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ABSTRACT

The study sought to investigate the influence of organizational structure, organizational culture and leadership on strategy implementation in Kenya Forest Service. Specifically, the study was meant to assist in determining if the structure, culture and leadership styles of Kenya Forest service had any effect on the implementation of its strategic plan.

Descriptive study was the most ideal for this study. The population under the study comprised 504 employees and a sample size of 35 employees based at the KFS headquarters, Karura. Primary data was collected from different targeted employees from different departments using questionnaires. Further a pilot study was carried out to determine the reliability of the questionnaires. Data analysis methods involved the use regression and correlation analysis. Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program and presented using tables and figures to give a clear picture of the research findings at a glance.

The study revealed that KFS that most employees did not know their role in the implementation of the strategy. They agreed that the current structure does not clearly define their roles. Some employees felt the current structure was not changed to suit the strategy. Moreover, they felt that current organization structure is able to facilitate decision making at any necessary level. He study also revealed that there are no proper communication channels or flow of information among the different levels of the structure.

In terms of the influence of culture on strategy implementation the study revealed that most employees believe that culture of KFS has and therefore different from the one that existed in the Forest Department. The study revealed that culture of Kenya Forest Service does not support that implementation of strategy and that the government could easily affect the activities that are taking place in the organization.

The study also revealed that the leaders of the organization did not communicate to other employees on their different roles in strategy implementation. Most of the KFS staff was neutral on the willingness of their leaders to help in case of any problem however some felt that their leaders totally supported the organization.
The study concludes that the directors, managers, departmental heads and hired specialists participated in the strategy implementation process in Kenya Forest Service. The involvement of the top management illustrates the significance of effective strategy implementation to an organization’s overall progress. However the culture of KFS does not fully support strategy implementation The study also concludes that KFS utilizes effective leadership, effective communication of the strategy and its link to organizational goals, identifying potential vulnerabilities of the strategy, adequate planning in advance, constant monitoring of the strategy implementation, involvement of all concerned stakeholders, staff training and development and rewarding success in strategy implementation as its strategy implementation practices.

The study recommends that KFS should inform the government of challenges associated with ineffective regulatory framework for appropriate remedy. Further, the study recommends that KFS should allocate more funds, train its staff and eliminate inefficiencies in its processes for it to achieve successful strategy implementation.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Strategy implementation is an integral part of strategic management process. It is a process that actualizes the formulated strategy plan and ensures that the vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives of the organization are successfully achieved as planned. Among all activities that managers do, there is nothing that affects a company’s ultimate success or failure more than how well the management team sets the company’s long term direction, develops competitively effective strategic moves and business approaches and implements what needs to be done internally to produce good strategy execution. Poor implementation undermines the strategy’s potential and paves the way for shortfalls in organization performance (Thompson and Strickland, 2008).

According to Al-Ghamdi, (2008), the challenges associated with strategy implementation include factors like strategy implementation taking longer than anticipated, insufficient coordination within the organization, other matters that arise which takes resources away from the implementation phase, insufficient capabilities of the management and employees to implement the changes, lack of training for management and employees in order to implement the changes.

According to Speculand (2007), crafting a strategy is not enough but that it has to be implemented for it to bring forth results. He says that you can have the greatest strategy in the world but if you cannot implement it, it is not worth the paper it is written on. Therefore strategy has to be effectively implemented for an organization to perform optimally in the ever changing environment. To ensure success, strategy must be translated into carefully implemented action and this means that it has to be translated into guidelines for the daily activities of the firm’s members, it has to be reflected in the way the firm organizes its activities and the firm managers must direct and control actions of the firm (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). A good strategy should fit in the environment in which the organization finds itself so that it can correspond to the survival factors in the environment, should allow an organization to be distinctive and also allow the organization to survive over the long term (Haderberg and Rieple, 2008).
Strategic management in the public sector is concerned with strengthening the long term health and effectiveness of government units and leading them through positive change to ensure continuity and productive fit with the changing environment. This involves setting in place a value chain that allows the agency’s users to be served effectively and efficiently and providing transparent accountability to both public and politicians. It also involves putting in place an effective control and evaluation activity. Staff of a best run public sector organization invariably have a comprehensive understanding of the issues affecting the groups that use their services and a knowledge of where to locate resources that will help them (Haderberg, J and Rieple.R.M, 2008).

Joyce (2007) notes that the public service went through a very difficult time in the 1980s and the 1990s and that it is not clear yet that the danger to them is over. Most of the crises in the public services organizations exist as a result of poor fit between the organization and its environment and this therefore mean that the failure of public services to keep up with the external changes opens up a gap between the organization and the public it is meant to be serving. Strategic management in the public services is an unfinished and evolving phenomenon.

The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources prepared the Kenya Forestry Master Plan (KFMP) in 1994 after extensive studies. The KFMP recommended a shift in Kenya’s natural resource management approach from an exclusionist approach to a more participatory and holistic approach. The Kenya Master Plan proposed urgent studies on new patterns of forestry administration which would put an end to deforestation and improve the management of indigenous forests and forest plantations. The studies conducted in preparation of the Plan had identified numerous weaknesses in the Forests Act CAP 385 that were partly responsible for the decline in the sector. These were addressed in the Forest Policy 2004, which was subsequently revised in 2005, and in the Forest Act 2005 (Avishi, 2006).

In November of 2005 the Government of Kenya (GOK) ratified a new Forests Act. Kenya Forest Service is a State Corporation established in February 2007 under the Forest Act 2005 to conserve develops and sustainably manage forest resources for Kenya’s social-economic development. The KFS management structure comprises 10 conservancies that are ecologically demarcated, 76 Zonal Forest Offices, 150 forest Stations, and 250
divisional forest extension offices located countrywide, and critical in forest management and surveillance. To participate in forest management, forest adjacent communities have formed registered groups and are currently working with KFS to sustainably manage forest resources. In total, there are 325 community forest associations (Avishi, 2006).

The Kenya Forest Service is an agency of the Government of Kenya designated by the Forest Act of 2005 as the replacement for the old Forest Department which was underfunded as a result of being entirely funded by forest revenues (Nelson, Peter et al, 2007). Avishi (2006) notes that the forest policy has set out core programs on natural forest conservation and management, farm forestry, dry land forestry and industrial forest plantations development to support and guide forest programs. Moreover, it has recognized the vital role played by the key stakeholders, the private sector and communities in forest management.

The mandate of KFS is to conserve, develop and sustainably manage forestry resources. Its mission is to enhance conservation and sustainable management of forests and allied resources for environmental stability and social-economic development. Forests are basis of water catchments in Kenya. Their destruction increases pressure on a population grappling with hunger and water shortage and power shortage. Forests are important for protecting ecological diversity, regulating climate patterns and acting as carbon sinks. The KFS core functions are to sustainably manage natural forests for social, economic and environmental benefits. It is responsible of increasing productivity of industrial forest plantations and enhancing efficiency in wood utilization by promoting farm forestry and commercial tree farming. It also promotes efficient utilization and marketing of forest products (KFS, 2007).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Success of the strategy adopted ought to take into consideration an organization’s competencies and strengths in terms of capabilities and match this with the environment within which an organization operates Most organizations irrespective of their size, age or industry are increasingly faced with the challenge of continuous dynamic change (Munala 2010).
Impediments to strategy implementation should be taken into account and the most reliable way to get the best information is to include the largest possible number of the organization’s members into the discussion. Alexander (1985) affirms that strategy implementation is less glamorous than strategy formulation, people overlook it because of a belief that anyone can do it, people are not exactly sure what it includes and where it begins and ends. Strategy implementation should be taken into account and the most reliable way to get the best information is to include the largest possible number of the organization’s members into the discussion.

The major challenges that organizations face in strategy implementation are: the implementation taking more time than allocated, unanticipated major problems surfacing during implementation, poor coordination, competing activities, lacking competencies, etc. In addition to this, a poor fit between human resources and the organizations structure and systems as well as poor vertical communication in both directions also pose challenges in strategy implementation (Hambrick and Cannella, 2003).

The forest sector contributes both tangible and intangible benefits of enormous proportions in support of the Kenyan economy but on the other hand sustainable utilization of these benefits has been faced with a lot of challenges such as increasing demand for forest products and services, competition with other land uses, poor governance in natural resource management and administration and low financial resource provision. Lack of investment in modern technology and under-valuation of forest resources have further impacted on the ability of the ability of the sector to substantially contribute to economic growth.

Studies have been done on the challenges of strategy implementation. For instance, Arumonyang (2009) did a survey of strategy implementation challenges facing regional development authorities in Kenya, Patrick (2009), on challenges of strategy implementation at Kenya wildlife service, Njoki (2009), challenges of strategy implementation at Oxfam great Britain-Kenya, Martha (2010), challenges of strategy implementation at the ministry of road and public works in Kenya. Aosa (1992), on an empirical investigation of aspects of strategy formulation and implementation within large, private manufacturing companies in Kenya and Awino (2002), purchasing and supply chain strategy: benefits, barriers and bridges - an independent conceptual study.
No study has been done on challenges faced by Kenya Forest Service in strategy implementation. This study therefore sought to fill in this gap by investigating the challenges faced by Kenya Forest Service in strategy implementation. Moreover, the above studies carried out on challenges faced by organizations in strategy implementation have cited organizational structure and organizational culture as some of the factors that affect implementation of strategy. This study seeks to find out how the organizational structure and culture of KFS has affected the implementation of its strategy and therefore filling the gap.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of organizational structure, organizational culture and leadership on strategy implementation in Kenya Forest Service.

1.4 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1.4.1 Does organizational structure have any influence on strategy implementation?
1.4.2 Does organizational culture have any influence on strategy implementation?
1.4.3 Does leadership have any influence on strategy implementation?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study can be beneficial to a number of users namely:
1.5.1 KFS’s Management
The findings of this study will be of great importance to the management of Kenya Forest Service as they will be enlightened on the influence of organizational structure, organizational culture and leadership on strategy implementation in Kenya Forest Service; this will assist them in strategy implementation within the organization.

1.5.2. Employees
The study findings will assist employee of the Kenya Forest Service to appreciate the influence of organizational structure, organizational culture and leadership on strategy implementation in Kenya Forest Service, this will assist in reducing resistance to strategy implementation within the organization.

1.5.3 Other Parastatals/ or Environmental Organization
This study will be beneficial to the staff and managers of the organization since it will give the challenges to effective management. The findings and the recommendations from the study can be used to implement corrective action hence contribute to the efficiency of implementation of future strategic plans. The findings will also help in enlightening the key decision makers in Kenya forest service in policies formulation

1.5.4 Researchers
This study forms a basis for literature for academicians and researchers who might want to review the strategic implementation process of Kenya forest service and of any other public organization. Other organizations will definitely want to know what KFS has gone through as it’s implementing its first strategic plan and gain the knowledge through research on how to successfully implement strategic plans for new public service organization The study will also highlight other important relationships that require further research; this may be in the areas of relationships between successful strategy implementation and firm’s performance or any other relevant and related topic.

1.5.5 Government of Kenya
The study will provide information to the government on how far KFS has come in terms of strategy implementation and therefore decide effectively on the resources it is supposed to allocate to the organization. The outcome of the study will help the government in running future public organizations smoothly.
1.5.4 Forest Community
This study will provide information to the forest community who live around and inside the forest. They are the communities that form Community Forest Associations which help the organization in conserving the forest. This will act as a source of motivation to them and therefore increase more participation hence increasing the forest cover of our country.

1.5.5 Donors
The forest sector depends heavily on donors therefore this information will be useful to both the national and international donors who will pump in more funds to support more projects.

1.6 Scope of The Study
The study focused on KFS headquarters offices in Nairobi, Kiambu road. The study has a narrow scope due the fact it focused on carrying out research at the head office in Nairobi whereas KFS is an organization with offices all over the country. In addition to this issue, carrying out the study at the time after the implementation of the strategic plan was also a challenge. The study was carried out over a period of six months.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Strategic Implementation
Strategic implementation is set of activities necessary to fully execute an organization’s strategies (Katsioloudes, 2000).

1.7.2 Strategic Management
Strategic management is the process through which organizations analyze and learn from their internal and external environments, establish strategic direction, create strategies that are intended to move an organization in that direction and implement those strategies, all in an effort to satisfy stakeholders (Harrison, 2003)

1.7.3 Leadership
Karuri (2006), defines leadership as the forces that make things happen. She sees leaders as giving the direction of the organization through a vision of the whole picture of the
organization. Leadership is a major factor that distinguishes successful organizations from less successful ones. The leadership therefore provides guidance in making strategic choices (Yukl, 2004).

1.7.4 Organizational Culture
Organizational culture is the basic assumption and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization that operates unconsciously and define, in a basic taken-for-granted fashion, how an organization views itself and its environment. In other words, culture is about that which is taken for granted but no none the less contributes to how groups of people respond and behave in relation to issue they face (Johnson, Scholes and Whittington, 2008).

1.7.5 Strategy
Strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long term; which achieves the advantage for the organization through its configuration of resources within a challenging environment, to meet the needs of market and to fulfill stakeholder’s expectations (Johnson and Scholes, 2002).

1.7.6 Organizational Structure
Organization structure is a formal framework by which jobs tasks are divided, grouped and coordinated. The structure identifies the key activities within the firm and the manner in which they will be coordinated to achieve the firm’s strategic purpose. (Robins and Coulter, 2002).

1.8 Chapter Summary
Chapter one gives the background of the problems facing public organizations in strategy implementation and this forms the background of the study. It also shows the statement problem and the rationale of carrying out the study. Moreover, this chapter defines the scope of the study and the probable beneficiaries of the study. This chapter also shows what will guide the study in terms of the research questions. The forthcoming chapter will be literature review based on the three different research questions. It will give a critical summary of the work done by previous researchers on topics related to the topic of this study.
Chapter two gives the literature review of the studies done by different researchers that are related to the topic. Chapter three will explain the research methodology that was used in the study. It will explain how the needed information was gathered and from which groups of people. Chapter four will give results and findings from the 35 respondents who were interviewed to determine the effect of culture structure and leadership on strategy implementation at Kenya Forest Service. Chapter five summarizes, discusses, concludes and makes recommendations based on the findings from chapter 4 in light of the literature review in chapter 2.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature that is relevant to the research by looking at what other authors have written that could add more insight into the topic under study. The study will seek to use literature on the concept of strategy, strategy implementation, organizational culture, organizational structure and challenges facing strategy implementation. This will also be done by making reference to theories already in existence.

According to Murithi (2009), implementation of business strategies is a challenge for most of the parastatals in the Kenya’s ministries as there are various factors that have negatively influenced the strategy implementation resulting in poor implementation process. These challenges have made some organizations to implement these strategies inappropriately, not fully implement them and or abandon them.

2.2 Influence of Organizational Structure on Strategy Implementation

2.2.1 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation

Organization structure is a formal framework by which jobs tasks are divided, grouped and coordinated. The structure identifies the key activities within the firm and the manner in which they will be coordinated to achieve the firm’s strategic purpose. An inconsistency between structure and strategy lead to a disorder, friction and mal performance within the organization. Therefore, management must incorporate regular job evaluation exercises as a means to ensure a strategy-structure fit to avoid discordance (Robins and Coulter, 2002).

The implementation of the new strategy requires that professional employees be recruited to carry out the exercise. Alternatively employees should be provided with skills and knowledge through training to implement it (Okumu, 2003). It is vital to nurture the people in an organization because they are the process owners and process is what drives implementation (Ehlers and Lazenby, 2007). This therefore means that employees are important in the implementation of the strategy and that they are the ones who can either lead to the success or failure of the strategy.
Rutan (1999) argues that all implementation aspects during the planning phase are fundamental for execution as there is no time to do that during execution. It is therefore critical that everyone on the team understands and agrees upon the details of the plan. Management also must make the commitment to stay focused on the agreed plans and should make significant changes to the plan after careful consideration on the overall implications and consequences of the change. The organization should maintain a balance between ongoing business activities and working on new strategic initiatives. That means, problems with implementation often occur when companies concentrate on new strategy development and in the process forget their main line of business that underlie within previously formulated business strategies. According to Schmidt and Keil (2013), competent employees and their capabilities is essential ingredient for successful strategy implementation. He adds that it is important for the organization to develop human resource competencies.

Chandler (1962) asserts that once a firm has developed goals the next thing is to develop an appropriate structure to enable effective coordination of resources and he adds that structure follows strategy in his study carried out in the United States in the early 1960’s. Without deliberately organizing responsibilities and activities to produce linkages between structure and strategy, the outcomes are likely to be disorder, friction and malfunction. Every organization needs to build and maintain the optimal structure to generate and develop its strategies (Lynch, 2000). Hence, it seems that there is agreement among the two writes that structure is directly related to strategy and that structure is a product of strategy.

As a result of having a set of operational imperatives, then it is possible for the leaders to design out the organization to best achieve the desired results, making decisions along the lines of: reporting hierarchy, individual/functional/business performance metrics, job descriptions/desired candidate profiles, elements centralize/decentralize, and others (Lee, 2002). Daft (2001) affirms that organizational structures designate formal reporting relationships including the number of levels in the hierarchy and the span of control of managers and supervisors. It is therefore imperative to note that strategy designs the structure and assigns duties and responsibilities to the different components of the structure as evidenced by the views of the two writers.
2.2.2 Types Organizational Structures

There are different types of organizational structures and there is no particular strategy that is fit for all organizations. Finding structure to follow strategy is a complex task and not all organizations are able to perform successfully each time (Katsioloudes, 2002). Functional organizational structure is one that divides the organization into key activities, has much greater formality within it and is centrally controlled with the chief executive being the one to determine the strategy and to instruct the functional units to deliver their part of the puzzle.

Divisionalized structure is the kind of structure characterized by decentralized decision-making authority and the division of the organization into major themes with the themes being functionally organized. It is viewed as the most effective as the different units do no need to work closely with other units within the organization. Strategic Business units is a kind of organizational structure in which the individual units are not tightly controlled but are held responsible for their own performance results whereas matrix structure is the kind of structure that is simultaneously structured functionally and divisionally (Macmillan and Tampoe, 2000). In summary, it is clear that what is good for one organization cannot be necessarily good for another organization and that there is no one design for all.

Structures are essential part of strategy implementation (Whittington 2002). Lee (2011) observes that every strategy needs to have a clearly defined organization architecture (the way organization needs to be structured to deliver the different set of outputs and outcomes) implied by its new ambition. The goal here is to align the organizational structure to fit the requirements of the strategy. Too often, leadership teams assume that existing structures, processes, metrics, behaviors, skills, and tools will deliver a new strategic destination; to their regret, they later learn that the existing organization was optimized to deliver the past vision, not the future one. A critical step – often overlooked – is ensuring that organizational capabilities align with the strategy. A basic assessment of organizational capabilities and the capability gaps created by a change in strategy is a very direct means of improving alignment (Sterling, 2006). These two researchers agree that there should be a fit between structure and strategy for strategy to be successfully implemented and for it achieve the required end results.
Chandler (1962) explains that once a firm has formulated its goals the next thing is to develop an appropriate structure to enable effective coordination of resources. This therefore means that strategy comes before structure so it therefore shapes it. The basic question to ask: what must our organizational construct be able to achieve and deliver, repeatedly, for us to succeed in our desired future state? Having a set of operational imperatives, then it is possible for the leaders to design out the organization to best achieve the desired results, making decisions along the lines of: reporting hierarchy, individual/functional/business performance metrics, job descriptions/desired candidate profiles, elements centralize/decentralize, and others (Getz, 2011).

Pinpointing the key functions and tasks requisite for successful strategy implementation and making them the primary building blocks of the organization structure is one way that strategy shapes structure. This is followed by reflection on how the strategy critical functions and organizational units relate to those that are routine and those that provide staff support. Finally determining the degree of authenticity needed to manage each organizational unit bearing in mind both the costs and benefits of decentralized decision making and provision of a coordination among the various units of the organization (Chandler, 2002).

Macmillan and Tampoe (2000) assert that every organization should be structured to achieve its strategic intent and came up with five steps of determining organizational structures for strategic aims. They believe that an organization should come up with a formal structure that will best suit the business need. Lynch (2000) suggested two approaches for ensuring fit between strategy and structure and they are prescriptive and emergent approaches. Prescriptive approach is where the purpose of an organization is to allocate the work and administrative mechanisms that are necessary to control and integrate the strategies of an organization. It is where work is allocated to functions and recombined into departments with power being distributed accordingly whereas emergent approach is where the organization itself may restrict or enhance the strategies that are proposed.

2.2.3 Organization Communication

Once the strategy has been formulated, communication is one of the most important vehicles for successful implementation. First of all, management should inform all
employees about the content, meaning of, and reasons for the new strategy. However, they should not only inform the employees, they should also leave room for questions from and discussion with the affected employees. Communication also involves the explanation of new tasks and responsibilities to the affected employees. Throughout the implementation process, communication should flow bottom-up to allow management to monitor the implementation process and determine whether changes to the approach are needed (Alexander, 2005).

The correct organizational structure is crucial to enable the organization to implement its strategy. To facilitate the achievement of the strategic and organizational objectives, organizational structure coordinates and integrates the tasks executed by all employees in the organization, i.e. employees at all levels, and across all divisions and functions (Hill et al, 2009). Organizational structure determines the departments and functions in an organization, it defines the hierarchy, span of control and reporting relationships, and includes the systems for communication, coordination and integration across these divisions and functions, both vertically and horizontally (Daft, 2011).

First of all, tasks and people need to be grouped in functions. After this, functions can be grouped into divisions to allow the organization to achieve organizational goals effectively and efficiently. Across these divisions and functions authority and responsibilities need to be allocated. A clear hierarchy needs to be defined from the Board of Directors through middle management all the way down to the operational employees. The hierarchy should clarify the span of control that each of the employees has, i.e. the people and tasks they are responsible for and have authority over. As the organization has been divided into separate functions and divisions, which all together should strive to achieve the same organizational objectives, communication and coordination across these functions and divisions is needed. Through integrating mechanisms, such as direct contact, liaison roles and cross functional or divisional teams, information about activities, ideas and problems are efficiently spread across the organization (Hill et al, 2009).

2.3 Influence of Organizational Culture on Strategy Implementation

2.3.1 Organizational Culture and Strategy Implementation
Organizational culture is the basic assumption and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization that operates unconsciously and define, in a basic taken-for-granted
fashion, how an organization views itself and its environment. In other words, culture is about that which is taken for granted but none the less contributes to how groups of people respond and behave in relation to issue they face. It therefore has important influences on the development and change of organizational strategy (Johnson, Scholes and Whittington, 2008).

Organizational culture can either be a valuable or stumbling block to successful strategy implementation. When organization’s beliefs, vision and objectives underpinning its chosen strategy are compatible with its organizational culture, culture serves as a valuable driver and simplifies strategy implementation effort (Ehlers and Lazenby, 2007). Organizational culture is required in order to mobilize and sustain the process of change required to implement the strategy. It is the awareness and internalization of the shared vision, mission and values needed to execute the strategy (Kaplan and Norton, 2005). According to Hrebiniak (2005) the culture of an organization is the result of shared assumptions regarding the external and internal environments of the organization. These assumptions lead to shared values and beliefs in the organization, which have an impact on the behavior of the members of the organization towards achieving the formulated vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives. Organizational culture can affect strategy implementation and strategy implementation can in turn affect the organizational culture. Culture provides the context within which strategies are formulated.

Speculand (2009) believes that contrary to popular belief most people do not resist change! This is probably the most controversial of the six Mind Shifts, because for years we have firmly believed that most staff members will resist change. Remember, if our current beliefs are accurate, we would not be failing so frequently. The question of why we mistakenly believe staff members resist change and its implications are critical to successful implementation.

Employees regard a decision they perceive to be consistent with common values and beliefs as substantively appropriate and worth of support. Culture therefore provides the opportunity for inducing cooperation that otherwise would have been difficult to achieve (Harrison, 2003). Cameron and Quinn (1999) found that organizations rarely have one type of culture but that time and again; there is a mix of the four organizational cultures.
The flexible organizations are the most successful since they are able to adjust and change their organizational culture to fit the strategy requirements hence achieving their goals at the end. There is no final “best” organizational culture but in a particular circumstance one class of culture serves better than another.

A fundamental part of managing strategy implementation is the organizational culture. Hill et al (2009) define organizational culture as the “specific collection of values, norms, beliefs and attitudes that are shared by people and groups in an organization and that control the way they interact with each other and with stakeholders outside the organization”. Although not as tangible as strategic control systems and organizational structure, culture is one of the strongest elements of control in an organization. A strong organizational culture enhances integration and coordination within the organization. Culture gives members of the organization the ability to develop a collective identity, and guides them in their daily business relationships, execution of tasks, communication and decision-making.

If propagated correctly, organizational values will become part of the individual’s values through which the individual will follow them unconsciously. To create a strong organizational culture, it is important that leadership promotes what the organization believes is correct behavior. Within the values of the organization, strong emphasis should be given to ethical behavior. A code of ethics can help management to communicate the ethical behavior they expect from everybody in the organization (Hill et al, 2009; Daft, 2001). A beliefs system as defined by Simons (2005) is “the explicit set of organizational definitions that senior managers communicate formally and reinforce systematically to provide basic values, purpose and direction for the organization”. A beliefs system controls the core values of the organization, which are linked to the business strategy. Such a system is created through symbolic use of information, e.g. inspirational leadership. It attempts to create awareness and understanding of the organization’s core values and should help employees to respond to problems they face during the process of strategy implementation.

One of the major challenges in strategy implementation appears to be more cultural and behavioural in nature, including the impact of poor integration of activities and diminished feelings of ownership and commitment (Aaltonen and Ikävalko, 2002).
Corboy and O'Corrbui (2009), meanwhile, identify the deadly sins of strategy implementation which involves a lack of understanding of how the strategy should be implemented, customers and staff not fully appreciating the strategy; difficulties and obstacles not acknowledged, recognized or acted upon, and ignoring the day-to-day business imperatives. Marginson, (2002) contend that strategy implementation evolves either from a process of winning group commitment through a coalitional form of decision-making, or as a result of complete coalitional involvement of implementation staff through a strong corporate culture.

2.3.2 Types of Organizational Culture
The Clan Culture is where the working environment is a sociable one, people having a lot in common and the executives are seen as mentors or maybe even as father figures. The organization is held together by commitment and tradition and it encourages teamwork, participation, and consensus. The Adhocracy Culture is where there an energetic and creative working environment, employees take risk, leaders are innovator and experiments and innovation are the bonding materials within the organization.

The Market Culture is a results-based organization that highlights completing work and getting things done, people are competitive and concentrated on goals; leaders are tough and have high expectations and importance of winning keeps the organization together. Finally, the hierarchy Culture is a formalized and structured work environment in which procedures decide what people do, leaders are proud of their efficiency-based coordination and keeping the organization functioning effortlessly is most crucial (Cameron and Quinn, 1999).

2.3.3 Organizational Culture and Strategy Fit
Johnson et.al. (2008) are of the view that organizations can be captured by their culture and the employees may also find it very difficult to change their strategy outside the bounds of their culture. The following diagram shows cultural influence on strategy development:
2.3.4 Uniqueness of Culture

Thompson and Strickland (1996) noted that each and every organization has unique culture which is seen in the way it approaches problems and conducting activities. Its mix of managerial personalities and styles, its own set of war stories and heroes and its own experiences of how changes have been instituted. The management team has the responsibility of striking a balance between the formulation process and the organization’s culture. For an organization to be successful then the corporate culture has to dictate on its beliefs. Such beliefs substantially drive the behavior of people in an organization. An organization’s culture provides the social context in which an organization performs its work and interactions. She affirms that managers are the ones who develop and implement a strategic plan. It is therefore part of their leadership task that once strategy has been developed, they bring the company’s culture into alignment with strategy and keep it here. Failure to which she warns may lead to high organization resistance to change and de-motivation which in turn can frustrate the strategy implementation effort (Karuri, 2006).

Culture is formed by screening and selecting new employees who share the same values as the organization. Culture is dynamic and is shaped both by the internal and external
factors. Internal factors include staff turnover and recruitment whereas external factors include technology and competition (Bennis, 1989).

2.3.5 Characteristics of Culture

Hosftede came up with characteristics of culture. They state that culture is dynamic because it is prone to change. It is also pervasive because it influences every part of the society and gives members a common identity. They go further and add that culture is learnt because members of the culture learn ways of thinking and patterns of a behavior. It is integrated because it functions like an integrated whole. Moreover, it is ethnocentric because it is reinforced by economic, technological and intellectual domination. Finally, culture provides social cohesion because it enables individuals in a group to share patterns of perceptions which makes them see the same things same way and this holds them together. All these characteristics show that culture is a vital part of organizations.

2.4 Influence of leadership on Strategy Implementation

First of all, ineffective leadership is a factor mentioned by almost all researchers as a reason hindering the implementation of strategy. Alexander (2005) found that ineffective coordination of implementation activities was one of the causes of failure. This finding is confirmed by Al-Ghamdi (1998), who performed a similar research in the United Kingdom. Beer et al (2000) mention the quality of direction, which describes multiple ways in which senior management can be ineffective. Senior management sometimes bypasses middle management, and directly obtains information from and gives orders to the lower level employees, causing ineffective communication lines in the implementation team. Additionally, this causes a situation in which conflicts are avoided and value-adding discussions on decision-making are lost. Finally, Beer et al (2010) state that leadership in many teams does not make the necessary trade-offs they face during the implementation. Instead, they create vague strategic objectives which do not provide effective direction for implementation.

2.4.1 Leadership and Strategy Implementation

Karuri (2006), defines leadership as the forces that make things happen. She sees leaders as giving the direction of the organization through a vision of the whole picture of the organization. Leadership is a major factor that distinguishes successful organizations
from less successful ones. The leadership therefore provides guidance in making strategic choices (Yukl 1994).

Strategic leadership components interact with each other and they positively contribute to the effective implementation strategy (Hitt et al., 2007). Strategic leadership components in organizations needs competent leaders who are able to translate strategy into actions and the results (Hsieh and Yik, 2005). The best planned strategies are worthless if they cannot be translated from concept to reality and even the best strategy can fail if an organization doesn’t have cadre of leaders with the right capabilities at the right levels of the organization. Successful implementation of strategies formulated by the CEO and top management will depend on their leadership and the quality of their relationship with managers and employees (Bass, 2007). Strategic leadership must be biased towards strategy implementation and must drive the organization forward towards the successful implementation of strategy (Hrebiniak, 2005). Effective strategic leaders are required to drive the strategy forward and to keep improving on how the strategy is implemented. Therefore, strategic leaders play a critical role in strategic control and continuous improvement efforts (Thompson and Strickland, 2003).

Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively and the process of facilitating individuals and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives. Effectiveness of leadership is the extent to which leader's organizational units perform its task successfully and attains its goals (Yukl, 2002).

A leader's role is to design that strategy. The consequence, however, is that once leaders have created their strategies, they believe they have completed most of their responsibilities and many delegate this process to others, taking their eyes off what needs to be done to put their strategies in place. After all, they believe, it is more difficult to create a strategy than to implement it (Speculand, 2009). Far too many new leaders do a poor job of diagnosing their situation and tailoring their strategies accordingly and make unnecessary mistakes, such as committing to unachievable goals (Watkins, 2006). This painful scenario shows that the two researchers agree on the fact that many leaders of the 20th century contribute a lot in the failure of the strategic management implementation
Mintzberg (2011) explains that everyone is responsible in an organization and that everyone is learning at all levels, and management is listening. The problem with the concept of leadership is that it implies everyone else is a follower. But we don't need more followers. We need a world of community-ship in which employees have a sense of belonging, and a willingness to work hard for it. The notion that one can be a leader and not a manager, originally postulated by Harvard Business School professor Abraham Zaleznik, is wrong. An executive cannot lead without managing and if they're not coupled, the organization becomes dysfunctional. Allen (2011) contradicts this by stating that strategic leadership is best understood as the catalyzing force in the strategic process. He believes that providing strategic leadership means providing both direction and impetus for action such that desired results are achieved. He goes on further saying that leadership is knowing the right things to do and then instilling in others the understanding, motivation and the energy to get those things accomplished. One does not manage people. The task is to lead people and the goal is to make productive the specific strengths and knowledge of each individual (Drucker, 2004)

Cater Tomaz (2010) argues that managers mostly rely on planning and organizing activities when implementing strategies, while the biggest obstacle to strategy execution is poor leadership. Moreover, the results of multiple regression analysis reveal that greater obstacles to strategy execution in the forms of inadequate leadership skills and employees’ reluctance to share their knowledge have a negative influence on performance, while adapting the organizational structure to the selected strategy as an activity for strategy implementation has a positive influence on performance. This is supported by an empirical study that was done to analyze of the governance of sustainability in fifty large listed companies based on each company’s disclosures in annual and sustainability reports. The study found that significant progress is being made by large listed Australian companies towards integrating sustainability into core business operations. There is evidence of leadership structures being put in place to ensure that board and senior management are involved in sustainability strategy development and are then incentivized to monitor and ensure implementation of that strategy through financial rewards (Klettner et.al, 2014).

O’reilly et.al (2010) affirms that a leader’s behavior influences group and organizational behavior. Most organizations have multiple layers of leaders, implying that any single
leader does not lead in isolation. Their focused on how the consistency of leadership effectiveness across hierarchical levels influenced the implementation of a strategic initiative in a large health care system and they found that it was only when leaders’ effectiveness at different levels was considered in the aggregate that significant performance improvement occurred. Shaarp (2006), supports this idea through his empirical study that found out that Mismatched capabilities, poor asset configurations, and inadequate execution can all play their part in undermining a company's strategic objectives. Although well-regarded corporations tend to keep these pitfalls squarely in their sights, in our experience far fewer companies recognize or treat leadership as the starting point of strategy. He goes on saying that whereas good managers deliver predictable results as promised, as well as occasional incremental improvements, leaders generate breakthroughs in performance. A company's leadership reaches well beyond a few good men and women at the top. It typically includes the 3 to 5 percent of employees throughout the organization who can deliver breakthroughs in performance. Since bold strategies often require breakthroughs along a number of fronts, a company needs stronger and more dominant leadership at all levels if these strategies are to succeed.

French and Raven (2006) came up with framework for understanding power which is the ability to make people do what the leader wants them to do. An effective leader must have power and know how to use it appropriately. The different types of power are; legitimate power which is power based on a leader’s official position, reward power which is based on leader’s ability to reward subordinate, coercive power which is based on ability of the leader to obtain compliance by instilling fear of punishment, referent power which is based on a person’s identification with or closeness to another and charismatic power that emanates from the force of personality. Effective leaders use all the different types of power at different times when necessary.

2.4.2 Leadership Models

2.4.2.1 Contingency Leadership Model

Fiedler, (1967) came up with a contingency theory which propagates the view that there is no single best way for managers to lead. What works in one situation may not work in another. He rated managers as either relationship oriented or task oriented. According to Fiedler leadership is fixed as it depends on leader’s personality but certain situations favor certain leadership styles. Relationship oriented leaders are in a situation where a
positive relationship between them and their followers results to more support from their followers. On the other hand, task oriented leaders follow a task structure where the leadership style is determined by the level of structure of the job. LPC (least preferred co-worker) is used to classify leadership style. A high LPC score suggest that the leader is relationship oriented while a low LPC score indicates a task oriented leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader-member relationship</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High structure</td>
<td>Low structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/middle LPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2: Fiedler’s Contingency Theory**

**2.4.2.2 Situational Leadership Model**

Hersey and Blanchard, (1967) developed the situational leadership model that proposes that the developmental levels of a leader’s subordinates play the greatest role in determining which leadership styles are most appropriate. According to them leadership styles are determined by task behavior, relationship behaviors and the level of maturity of the followers. As a result of these they identified four leadership styles which are direct or telling, coaching or selling, supporting or participating or delegating leadership styles. They conclude by saying that effective leaders adopt their behaviors and leadership style to meet requirements of different situations.
Figure 2.3: Hersey-Blanchard model of Situational Leadership

3.7 Conceptual Framework

![Conceptual Framework diagram]

Source, Research (2015)

2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter gives a critical summary of the work done by other researchers on topics related to this study. It gives an account of what has been published basing on the objectives of the study. This chapter has operationalized the objectives and shown the different aspects that form the foundation of the objectives. The next chapter is on
research methodology which gives the methods and procedures that was used to carry out the study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research methodology used in this study. It outlines in detail how the research was conducted and the justification of the methodology adopted. It reviews the research design, the population, sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures and data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Design

Research design is a plan for selecting the sources and type of information to answer the research questions. It is a framework for specifying the relationships among the study variables (Blanche, Durrheim, and Painter, 2006). This study is a descriptive study because of the nature of the variables. A research design is the conceptual structure within which research would be conducted. The purpose of a research design is to provide for collection of relevant evidence with minimal expenditure of effort, time and money. The importance of a case study is emphasized by Young (1960) and Kothari (1960) who were in agreement that a case study is a very powerful form of qualitative analysis that involves a careful and complete observation of a social unit irrespective of what types of unit is under study. The research design was appropriate as it gave conclusive results of the specific objectives of the study. Strategy implementation is the dependent variable whereas organizational culture, structure and leadership are the independent variables.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003) define population as all members of some defined group. There are different levels of staff based on job description, responsibilities, level of education and the location of the office. The study covered both male and female employees at the at the head office. The population at the headquarter offices was 504 members of staff from all cadres.
3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame
Schindler (2006) defines a sampling frame as a complete list of the population of interest in a study. The study focused on Kenya Forest Service who are directly involved in the implementation of the strategic plan. The list was acquired from the human resource department.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique
The study was first carried out using stratified sampling followed by random sampling. Stratified random sampling is a sampling technique which involves the selection of a sample in which the population is divided into subpopulations called strata, with all the strata being represented in the sample (Hinkle et al, 2003). Healey (2010) describes this kind of sampling as a very desirable technique because it guarantees that the samples will representative on the selected traits. Linda Westfall (2008), explains that strata rare formed by classifying the population basing characteristics such as age, gender or socio-economic status. Selection of elements is then made separately from within each stratum, usually by random or systematic sampling methods.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
The sample size is the number of observations in a sample (Hinkle et al, 2003). The study focused on 35 members of staff from all levels with the main focus being on top management. This number was chosen because it a true representative of the whole population. The composition was as tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Demographic Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Data Collection Methods

This study emphasized the use of primary data. Primary data are records kept and written by actual participants in or witnesses of an event (Burns, 2003). Primary data was collected from different targeted employees from different departments using questionnaires. This research used closed questionnaires developed basing on the objectives. Burns (2003) further defines questionnaires as ones with closed items which allow the respondent to choose from two or more fixed alternatives which must be exhaustive. Questionnaires were used due to the fact that they enable the researcher to administer the same set of identical questions, phrased in exactly the same way leading to ease of data analysis.

Structured questions are easier to analyze since they are in the immediate usable form, (Orotho and Kombo, 2002). Likert type of scale was used for example beside each statements presented below, please indicate whether you are extremely satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied. Likert scales are often used in matrix questions and are ordered in such a way that they indicate the presence or absence of the characteristic being measured, (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Given that those who were interviewed were the respondents and the researcher required to obtain in-depth information on issues surrounding strategy implementation in Kenya forest service, the questionnaires were regarded as the best method as it gave a clear guidance on what questions were asked. The study had 4 likert scales

3.5 Research Procedures

The research procedure started by carrying out a pilot test on five respondents from the target population to test the completeness of the questionnaires. This helped in ensuring that the information gathered was reliable and valid. It also helped to manage the interviews with respondents hence reducing ambiguity. This was followed by correction and amendments to the questionnaires to make sure it gave the best results at the end of the study. The questionnaires were administered personally to the staff on duty at the organization after explaining the purpose of the research to them and how their sincerity will be important to the study. When collecting the questionnaire from a respondent I went through them to ensure that it had all the required information and also to get clarification on some issues if need be.
3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Data analysis is the process through which raw data is ordered and organized so that useful information can be extracted from it (Lloyd, 2002). The data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 22. This method uses measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion to describe the data. Measures of central tendency are mean, mode and median while measures of dispersion are range, standard deviation and variance (O.Mugenda and A.Mughenda, 1999).

The analyzed data was presented in terms of bar charts and different values were presented in form of tables. The study showed the tables of the model summary, correlation and coefficient tables that gave the values of coefficient of variation, coefficient of determination and P-value.

3.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter explained the research methodology that was used in the study. It explained how the needed information was gathered and from which groups of people. Moreover it gave the number of people who were interviewed and the reason why they were chosen. The next chapter gave the results and findings of the study after collecting the information from the intended target population.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the data analysis and the research findings from the completed questionnaires on challenges faced by Kenyan Parastatals in strategy implementation. Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequency tables were used to interpret data. The analyzed data provided information on respondent’s demography, the extent to which KFS has faced challenges in strategy implementation.

4.2 Response Rate

Table 4.2: Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Target Respondents</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study targeted a sample size of 35 respondents from which 35 filled in and returned the questionnaires making a response rate of 100%. This response rate was satisfactory to make conclusions for the study. The response rate was representative. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is excellent. Based on the assertion, the response rate was considered to excellent.
4.3 Demographic Information

4.3.1 Gender Of The Respondent

The study sought to determine the gender of the respondent, from the finding the study found that majority of the respondent as shown by 60% indicated that they were males whereas 40% of the respondent indicated that they were females, this is an indication that males and females were involved in the study though not in equal proportion.

4.3.2 Position In The Organization

The study requested the respondent to indicate their position in the organization, from the finding the study found that those who indicated that they were in top management, supervisory level and middle level management were shown by 28.6% in each case, whereas 14.3% of the respondent indicated that they were subordinate staff, this is an indication that all level of staff were involved in the study.
4.3.3 Respondent Working Period

![WORKING PERIOD](image)

**Figure 4.7: Respondent Working Period**

On the period the respondent has worked in the organization, the study found that 28.6% of the respondent indicated that they had worked for 20 to 25 years, 25.7% of the respondent indicated that they had worked for 6 to 10 years, 20% of the respondent indicated that they had worked for 0 to 5 years, 14.3% of the respondent indicated that they had worked for 11 to 15 years, 8.6% of the respondent had worked for 16 to 20 years whereas 2.9% of the respondent indicated that they had worked for 26 to 30 years, this is an indication that majority of the respondent in the organization form more than five years and thus they were in a position to give credible information to the study.
4.4 Organizational Structure

4.4.1 Descriptive statistics

![Organizational Structure Chart]

**Figure 4.8: Organizational Structure**

The findings in the figure 4.8 above indicates that 25.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed that KFS has identified all its primary activities, 20% of the respondents strongly disagreed that levels of authority for each employee has been clearly identified, 17.1% were neutral on whether the organizational structure has made an effort to outsource all non-critical activities, however 11.4% strongly disagreed that your role has been clearly identified and stated in the current organizational structure, 8.6% strongly disagree that the organizational structure was changed to suit the current strategic plan, while another 8.6% agree that the current organization structure is able to facilitate decision making at any necessary level, the least of them 5.7% were neutral on the fact that the current organizational structure was appropriate to support the implementation of the strategic plan and 2.9% disagreed that there is a proper communication among and within the different levels of management.
4.4.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.2: Correlations between organization structure and strategy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Strategy implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.414*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study conducted a Pearson product moment correlation to determine the strength of relationship between organization structure and strategy implementation, the study found that there negative significant relationship between organization structure and strategy implementation as shown by correlation coefficient of 0.414. The study found that the sign value (0.013) an indication that there was significant relationship between organization structure and strategy implementation structure. This is an indication that organization structure negatively affected strategy implementation at Kenya Forest Service.

4.4.3 Regression Analysis between Structure and Strategy Implementation

Table 4.3: Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.395</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>4.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>-1.022</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>-.414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The established regression equation was

**Strategy Implementation = 5.395-1.022 Structure**

From the above regression equation it was revealed that holding organization structure to a constant zero, strategy implementation would be 5.395, the study found that a unit increase in organization structure would lead to decrease in strategy implementation, this is an indication that organization structure negatively affects strategy implementation, the study also found that there is significant relationship between strategy implementation
and organization culture. The correlation has a significant relationship given by $r = -0.414$, $P \leq 0.05$. This means that the relationship is a negative one.

4.5 Organizational Culture

4.5.1 Descriptive Statistic on Organization Culture
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**Figure 4.9: Statement on Organizational Culture**

The study sought to determine the respondent level of agreement on various statements related to organization culture and strategy implementation, the study found that 25.7% of the respondents strongly disagree that the current KFS culture is similar to the culture that existed in the forest department, 14.3% agree that the organization is good at fulfilling its mission, 11.4% were neutral on the fact that there is free flow of information within KFS, 11% of the respondents agree that the organization culture is the same from the top to the lower level management, 8.6% disagree that culture supports strategy implementation the rest 2.9% strongly agree that the government activities and policies easily affect our culture.
4.5.2 Correlation Analysis on Culture and Strategy Implementation

Table 4.4: Correlation of Culture and Strategy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Strategy Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.987**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.987**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study conducted a Pearson product moment correlation to determine the strength of relationship between organization culture and strategy implementation, the study found that there strongly positive significant relationship between organization culture and strategy implementation as shown by correlation coefficient of 0.987. The p-value (p=0.000) was found to less 0.05 an indication that there is a significant positive correlation between strategy implementation and culture. This means that culture has a significant influence on strategy implementation.

4.5.3 Regression analysis of Culture and Strategy Implementation

Table 4.5: Regression Coefficientsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-1.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The established regression equation was

\[
\text{Strategy Implementation} = -0.106 + 1.003 \text{ Culture}
\]

From the above regression equation it was revealed that holding organization culture to a constant zero, strategy implementation would be at -0.106, a unit increase in organization culture would lead to increase in the strategy implementation by factors of 1.003. The sign value is less than 0.05, an indication that organization culture significantly influences strategy implementation, and thus organization culture positively influences strategy implementation. There is a significant positive relationship given by \( r = 0.987, P \leq 0.05 \)
4.6 Leadership

4.6.1 Descriptive Statistics on Leadership

![Bar chart showing responses to leadership statements](chart.png)

**Figure 4.10: Leadership and strategy implementation**

The study sought to determine respondent level of agreement on statement relating to leadership and strategy implementation from the finding the study found that 42% disagree that leaders have communicated to everyone on their role of strategy, the figure below also shows that 63% of the respondents agree that their leaders are part of the strategy implementation team, 43% were neutral on whether leaders are always willing to help in case of any problem, 16% of the respondents agree that their leaders totally support their organizations.

4.6.2 Correlation of Leadership and Strategy implementation.

**Table 4.6: Correlations of Leadership and Strategy Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Leadership Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Leadership N</th>
<th>Strategy Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Strategy Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Strategy N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.914**</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.914**</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.914**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study conducted a Pearson product moment correlation to determine the strength of relationship between leadership and strategy implementation, the study found that there strongly positive significant relationship between leadership and strategy implementation as shown by correlation coefficient of 0.914. The $p$-value ($p=0.000$) was found to less 0.05 an indication that there is a significant positive correlation between strategy implementation and leadership. This means that leadership has a significant influence on strategy implementation.

4.6.3 Regression of Leadership and Strategy Implementation.

The established regression equation was

$$\text{Strategy Implementation} = -0.046 + 0.938\text{leadership}$$

From the above regression equation it was revealed that holding leadership to a constant zero, strategy implementation would be at -0.046, a unit increase in leadership would lead to increase in the strategy implementation by factors of 0.938. The sign value is less than 0.05 an indication that leadership significantly influences strategy implementation, thus leadership positively influence strategy implementation. There is a significant positive relationship given by $r=0.914$, $P\leq0.05$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>12.954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficient $a$
4.7 Strategy Implementation

4.7.1 Descriptive statistics

![Strategy Implementation Chart]

**Figure 4.11: Strategy Implementation**

The figure below shows that 37.1% of the respondents disagree that the current strategic plan was readily acceptable by all employees in the organization, 48.6% disagreed that the key formulators of the strategic plan are actively involved in the implementation of the strategic plan, 43% were neutral on the fact that organization policies and procedures supported the implementation of the strategic plan, 57% agreed that current activities and plans are as per the strategic plan, 42.8% of them agreed that the organization has sufficient resources to carry out the strategic plan to the end. 34.3% of them agreed that there was proper training of different employees directly involved with strategic plan
implementation, 60% were neutral that there is effective feedback mechanism to monitor the implementation process while 31.4% of the respondents were also neutral whether the government has supported the strategic plan implementations.

Figure 4.12: Rating of strategy implementation process

The figure above shows that 50% of the respondents rated the strategy implementation process as of average success, while 17% of the respondents rated the process as of high success, 15% rated it as of very high success, while 12% rated the process as of very low success and others 6% rated strategy implementation process as of no success at all.

Figure 4.13: Rating of level of carrying out strategic plan

Figure below shows that 31.4% of the respondents rated the level of carrying out strategic plan as average while 25.7% rated it as low, followed by 22.9% who rated it as high and the minorities 20% rated level of carrying out strategic plan as very high.
4.8 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the results arising from research undertaken were analyzed in detail. The results and findings from the 35 respondents were used to determine the effect of culture structure and leadership on strategy implementation at Kenya Forest Service. The findings are presented using tables, charts, and regression analyses as per the research questions. The results show that culture, structure and leadership have significant effect on the implementation of strategy at the organization. The following chapter summarizes, discusses, concludes and makes recommendations based on the findings from chapter 4 in light of the literature review in chapter 2.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study in line with the objective of the study. The research sought to establish the challenges faced by Kenya Forest Service in strategy implementation.

5.2 Summary
Regardless of different training programmes that are being prepared and implemented by different Organizations still most of them have experienced failures either at programme designing or at the stage of implementation. The study findings intended to provide recommendations to the company’s management following the revelations of respondents on what is taking place and what should be done in order to encourage employees to undergo training and having a well trained workforce in the Company.

To begin with the researcher visited a number of literatures to find out what others have done so far and currently what are the causes of failures of training programmes in parastatals organizations. Some literatures show that the failure was due to lack of clear training program that lead to random implementation; while other literatures indicate lack of training needs assessment and shortage of training budgets.

To achieve the above objectives, the researcher collected data from 35 respondents of Kenya Forest Service KFS. A simple random and purposive sampling technique was applied to locate the respondents. Questionnaires, structured and unstructured interviews were administered to the respondents. Data were analyzed with the aid of Statistical Package of Social Science

The study found that only 60% of the respondents were male respondents in the Company. This shows that the Company employs majority of men compared to women. 28.6% of the respondents were from the top management level, middle management level and from the supervisory of the KFS organization. Thus the study revealed that minorities of respondents in the organization were subordinate staffs and casuals too.
5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Influence of Organizational Structure on Strategy Implementation

The first research question of the study was to determine whether organizational structure have any influence on strategy implementation. From the findings the study found that Kenya Forest service has identified all its primary activities, that the levels of authority for each employee has been clearly identified, organizational structure has made an effort to out-source all non-critical activities, their role has been clearly identified and stated in the current organizational structure, organizational structure was changed to suit the current strategic plan, the current organization structure is able to facilitate decision making at any necessary level, the current organizational structure was appropriate to support the implementation of the strategic plan and there is a proper communication among and within the different levels of management. Lee (2011) observes that every strategy needs to have a clearly defined organization architecture (the way organization needs to be structured to deliver the different set of outputs and outcomes) implied by its new ambition. The goal here is to align the organizational structure to fit the requirements of the strategy.

From the correlation analysis the study found that there was negative significant relationship between organization structure and strategy implementation. This was an indication that organization structure negatively affected strategy implementation at Kenya Forest Service. The study further established that unit increase in organization structure would lead to decrease in strategy implementation. This was an indication that organization structure negatively affects strategy implementation. Robins and Coulter (2002) found that an inconsistency between structure and strategy lead to a disorder, friction and mal performance within the organization. Therefore, management must incorporate regular job evaluation exercises as a means to ensure a strategy-structure fit to avoid discordance. Okumu (2003) revealed the implementation of the new strategy requires that professional employees be recruited to carry out the exercise. It is vital to nurture the people in an organization because they are the process owners and process is what drives implementation (Ehlers and Lazenby, 2007). This therefore means that employees are important in the implementation of the strategy and that they are the ones who can either lead to the success or failure of the strategy. Structures are essential part of strategy implementation (Whittington 2002).
From the finding on the correlation analysis the study found that there is a negative significant relationship between organization structure and strategy implementation. Rutan (1999) argues that all implementation aspects during the planning phase are fundamental for execution as there is no time to do that during execution. It is therefore critical that everyone on the team understands and agrees upon the details of the plan. Management also must make the commitment to stay focused on the agreed plans and should make significant changes to the plan after careful consideration on the overall implications and consequences of the change. According to Schmidt & Keil (2013), competent employees and their capabilities is essential ingredient for successful strategy implementation. He adds that it is important for the organization to develop human resource competencies.

From the regression analysis the study found that organization structure negatively affects strategy implementation, the study also found that there is significant relationship between strategy implementation and organization culture. The organization should maintain a balance between ongoing business activities and working on new strategic initiatives. Chandler (1962) asserts that once a firm has developed goals the next thing is to develop an appropriate structure to enable effective coordination of resources and he adds that structure follows strategy in his study carried out in the United States in the early 1960’s. Every organization needs to build and maintain the optimal structure to generate and develop its strategies (Lynch, 2000). Hence, it seems that there is agreement among the two writes that structure is directly related to strategy and that structure is a product of strategy. Daft (2001) affirms that organizational structures designate formal reporting relationships including the number of levels in the hierarchy and the span of control of managers and supervisors. It is therefore imperative to note that strategy designs the structure and assigns duties and responsibilities to the different components of the structure as evidenced by the views of the two writers.

5.3.2 Influence of Organizational Culture on Strategy Implementation

The second research question of the study was to investigate whether organizational culture has any influence on strategy implementation. From the finding the study found that the current Kenya Forest Services culture is similar to the culture that existed in the forest department, organization is good at fulfilling its mission, there is free flow of
information within KFS, the organization culture is the same from the top to the lower level management, culture supports strategy implementation the rest and that the government activities and policies easily affect our culture. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2008) states that culture is about that which is taken for granted but none the less contributes to how groups of people respond and behave in relation to issue they face. It therefore has important influences on the development and change of organizational strategy. Organizational culture is required in order to mobilize and sustain the process of change required to implement the strategy. It is the awareness and internalization of the shared vision, mission and values needed to execute the strategy (Kaplan and Norton, 2005). According to Hrebiniak (2005) the culture of an organization is the result of shared assumptions regarding the external and internal environments of the organization. Organizational culture can affect strategy implementation and strategy implementation can in turn affect the organizational culture. Culture provides the context within which strategies are formulated.

Speculand (2009) believes that contrary to popular belief most people do not resist change! This is probably the most controversial of the six Mind Shifts, because for years we have firmly believed that most staff members will resist change. Employees regard a decision they perceive to be consistent with common values and beliefs as substantively appropriate and worth of support. Cameron and Quinn (1999) found that organizations rarely have one type of culture but that time and again; there is a mix of the four organizational cultures. The flexible organizations are the most successful since they are able to adjust and change their organizational culture to fit the strategy requirements hence achieving their goals at the end. There is no final “best” organizational culture but in a particular circumstance one class of culture serves better than another.

From the pearson product movement correlation analysis, the study found that that there strongly positive significant relationship between organization culture and strategy implementation, this strong relationship was found to be statistically significant. Culture is a formalized and structured work environment in which procedures decide what people do, leaders are proud of their efficiency-based coordination and keeping the organization functioning effortlessly is most crucial (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Johnson et.al. (2008) are of the view that organizations can be captured by their culture and the employees may also find it very difficult to change their strategy outside the bounds of their culture.
From the regression analysis, the study found that organization culture positively influence strategy implementation, the study found that the positive influence was significant. Thompson and Strickland (1996) noted that each and every organization has unique culture which is seen in the way it approaches problems and conducting activities. An organization’s culture provides the social context in which an organization performs its work and interactions. She affirms that managers are the ones who develop and implement a strategic plan. Internal factors include staff turnover and recruitment whereas external factors include technology and competition (Bennis, 1989).

5.3.3 Influence of Leadership on Strategy Implementation
The third research question of the study was to establish the influence of leadership on strategy implementation. The study found that leaders have communicated to everyone on their role of strategy, that their leaders are part of the strategy implementation team, leaders are always willing to help in case of any problem and that their leaders totally support their organizations. Leadership is a major factor that distinguishes successful organizations from less successful ones. The leadership therefore provides guidance in making strategic choices (Yukl 1994). Strategic leadership components in organizations need competent leaders who are able to translate strategy into actions and the results (Hsieh and Yik, 2005). Successful implementation of strategies formulated by the CEO and top management will depend on their leadership and the quality of their relationship with managers and employees (Bass, 2007). Strategic leadership must be biased towards strategy implementation and must drive the organization forward towards the successful implementation of strategy (Hrebiniak, 2005).

From the finding on the correlation analysis the study found that there is strongly positive significant relationship between leadership and strategy implementation, this relationship was found to be significant. Effective strategic leaders are required to drive the strategy forward and to keep improving on how the strategy is implemented. Therefore, strategic leaders play a critical role in strategic control and continuous improvement efforts (Thompson and Strickland, 2003). O’reilly et.al (2010) affirms that a leader’s behavior influences group and organizational behavior. Most organizations have multiple layers of leaders, implying that any single leader does not lead in isolation. Their focused on how
the consistency of leadership effectiveness across hierarchical levels influenced the implementation of a strategic initiative in a large health care system and they found that it was only when leaders' effectiveness at different levels was considered in the aggregate that significant performance improvement occurred. There is evidence of leadership structures being put in place to ensure that board and senior management are involved in sustainability strategy development and are then incentivized to monitor and ensure implementation of that strategy through financial rewards (Klettner et.al, 2014).

From the findings on the regression analysis, the study found that an increase in leadership would lead to increase in the strategy implementation; the study found that leadership positively influences strategy implementation. Mintzberg (2011) explains that everyone is responsible in an organization and that everyone is learning at all levels, and management is listening. The problem with the concept of leadership is that it implies everyone else is a follower. But we don't need more followers. Cater Tomaz (2010) argues that managers mostly rely on planning and organizing activities when implementing strategies, while the biggest obstacle to strategy execution is poor leadership. Moreover, the results of multiple regression analysis reveal that greater obstacles to strategy execution in the forms of inadequate leadership skills and employees' reluctance to share their knowledge have a negative influence on performance, while adapting the organizational structure to the selected strategy as an activity for strategy implementation has a positive influence on performance.

5.4 Conclusion

The study concluded that:

5.4.1 Influence of Organizational Structure on Strategy Implementation

All organizations, whether private or public face a common challenge when implementing a new strategic initiative: how to successfully manage the changes that will occur as the new initiative is deployed. Some researchers note that organizations fail to implement up to 70% of their strategic plans (Beer and Nohria, 2000; Miller, 2002). Pilkington and Fitzgerald (2006) noted that two central themes of operations management concern the case study method and best practices in relation to strategy and context.

While there were no studies found that benchmarked strategic planning process, studies of implementing leading practices in other functional areas of organizations
have identified important cultural and organizational elements. These include: leadership championing the implementation effort, market constraints, and recognizing that deploying leading practices is dependent on resolving people, process and technology issues.

5.4.2 Influence of Organizational Culture on Strategy Implementation

The main reason of this study was to find out the challenges faced by Kenyan Parastatals in strategy implementation: a case of Kenya Forest Service. After identifying these challenges, KFS ought to try to address and correct them, and find ways of strategy implementation at the company. In this world of science and technology, and business competition, the company needs to invest more knowledge, good customer care and building competence in skills and knowledge in strategy implementation.

A process model for operationalizing manufacturing strategic plan, consisting of three constructs, competitive priorities, manufacturing objectives and action programs for investment. Recent research suggests that linking public sector strategic plans with content and process aids strategic plans implementation improves. While these frameworks emphasize the importance of context and process they do not give details of which operational factors are important, and their role and impact during implementation.

5.4.3 Influence of Leadership on Strategy Implementation

Market dynamics have created more challenges for public sector, with the emergence of the global economy, advances in technology, increased societal demands, and the need to provide more social services with fewer resources. As well, a widespread desire for increased organizational scrutiny has increased the pressure for change, given more accessible globalized information systems and heightened media attention critical of government inefficiencies in service delivery. New approaches to management in the public sector are therefore imperative.

While strategic frameworks emphasize the importance of strategic plans, they do not give details of the risks associated with strategic management process. Of the studies done in the area of strategic management on parastatals, none seems to have explored the risk factors of strategic planning process and thus this study fills the gap by investigating the challenges in the strategic planning process of Kenya Forest Service in Kenya.
5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1. Recommendations for Improvements
In this section the researcher gives some recommendations that may assist in ensuring effective strategic implementation at KFS. The management should ensure a well-planned and strategic implementable training program is in place and the training is done and implemented effectively. Not only that but also the company management should make sure that training program is exposed to all employees.

5.5.1.1 Organizational Structure and Strategy Implementation
Companies to make training a stand-alone function, separate from human resources. This training can be a substantial investment, but it is an investment in this company, your people and the future. Apart from its annual training budget the KFS need to request national and international sponsors to contribute training funds so as to raise sufficient funds to train all prospective staff per year. The Company Management especially Human Resource Department should have program to sensitize employees on strategic implementation towards developing their carries. They need to apply self-sponsorship for the betterment of their future, know where to find and have the strategic implementation Training and Development guidelines and programs for the company in every annual budget, to know their training rights and have to claim for if not given while they are budgeted for and A cultivate a learning culture. The Company needs to have a clear policy for selecting staff for Training known to all employees and make them part and parcel of the program. In so doing the employees will understand the importance of strategic implementation, their skills and knowledge in order to cope with the environment and not just think of financial benefits. The Management must consider all employees to have equal chances and rights for training.

5.5.1.2 Organizational Culture and Strategy Implementation
Sociological factors such as; old age and low education background, and marital status, that hinder employees from attending training hence failure of training programs. The Management has to develop and inculcate learning organization culture to its employees so as to have a well trained work force. Other researcher have pointed out that the culture was the glue that holds an organization together; an organization's culture was based on openness and trust, where employees were supported and
rewarded for learning and innovating, and one that promoted experimentation, risk taking, and "values the well-being of all employees.

5.5.1.3 Leadership and Strategy Implementation

Effective programs can improve equipment reliability and increase production levels. It can also support incorporation of new technologies, implementation of new procedures, or the transfer of knowledge. Effective programs can transform “on-paper” benefits into a real return on investment (ROI)”. These benefits can include higher revenue generated, increased productivity, improved quality, lower costs, more satisfied customers, higher job satisfaction, and lower employee turnover. Strategic Implementation is a valuable commodity that, if viewed as an investment rather than an expense, can produce high returns. While it is true that it can cost money and use valuable employee time and resources, studies tend to show training provides a positive return on investment—sometimes in the neighborhood of several hundred percent. Therefore, although strategic implementation might seem like a luxury expense in tight financial times, it is, in fact, one of the most sure and sound investments available.

Finally, the Company Management needs to study various models of strategy implementation programs and adopt the model that they find appropriate for their staff development. As indicated earlier the researcher recommends the company to study and if possible adapt the “Blended strategic implementation program”.

5.5.2 Recommendation For Further Research

The researcher wishes to call upon further researches on the following areas: An assessment on Social factors affecting strategy implementation programs in parastatals. This study should focus on why factors such as age, marital status or education background limit employees from attaining career development. Assessment on methods used to train staff of different categories. The study should once again, focus on how different training methods can be used to effectively impart knowledge to employees of different educational background and job disciplines.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Survey Questionnaire

For Evaluation of Strategy implementation at Kenya Forest Service.

Dear Respondent,

Please find attached a questionnaire that will be used to collect data on Strategy Implementation at Kenya Forest Service. You are kindly requested to provide the required information in the questionnaire. Please note that any information obtained will be treated as private and confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Results from this study will be beneficial to the management of Kenya Forest service, its stakeholders and other researchers in providing relevant information on strategy implementation in Kenyan parastatals.

Should you require a copy of the report please indicate your contacts on the back page of this questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and time

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Please indicate your gender
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your position in the organization?
   - Top management level
   - Middle management level
   - Supervisory level
   - Subordinate staff

3. For how long have you been working with the organization?
   - Below 1 year
   - 1 – 10 years
   - 11 – 20 years
   - Over 20 years.
SECTION B: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Basing on your experience and knowledge please indicate your answer by putting an X to each item using the response scale of strongly disagrees to strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1: KFS has identified all its primary activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2: Levels of authority for each employee has been clearly identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3: Your role has been clearly identified and stated in the current organizational structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4: The organizational structure was changed to suit the current strategic plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5: There is proper communication among and within the different levels of management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7: The organization has made an effort to outsource all non-critical activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8: the current organization structure is appropriate to support the implementation of the strategic plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9: the current organization structure is able to facilitate decision making at any necessary level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION C: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE**

Basing on your experience and knowledge please indicate your answer by putting an X to each item using the response scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1: The current KFS culture is similar to the culture that existed in the Forest Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: The current culture allows the employees to develop strategic initiatives within the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3: Our organization is good at fulfilling its mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4: Our organization’s culture is the same from the top to the lower level management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5: Government activities and politics easily affect our culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6: Our culture supports strategy implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7: There is free flow of information within KFS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: CHALLENGES OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Basing on your experience and knowledge please indicate your answer by putting an X to each item using the response scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1: Current strategic plan was readily acceptable by all employees in the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: The key formulators of the strategic plan are actively involved in the implementation of the strategic plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3: Organizations policies and procedures supported the implementation of the strategic plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4: current activities and plans are as per the strategic plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5: The organization has the sufficient resources to carry out the strategic plan to the end</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6: There was proper training of different employees directly involved with strategic plan implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7: There is effective feedback mechanism to monitor the implementation process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8: The government has supported the strategic plan implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: GENERAL SUCCESS QUESTIONS

E1: On the overall, how would you rate the success of the strategy implementation process?

☐ No success
☐ Low success
☐ Average success
☐ High success
☐ Very high success

E2: On the overall, how would you rate the level of carrying out the strategic plan within the resources initially budgeted for

☐ Low
☐ Average
☐ High
☐ Very high