

Figure 4.5: Position in the Organization

4.3 Influence of Behavioral Barriers on Strategy Implementation
The first objective sought to determine the influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. To achieve this a five point likert scale was utilised where 5-Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.

4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics of Behavioral Barriers
The study established that a majority agreed that the behavior of the people working within USIU- Africa play an important role in implementation of strategies (M=4.27 , SD=1.076). USIU-Africa employees enjoy job security (M=3.84, SD=1.028), employees adjust to organizational culture (M=3.84, SD=.850), and coordination between departments leads to success in USIU-Africa (M=3.51, SD=1.260).

It was also established that majority were uncertain about employees easily fit into stipulated roles (M=3.33, SD=.875), apprehension of loss of specialization due to technological innovation is not a fear amongst employees (M=3.35 SD=.855), USIU-Africa employees are committed to Strategy Implementation efforts (M=3.40, SD=.792), USIU-Africa employees
are involved in implementation of strategies (M=3.43, SD=.979) and USIU-Africa top management are supportive to implementation of strategies (M=3.49, SD=1.043).

**Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics of Behavioral Barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The behavior of the people working within USIU- Africa play an important role in implementation of strategies.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees are committed to Strategy Implementation efforts.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees are involved in implementation of strategies.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa top management are supportive to implementation of strategies.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees enjoy job security.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension of loss of specialization due to technological innovation is not a fear amongst employees.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees adjust to organizational culture.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees easily fit into stipulated roles.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination between departments leads to success in USIU-Africa.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4 Technical Barriers Influence on Strategy Implementation**

The second objective sought to determine the influence of technical barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. To achieve this a five point likert scale was utilised where 5-Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.

**4.4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Technical Barriers**

It was agreed that USIU-Africa employees attend trainings related to their duties (M=3.51, SD=1.003), in addition, the level of education attained by USIU-Africa employees is adequate to achieve set objectives (M=3.90, SD=.973), and USIU-Africa pays attention to computerized maintenance systems (M=3.69, SD=1.004). Majority also agreed that USIU-Africa employees
have technical knowledge (M=3.67, SD=.826) and employees understand the requirements of USIU-Africa (M=3.61, SD=.975). There was however uncertainty on employees are aware of strategies to be accomplished (M=3.37, SD=.972).

**Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics of Technical Barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees attend trainings related to their duties.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of education attained by USIU-Africa employees is adequate to achieve set objectives.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are aware of strategies to be accomplished.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa pays attention to computerized maintenance systems.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees have technical knowledge.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees understand the requirements of USIU-Africa.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Influence of Operational Barriers on Strategy Implementation

The third objective sought to determine the influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. To achieve this a five point likert scale was utilised where 5- Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.

4.5.1 Descriptive Statistics of Operational Barriers

It was agreed that USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures for employees (M=4.00, SD=.842), USIU-Africa has preventive maintenance schedules (M=3.78, SD=.941), USIU-Africa has adequate working tools (M=3.92, SD=.909), USIU-Africa has adequate working systems (M=3.84, SD=1.048), USIU-Africa has invested in quality working techniques (M=3.80, SD=1.020). There was uncertainty about USIU-Africa investing in quality working methodologies (M=3.47, SD=.960). It was however disagreed that USIU-Africa is keen on following up on employees’ progress (M=2.90, SD=1.195).
Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics of Operational Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa has preventive maintenance schedules.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa has adequate working tools.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa has adequate working systems.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa has invested in quality working techniques</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa is keen on following up on employees’ progress.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa has invested in quality working methodologies.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Influence of Strategic Barriers on Strategy Implementation

The fourth objective sought to determine the influence of strategic barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. To achieve this a five point likert scale was utilised where 5- Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.

4.6.1 Descriptive Statistics of Strategic Barriers on Strategy Implementation

The study established that USIU-Africa focuses on long term planning (M=3.73, SD=.953), there was uncertainty about USIU-Africa employees are proactive in their decision making (M=3.22, SD=.963), USIU-Africa employees are clear about set policies (M=3.16, SD=1.028), USIU-Africa employees are clear about set objectives (M=3.20, SD= 1.172) and structure of USIU-Africa supports successful implementation of strategies (M=3.16, SD=.965).
Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics of Strategic Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees are proactive in their decision making.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa focuses on long term planning.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees are clear about set policies.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-Africa employees are clear about set objectives.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structure of USIU-Africa supports successful implementation of strategies.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Regression Analysis

4.7.1 Regression Analysis of Strategy Implementation and Behavioral Barriers

The research analyzed the relationship between the dependent variable (strategy implementation) against Behavioral Barriers. The results showed that adjusted $R^2$ value was 0.405 hence 40.5% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in Behavioral Barriers as illustrated in Table 4.6

Table 4.6: Model Summary of Strategy Implementation and Behavioral Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Square</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.646a</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.45459</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Behavioral Barriers

4.7.1.1 Anova of Strategy Implementation and Behavioral Barriers

ANOVA analysis results of the regression between strategy implementation and behavioral barriers was performed at 95% confidence level, the F critical was 33.695 and the P value was (0.000) therefore below 0.05 this implied that it was a statistically significant and can be used to assess the association between strategy implementation and behavioral barriers as illustrated in Table 4.7
4.7.1.2 Testing Hypothesis

H01: Behavioral barriers have no significant influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

The F calculated at 5% level of significance

\[ F = \frac{\text{Ms Regression}}{\text{Ms residual}} \]

\[ 6.693 / .207 = 33.638 \]

F value in a test (33.695) is larger than the F calculated (33.638). Thus we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between strategy implementation and behavioral barriers as shown in Table 4.8

4.7.2 Regression Analysis of Strategy Implementation and Technical Barriers

The research analyzed the relationship between the dependent variable (strategy implementation) against Technical Barriers. The results showed that adjusted R² value was 0.412 hence 41.2% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in Technical Barriers as illustrated in Table 4.8

### Table 4.7: ANOVA of Strategy Implementation and Behavioral Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Regression</td>
<td>6.963</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.963</td>
<td>33.695</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9.713</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.676</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Behavioral Barriers
Table 4.8: Model Summary of Strategy Implementation and Technical Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.651(^a)</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.45209</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Technical Barriers

### 4.7.2.1 Anova of Strategy Implementation and Technical Barriers

ANOVA analysis results of the regression between strategy implementation and technical barriers was performed at 95% confidence level, the F critical was 34.590 and the P value was (0.000) therefore below 0.05 this implied that it was a statistically significant and can be used to assess the association between strategy implementation and technical barriers as illustrated in Table 4.9

Table 4.9: ANOVA of Strategy Implementation and Behavioral Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>7.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.070</td>
<td>34.590</td>
<td>.000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9.606</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.676</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: performance

\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), Technical Barriers

### 4.7.2.2 Testing Hypothesis

H0\(_2\): Technical barriers have no significant influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

The F calculated at 5% level of significance

\[ F = \frac{Ms\ regression}{Ms\ residual} \]

\[ 7.070/0.204=34.657 \]
F value in a test (34.590) is smaller than the F calculated (34.657). Thus we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant relationship between strategy implementation and technical barriers as shown in Table 4.9

### 4.7.3 Regression Analysis of Strategy Implementation and Operational Barriers

The research analyzed the relationship between the dependent variable (strategy implementation) against operational barriers. The results showed that adjusted $R^2$ value was 0.424 hence 42.4% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in operational Barriers as illustrated in Table 4.10

**Table 4.10: Model Summary of Strategy Implementation and Operational Barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.660$^a$</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.44733</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Operational Barriers*

#### 4.7.3.1 Anova of Strategy Implementation and Operational Barriers

ANOVA analysis results of the regression between strategy implementation and operational barriers was performed at 95% confidence level, the F critical was 36.335 and the P value was (0.000) therefore below 0.05 this implied that it was statistically significant and can be used to assess the association between strategy implementation and operational barriers as illustrated in Table 4.11

**Table 4.11: ANOVA of Strategy Implementation and Operational Barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>7.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.271</td>
<td>36.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9.405</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.676</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: performance*

*b. Predictors: (Constant), operational Barriers*
4.7.3.2 Testing Hypothesis

H0₃: Operational barriers have no significant influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

The F calculated at 5% level of significance

\[ F = \frac{M_{\text{regression}}}{M_{\text{residual}}} \]

\[ 7.271/0.2 = 36.355 \]

F value in a test (36.335) is smaller than the F calculated (34.355). Thus we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant relationship between strategy implementation and operational barriers as shown in Table 4.11

4.7.4 Regression Analysis of Strategy Implementation and Strategic Barriers

The research analyzed the relationship between the dependent variable (strategy implementation) against strategic barriers. The results showed that adjusted \( R^2 \) value was 0.293 hence 29.3% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in strategic barriers as illustrated in Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55a</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.4956</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), strategic Barriers

4.7.4.1 Anova of Strategy Implementation and Strategic Barriers

ANOVA analysis results of the regression between strategy implementation and strategic barriers was performed at 95% confidence level, the F critical was 20.893 and the P value was (0.000) therefore below 0.05 this implied that it was statistically significant and can be used to assess the association between strategy implementation and strategic barriers as illustrated in Table 4.13
### Table 4.13: ANOVA of Strategy Implementation and Strategic Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>20.893</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>11.544</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.676</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Barriers

#### 4.7.4.2 Testing Hypothesis

H0₄: Strategic barriers have no significant influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

The F calculated at 5% level of significance

\[
F = \frac{Ms_{\text{regression}}}{Ms_{\text{residual}}}
\]

\[
5.132/0.246 = 20.862
\]

F value in a test (20.893) is larger than the F calculated (20.862). Thus we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between strategy implementation and strategic barriers as shown in Table 4.13

#### 4.8 Chapter Summary

The chapter presents the results and findings achieved from the data collected to identify the influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A. The first section presents the demography data, in the subsequent section the data is presented in line with the specific objectives of the study which sought to find out the influence of behavioral barriers, technical barriers, operational barriers and strategic barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A. The descriptive data is presented in the form of mean and standard deviation. In addition inferential statistics have been used to present the existing relationships between the various study variables. Chapter five offers discussions, conclusions and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This section offers the discussion, conclusions and recommendations made based on the research questions of the study which sought to establish general objective of the study was to identify the influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A. The specific objective of the study was to establish the influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A. To establish how technical barriers influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A, and to assess the influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

5.2 Summary

The general objective of the study was to identify the influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A. The specific objectives of the study is to find out the influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A. To establish how technical barriers influence on strategy implementation in USIU-A and to assess the influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation in USIU-A.

This study was done using the Survey research design with an aim of gathering information on factors influencing the strategy implementation process negatively or positively. In this study, the total population of employees is four hundred and seventy two (472). This research sampled a third of administrative staff (thirty nine) and a third of full time faculty (twelve). This offered total to a sample size of fifty one (51) respondents. This study used primary data, that offered a first-hand account of information from the respondents using a questionnaire. The data was analyzed statistically using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) as most of the data was in quantitative form. The study sought to highlight relationships and trends using calculations such as correlation, regression, ANOVA and the data was then be presented in graphical format.
The first objective sought to determine the influence of behavioral barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. The study established that a majority agreed that the behavior of the people working within USIU- Africa played an important role in implementation of strategies. USIU-Africa employees enjoy job security and they are willing to adjust to organizational culture. It was also established that the coordination between departments leads to success in USIU-Africa. The research analyzed the relationship between the dependent variable (strategy implementation) against behavioral barriers and the results showed that adjusted 40.5% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in behavioral barriers.

The second objective sought to determine the influence of technical barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. It was agreed that USIU-Africa employees attend trainings related to their duties, in addition, the level of education attained by USIU-Africa employees is adequate to achieve set objectives, and USIU-Africa pays attention to computerized maintenance systems. Majority also agreed that USIU-Africa employees have technical knowledge and employees understand the requirements of USIU-Africa. The research analyzed the relationship between strategy implementation and Technical Barriers. The results showed that 41.2% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in technical barriers.

The third objective sought to determine the influence of operational barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. It was agreed that USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures for employees, USIU-Africa has preventive maintenance schedules, and the institution has adequate working tools. Results also revealed that USIU-Africa has adequate working systems and the firm has invested in quality working techniques. The research analyzed the relationship between strategy implementation against operational barriers. The results showed that 42.4% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in operational barriers.

The fourth objective sought to determine the influence of strategic barriers on strategy implementation at USIU Africa. The study established that USIU-Africa focuses on long term planning), there was uncertainty about USIU-Africa employees are proactive in their decision making. Respondents failed to agree on whether USIU-Africa employees are clear about set
policies, or whether employees are clear about set objectives, there was also uncertainty about the structure of USIU-Africa supporting successful implementation of strategies. The research analyzed the relationship between strategy implementation against strategic barriers. The results showed that 29.3% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in strategic barriers.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Influence of Behavioral Barriers on Strategy Implementation

The study established that a majority agreed that the behavior of the people working within USIU-Africa played an important role in implementation of strategies. The behavior of the people working within a firm play an important role in implementation of strategies. Makina and Kenger (2018) study looked at Managing Strategic Change of an Organization's Performance at Nzoia Sugar Company, Kenya. There was positive correlation between improvement in performance and implementation of the strategies. There was a negative correlation between resistance to change and involvement in resistance to change. The study recommends involvement of all stakeholders in strategy formulation implementation and control. Jos, Marjolein and Caniëls (2012) also reiterates that non-aligned interaction between different professional discourses can be a source of resistance to change, in addition to other well-known sources of resistance to change in the change management literature. Similarly, Derya and Gökhan (2013) aimed to handle the concepts regarding pressures for organizational change, resisting forces and causes of resistance to change, and ways for school administrators to overcome resisting forces. Even though change is implemented for positive reasons like adapting to volatile environment conditions and remaining competitive, organization members often react to change efforts negatively and resist change.

The findings also indicated that USIU-Africa employees enjoy job security and they are willing to adjust to organizational culture. Jobs which are not backed by indefinite contract or cannot be guaranteed for reasonable period are deemed to lack job security. It is also seen as the employees free from the fear of being dismissed from his/her present employment or job loss. Some professions and employment activities have greater job security than others. Job security is an employee's assurance or confidence that they will keep their current job for a longer period as they so wish (businessdictionary.com). It is the assurance from the company or
organization that their employees will remain with them for a reasonable period of time without being wrongly dismissed (Huang, Wang, Chen.& Yien, 2011). Quite a number of factors such as employment contract, collective bargaining agreement, labor legislation and personal factors such as education, work experience, job functional area, work industry, work location, etc., play an important role in determining the need for an individual's services and impacts their personal job security (Iwarere & Lawal, 2011). Samson and Mary (2012) noted that people's job security eventually depends on whether they are employable or not and if businesses have a need for their skills or not. Although, employment laws can offer some relief against unemployment risk, they only have a marginal contribution to the job security of individuals. The fact remains that, individuals need to have the right skill set to have good job security (Lucky & Minai, 2011).

It was also established that the coordination between departments leads to success in USIU-Africa. Organizations that remain flexible are more likely to embrace change and create an environment that remains open to production and communication. This provides a model that welcomes cultural diversity and helps clarify strategy implementation. Culture within an organization can serve many purposes, including to unify members within an organization and help create a set of common norms or rules within an organization that employees follow (Janicijevic, 2012). Abok et. al., (2013) in her study on Culture's role in the implementation of strategic plans in non-governmental organizations in Kenya results indicate that organizational culture affect implementation of strategic plans in Kenyan NGOs the study revealed that valuable organization culture is better for effective implementation of strategic plans than a non-effective culture. Similarly, Muthoni (2013) in her study on Effects of Organizational Culture on Strategy Implementation in Commercial Banks in Kenya found that 75% of commercial banks in Kenya uphold culture of dynamism, entrepreneurship and creativity at work. Majority of these commercial banks in Kenya have adopted the cultures that are flexible in dynamic work environments.
5.3.2 Influence of Technical Barriers on Strategy Implementation

It was agreed that USIU-Africa employees attend trainings related to their duties. In the implementation of strategy hiring and retaining competent employees helps to develop core competencies. Enz (2012) however cautions that the organization’s core competency emerges incrementally as the firm goes about business. It is prudent to be proactive about what implementation of strategy entails and build competencies and capabilities that are scalable. Building core competencies is an inter-regional effort. Each department performs complementary activities across the organization’s value chain. In the implementation of strategy, the management team’s role is to concentrate enough resources and management attention on activities that strengthen employees’ core competencies (Johnson Scholes & Whittington, 2005). Badri, Bashiri and Hejazi (2013) also acknowledged that the effectiveness of strategy implementation is, at least in part, affected by the quality of people involved in the process.

The study also revealed that the level of education attained by USIU-Africa employees is adequate to achieve set objectives. Schmidt and Keil (2013) also suggested that competent employees training and their capabilities is essential ingredient for successful strategy implementation. They are important for the organization to develop human resource competencies. The organization needs to attract employees with necessary experience, technical skills and other soft skills (Badri, Bashiri, & Hejazi, 2013). The skills need to vary depending on the type of strategy the firm is planning to implement. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2005) further suggested that a strong management team with the right skills that works closely is important in strategy implementation. Firms need to challenge their employees to innovate and be creative, and motive them to upgrade their skills continuously (Kaifeng, Lepak, Jia, & Baer, 2012).

Majority also agreed that USIU-Africa employees have technical knowledge and employees understand the requirements of USIU-Africa. To carry out a specific activity or task therefore, benefits of training and development both for employer and employees are strategic in nature and hence much broader (Sattar, 2011). Employee training aims to change behaviour at work place in order to increase efficiency and higher performance standards. It is defined as function that includes all forms of planned learning experiences and activities whose purpose is to effect
changes in performance and other behaviour through the acquisition of new knowledge, skills, beliefs, values and attitudes (Chandra, 2009). Chandra (2009) used a case study research design to investigate human resource management practices at Wadia Institute of Himalayan Geology, the researcher utilised a questionnaire which is not applicable in case study methodology. The current study utilised questionnaires and interview to collect data on the influence of employee competencies on strategy implementation.

The research analyzed the relationship between strategy implementation and Technical Barriers. The results showed that 41.2% of the variation in strategy implementation was explained by the variations in technical barriers. Challenges posed by lack of skills and less educated workforce can only be solved through continuous training aimed at cumulatively equipping employees with the technical knowledge required to do the right actions (Speculand, 2014). Training is an activity that changes people's behavior (Ghosh, Joshi, Satyawadi, Mukherjee and Ranjan, 2011) and refers to a planned effort by a company to facilitate employees' learning of job-related competencies including knowledge, skills, or behaviors that are critical for successful job performance (Noe, 2009). Kihanya (2013) also found out that lack of skilled personnel result to failure in business strategy implementation in public sector organizations and the management team needs to take the effort to screen and evaluate potential employees and make sure these recruits can work within the organization’s work environment and culture.

5.3.3 Influence of Operational Barriers on Strategy Implementation

It was agreed that USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures for employees. Standardization is defined as an activity that gives rise to solutions for repetitive application to problems in various disciplines. Generally, the activity constitutes the process of establishing (determining, formulating, and issuing) and implementing standards. Thus, standards are the perfect result of a standardization activity and inside the context of quality systems consist of quality documents or documents related to the quality system. High levels of quality are important to accomplish company business objectives (Manghani, 2011).
The purpose of SOPs today is to guarantee that all workers are performing tasks in the same way, which is a needed for condition to get expected output from the process. When all workers perform their tasks constantly, it becomes possible to run controlled experiments to test the impact of changing various process parameters. When a process change is shown to improve process performance, SOPs are updated and workers are trained to the new procedures. All over the process, it is adorable to involve workers in SOP development and to praise worker ideas for the SOP improvement (Manghani, 2011).

For constant organizational advance, organized processes need to be constantly improved, hence necessitating ideas from those workers using those procedures. Ideas are not creative simply because they deviate from organized knowledge; ideas are creative when they are novel and suitable to the task at hand (Almeida, 2014). Workers may have many ideas; nevertheless, what they choose to do with their ideas will depend on various organizational and individual-difference factors. The most important factor, however, for the advancement of creative behaviors is worker intrinsic motivation. All organizations, businesses, etc. should have SOPs (Jain, 2008).

Study also revealed that USIU-Africa has preventive maintenance schedules. The strategy used mainly involved the filtering of uncompleted tasks from the tasks set and then to filter again from the resulted uncompleted tasks the ones which are satisfying the precedence constraint. If a task is not completed because of its preceding task, then it is put under hold until the precedence is finished. Israfil, Avizit, Rifaul and Omar (2014) also adds that in industries, Preventive Maintenance (PM) is not a new practice to minimize the sudden breakdown of production machine. PM will be performed at predetermine intervals to provide a balance between failure cost and component utilization (aging) rather, they wait for equipment failure to occur and then take whatever actions are necessary to repair or replace the equipment.

The results also revealed that USIU-Africa has adequate working systems. The workplace environment impacts employee morale, productivity and engagement both positively and negatively. Samson, Waiganjo and Koima (2015) notes that the work place environment in a majority of industry is unsafe and unhealthy. These includes poorly designed workstations, unsuitable furniture, lack of ventilation, inappropriate lighting, excessive noise, insufficient safety measures in fire emergencies and lack of personal protective equipment. People working
in such environment are prone to occupational disease and it impacts on employee’s performance. Thus productivity is decreased due to the workplace environment. It is the quality of the employee’s workplace environment that most impacts on their level of motivation and subsequent performance (Samson, Waiganjo & Koima, 2015).

5.3.4 Influence of Strategic Barriers on Strategy Implementation

The study established that USIU-Africa focuses on long term planning. Generally, the need for a business turning from reactive to proactive is increasing. Proactive enterprise leads to increased situation awareness capabilities even ahead of time. This will lead to a new class of enterprise systems, proactive and resilient enterprises, that will be continuously aware of that what “might happen” in the relevant business context and optimize their behavior to achieve what “should be the best action” even during stress and balancing on demanding margins. Proactive enterprise systems will be able to suggest early on to the decision makers the most appropriate process adjustments to avoid singular system behavior and optimize its performance (Magoutas et al., 2014).

Respondents failed to agree on whether USIU-Africa employees are clear about set policies. For an organization to gather strength via accrued knowledge in regions of economic and political governance, there is a consensus to the verdict that for any institution to be able to realise the set objectives, it should have in place, a trustworthy mechanism for constructing policies and strategies for executing the policy options (Ige, Adeyeye & Aina, 2011). Mazolla and Kellermanns (2010) assert that middle management having low or negative commitment to strategies developed by top level management stands as hindrances to effective implementation of strategy.

Greunig and Richard (2010) note that implementation of new strategy calls for recruitment of competent employees and continuous professional development. Successful implementation depends on the shoulders of managers with the capacity to motivate employees to supportively function at high level of duty that is difficult to conduct when the right employees are absent or the leader lacks interpersonal skills. One of the best practices in change management is to assume trust in organizational workforce from the start unless proven otherwise to best facilitate collaborative and cooperative behavior and to communicate defined values by which decisions will be made (Levin, 2010). Levin and Green (2010) suggest that organizational
leadership define each benefit in the plan and link the benefits to demonstrate the value of benefits to the stakeholders.

There was uncertainty on whether employees are clear about set objectives, Greunig and Richard (2010) note that implementation of new strategy calls for recruitment of competent employees and continuous professional development. Successful implementation depends on the shoulders of managers with the capacity to motivate employees to supportively function at high level of duty that is difficult to conduct when the right employees are absent or the leader lacks interpersonal skills. One of the best practices in change management is to assume trust in organizational workforce from the start unless proven otherwise to best facilitate collaborative and cooperative behaviour and to communicate defined values by which decisions will be made (Levin, 2010). Levin and Green (2010) suggest that organizational leadership define each benefit in the plan and link the benefits to demonstrate the value of benefits to the stakeholders.

According Ofojebe (2014) conducted a study to determine the extent to which the stipulations and visions of Management by Objectives (MBO) would be integrated in higher education institutions in South Eastern Nigeria to enhance higher education transformation in a globalized world. Findings indicated that in the views of the respondents, various MBO stipulations would be integrated in transforming the areas of administration, curriculum, quality assurance and committee works as well setting visions for future directions in the institutions.

There was also uncertainty about the structure of USIU-Africa supporting successful implementation of strategies. Strategy implementation determines the success of an organization because it actualizes the plans that have been set by the organization. Implementation phase of the strategy presents the greatest challenges because it involves interplay of several variables, both internal and external to the organization (Moinkett, 2015). This concurs with Ng’ enoh (2015) who did a study to establish the influence of organization structure on strategy implementation in major banks in Kenya. Major research findings indicated that the nature of organization structure had a high effect on the performance of employees, compliance with regulations and attainment of community expectations. The findings also indicated that the nature of organization structure had a moderate effect on the
attainment of bank communities’ expectations and growth of investments of major commercial banks in Kenya.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Influence of Behavioral Barriers on Strategy Implementation
The study concluded that behavior of staff at USIU- Africa plays a crucial role in the implementation of strategies. To ensure employees are motivated to take up the task, the institution has ensured that employees enjoy job security and are willing to adjust to organizational culture. It was also concluded that their exist an efficient coordination between the various departments in the firm and this has contributed to the strategy success. The study also concluded that behavioral barriers have a significant effect on strategy implementation. Employees are however uncertain if they can easily fit into stipulated roles and committed to Strategy implementation efforts. There is also a lack of affirmation of top management at the firm being supportive to implementation of strategies.

5.4.2 Influence of Technical Barriers on Strategy Implementation
The study concluded that USIU-Africa has ensured all employees attend trainings related to their duties. In addition, the firm’s employees have the necessary education and this has led to adequate achievement of the set objectives. Most employees possess the technical knowledge and therefore have an understanding of the requirements on strategy implementation. There is however a lack of certainty of employee awareness of strategies to be accomplished.

5.4.3 Influence of Operational Barriers on Strategy Implementation
For efficient strategy implementation, USIU-Africa has formulated standard operating procedures for employees to adhere. To mitigate any eventuality, USIU-Africa has set up a preventive maintenance schedules, and the institution has adequate working tools. The study also concludes that USIU-Africa has established adequate working systems and also invested in quality working techniques. There is however a lack of clear understanding of USIU-Africa investing in quality working methodologies although from the results, majority admit a lack of certainty about USIU-Africa being keen on following up on employees’ progress.

5.4.4 Influence of Strategic Barriers on Strategy Implementation
The study concluded that USIU-Africa has focused on long term planning, although instances of USIU-Africa employees being proactive in their decision making is still uncertain. Certainty of clear set policies, employees acknowledgement of set objectives, and USIU-Africa supporting successful implementation of strategies. The study concluded that variation in strategy implementation was influenced by the variations in strategic barriers.

5.5 Recommendation

5.5.1 Recommendation for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Influence of Behavioral Barriers on Strategy Implementation

Employee behavior is important in implementation of strategies, thus through the human resource department there should be a clear communication of the policies influencing employee behaviour. In addition, this study recommends that there should be a continuous coordination between departments in order for USIU-Africa to succeed in its strategy implementation programs. Employees need to be involved fully in the process and this should be an agenda driven by the top management in order to increase commitment levels at the firm as well as reduce employee apathy towards strategy implementation efforts.

5.5.1.2 Influence of Technical Barriers on Strategy Implementation

The study recommends that USIU-Africa employees should be exposed to more trainings related to their duties. Since majority of the employees have technical knowledge and understanding of the requirements for the jobs they do, there is a need for the institution to offer motivation to the employees, and such incentives would lead to more commitment to the firms strategic plans. The institution should make it an initiative to doing a follow up on employees’ progress.

5.5.1.3 Influence of Operational Barriers on Strategy Implementation

As it is right now, USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures for employees therefore through the various departmental heads, closer supervision should be done to ensure all employees adhere to the set SOPs. More awareness should be created with regards to USIU-Africa investing in quality working methodologies and for the firm to have synergy within its various department, USIU-Africa needs to adopt a policy on follow up on employees’ progress.
This will aid the firm in establishing the training needs as well as any barriers experienced in operations.

5.5.1.4 Influence of Strategic Barriers on Strategy Implementation
This study recommends that USIU-Africa needs to invest a lot of time to educate the employees about set policies and set objectives. This will ensure that team work is maintained and the firm is able to move together towards achieving the set strategic plan. The structure of USIU-Africa should be analyzed and recommendations made towards ensuring that it supports successful implementation of strategies.

5.5.2 Recommendation for Further Studies
This study was focussed on identifying the influence of organizational barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A. Further studies need to be done on barriers to strategy implementation in other private universities in order to generalize the findings.
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APPENDIX I: COVER LETTER

Cecilia Mweru Waihenya
United States International University-Kenya
P.O. BOX 14634 – 00800
Nairobi, Kenya

Dear Respondent,

REF: Filling Of Research Questionnaire

I kindly request your participation in a research project I am undertaking titled, “Influence of Organizational Barriers to Strategy Implementation in USIU-A University”. This study seeks to identify the barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A University and whether or not implementation is progressing as visualized or articulated in the strategy document.

To enhance confidentiality, kindly do not indicate your name on the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Mweru
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: BIO DATA

1. Indicate your gender.
   Female □
   Male  □

2. What is your age in years?
   20 – 24 years □
   25 – 29 years □
   30 – 34 years □
   34 – 38 years □
   39 – 43 years □
   44 – 48 years □
   Above 48 years □

3. Duration of employment at USIU-A University in years.
   1 – 2 years □
   3 – 5 years □
   6 – 10 years □
   10 – 14 years □
   Above 15 years □

4. What is your highest educational level?
   Certificate □
   Diploma □
   Degree  □
   Masters □
   Post-Graduate Diploma □
   Doctorate □
5. What is your position in the organization?
   Administrative staff – full time
   Faculty staff – full time

SECTION B: BARRIERS TO STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION IN USIU-A

Please tick as appropriate on a scale of 1-5 where 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Strategy Implementation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The behavior of the people working within USIU- Africa play an important role in implementation of strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. USIU-Africa employees are committed to Strategy Implementation efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. USIU-Africa employees are involved in implementation of strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. USIU-Africa top management are supportive to implementation of strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. USIU-Africa employees enjoy job security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Apprehension of loss of specialization due to technological innovation is not a fear amongst employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employees adjust to organizational culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employees easily fit into stipulated roles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coordination between departments leads to success in USIU-Africa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. USIU-Africa employees attend trainings related to their duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The level of education attained by USIU-Africa employees is adequate to achieve set objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Employees are aware of strategies to be accomplished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. USIU-Africa pays attention to computerized maintenance systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. USIU-Africa employees have technical knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Employees understand the requirements of USIU-Africa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. USIU-Africa has formulated Standard Operating Procedures for employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. USIU-Africa has preventive maintenance schedules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. USIU-Africa has adequate working tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. USIU-Africa has adequate working systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. USIU-Africa has invested in quality working techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. USIU-Africa is keen on following up on employees’ progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. USIU-Africa has invested in quality working methodologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. USIU-Africa employees are proactive in their decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. USIU-Africa focuses on long term planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. USIU-Africa employees are clear about set policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. USIU-Africa employees are clear about set objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The structure of USIU-Africa supports successful implementation of strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What other barriers to strategy implementation in USIU-A University not listed above have you experienced?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this research. If you wish to receive a copy of the results, kindly indicate your email address here

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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