# MANAGEMENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF INSITUTIONAL CULTURE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC CHANGE AT STRATHMORE UNIVERSITY

STUDENT NAME: GLADYS WAMBUI WAWERU

ADMISSION NO:   D61/70200/2008

Submitted to: Dr. Zack Awino - Supervisor

A Management Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the requirement of Master of Business Administration Degree, Department of Business Administration, School of Business, University of Nairobi.

**SEPTEMBER 2009**

# DECLARATION

This project is my ORIGINAL work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university.

SIGNED……………………………….DATE……………………………

Student name…………………………………..

Reg. Number …………………………………..

This Research study project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university supervisor.

SIGNED…………………………………..DATE…………………………….

Supervisor's name…………………………….

LECTURER

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

**Table of Contents**

## Acknowledgement

This study would not have been possible without the support of a number of individuals who dedicated their time and resources to guide and assist me in the course of preparing the study. I would like to acknowledge the Almighty God for the gift of life and intellectual ability to carry out this research.

I also acknowledge my parents Major & Mrs. Waweru, my family: Jordan, Bobby, Nicky, Maggie, Andy, Jeremy and Nadia for their immeasurable support in both cash and kind throughout the course of my study at Strathmore University.

To Kenn, Victoria, Selina, Maryan and Doris I say a big thank you for the Push and prayers. I am also deeply indebted to my supervisor Dr. Zack Awino for his guidance and assistance in undertaking this study. I would also like to acknowledge the support of the entire Strathmore University fraternity THANK YOU.

## Dedication

This research is dedicated to the Almighty God for not only enabling me to conduct this research study but also for depositing within me all the necessary potential to accomplish it. I also dedicate the study to my darling nephews Jeremy and Andrew and to my Nieces Nadia, Shiko and Kui "Aim for the sky"

## Definition of Terms used and List of Acronyms

KSHS – Kenya shillings

ICT – Information Communication Technology

ISO – International Standards Organisation

SU – Strathmore University

## List of Tables

# Abstract

As a result of the rapidly changing technological advancements, increased competition and customer expectations, most institutions of higher education and businesses at large are being forced to evolve with their surrounding environment or risk redundancy. This evolution has demanded that a change of perspective, which is sometimes planned and on other occasions emergent be adopted and embraced by institutions that want to operate successfully. There exist several critical dimensions to be considered when implementing such changes. One such dimension is the prevailing Organisational Culture. This study was conducted as a case study to gain an understanding of Strathmore University's Managements Perception on the influence of culture on the implementation of strategic change at the university. The researcher constructed questionnaires which were administered to managers and relevant data collected. Findings of the study suggest that the cultural aspect of the organisation is critical towards successful change implementation in the university. It was noted that the existing organisational structure and policies were supportive of the intended strategic changes. However there existed gaps in the information relayed and available to lower cadre employees. Informal cultural dimensions were notably given little concern and could thus be hindering the successful implementation and roll out of the strategy as intended. A lack of awareness amongst employees and poor communication channels were seen to be major hindrances to change implementation. To bridge this gap, it was recommended that training for employees be enhanced an that the communication channels within the organisation be reviewed to keep everyone abreast of the on goings of the institution.

# CHAPTER ONE

## Introduction

### 1.1 Background of the Study

As a result of the rapidly changing technological advancements, increased competition and customer expectations, most institutions of higher education and businesses at large are being forced to evolve with their surrounding environment or risk redundancy. This evolution demands a change of perspective which is sometimes planned and on other occasions it is emergent from the changing environment both internal and external to the organization. There are various dynamics in fostering change in any organisation. One such dynamic factor is culture. Understanding and management of the various facets of culture in an organisation is necessary for successful strategy implementation.

#### 1.1.1  Institutional Culture

Schein (1992) notes the importance of organizational culture in understanding how organizational function. He argues that basic assumptions (i.e. the taken-for-granted, shared, tacit ways of perceiving, thinking and reacting) are powerful and stable forces operating in organizations. As organizations attempt to cope with an environment that is changing at an ever-increasing rate, they struggle with the changes required. We need to remember that people make business work and we need to relearn old lessons about how a culture tie people together and gives them meaning and purpose (Deal and Kennedy 1982). Corporate culture can be defined as the way we do things around here. It communicates what we believe about people, performance and productivity. Corporate culture is therefore an important tool for winning the hearts, minds and commitment of people (employees) when well understood and managed.

#### 1.1.2  Strategic Change Management

Strategic change management primarily deals with the strategies for the realization of new structures, systems, processes or behavior patterns in an organization as it transforms itself to fit into the environment it operates within. Andrews, Cameron and Harris (2008) state that in spite of the multiplicity and variety of change theories available in handbooks, textbooks and courses,

the practice of change management is problematic. Caldwell (2003) sees a key inhibitor to the successful implementation of change theory as being the complex interaction that takes place between different change agents within an organization. Contemporary reality is that four distinct types of change agent may be involved in any particular change process, namely, senior leaders, middle managers, external consultants, and teams; each having different experiences and perspectives (Caldwell, 2003). It is dynamics operating within these categories of change agents that more often than not determine the success or failure of change implementation of whatever nature in an organisation.

### 1.1.3  Role of Management Team in aligning organizational culture and Changes within the organization

According to (Almaraz 1991) there is often strong resistance to new ways of thinking and new forms of organizing. This is a phenomenon often studied in organizational research. Usually the strategy planning level is less invasive of the comfort zone within which individuals are used to. However it is the actual implementation of the plans; those activities that are bound to destabilize the status quo that are faced with hindrances and resistance from the a fore mentioned agents in spite of their involvement in developing the initial plans. (Revenaugh 1994) states that Implementation is the challenge that comes at the end of all and old methods for improving organizations. Change processes can be viewed as sequences of individual and collective events, actions, and activities unfolding over time in context that describe or account for how entities develop or change (Pettigrew et al., 2001).

 (Weller 1996) notes that change in any type of organization takes time and resources and occurs at different levels and in different stages. The change process involves effective personal interaction in its attempt to change people's knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors about the value of embracing something new or achieving something more beneficial. It is therefore critical for managers mandated with the task of implementing changes in their institution to realize that they need to understand the dynamics operating within and without the environment and also accord due time to the process of strategy implementation. The social and cultural behaviour of individuals in an organisation is not an aspect that can be understood in haste but rather it is one

that demands continuous interaction and dialogue amongst all parties involved in the planning, formulation and implementation of strategies.

Helms (2006) observe that organizational restructuring and the accompanying cultural change has caused management styles to come in and go out of fashion. This can be attributed to the fact that organizations are unique and so are the dynamics within which it operates. As such a "one suit fits all strategy" may be a recipe for disaster for any change management process. Helms further notes that there has been a move away from an authoritarian style of management in which control is a key concept, to one that favors teamwork and empowerment. Today there is a greater emphasis on participatory management. Participation (or participatory management), otherwise known as employee involvement in decision making, encourages the involvement of stakeholders at all levels of an organization in analysis of problems, development of strategies and implementation of solutions (Helms, 2006). Armstrong, (2006) and Graham and Bennet, (1998), define participation in decision making as the inclusion of the employees in the decision-making process of the organization.

## 1.1.4 Influence and Role of Culture on Change Management and Implementation

Culture is a complex concept that can involve many factors. According to (Pearce & Robinson 2009) organizational culture is the set of important assumptions often unstated that members of an organization share in common. It is an intangible yet ever present theme that provides meaning, direction and the basis for action. The Harvard business press (2005) states that organizational culture also refers to a company's values, traditions, and operating styles.

It is well known that people are, for the most part, resistant to change of any sort. This is especially true in the case of transformational change. (Nadler, 1988) notes that in organizations, many factors come into play, such as fear of the unknown, habit, the possibility of economic insecurity, threats to social relationships, and failure to recognize the need for change (Nadler, 1988). This notwithstanding however, organizations must change to not only survive but to also be able to meet the ever changing needs of all its stake holders.

There are cultural boundaries and barriers around virtually every corner in any typical organization. (Tichy, 1983) defines major organizational change as: non routine, non-incremental, discontinuous change which alters the overall orientation of the organization and/or its components" The components referred are those found in (Leavitt1965) Contingency Model which depicts the interconnection of people, task, technology, and structure. A major change

may begin in any of the four components. Its magnitude will be such that all components will make some adjustment to the change, and may in fact incur major changes as a result. Such change will affect the culture of the organization, that is, the values, beliefs and expectations of organization members. The result of such a major change will transform the organization.

According to Andrews, Cameron and Harris (2008), in some cases the problems of implementing change reflect long-standing distinctive organizational cultures. Cameron *et al.* (1993) explains that depending on the existing culture and the degree to which a change differs from that culture, an organization may be more or less ready for such a change. This further compounds the importance with which management should handle and understand the organisational culture within which they are operating. They need to realize that the effectiveness of a change process is tied to successful outcomes realized from implementation (Pettigrew et al., 2001).

Tichy and Devanna (1986) suggest opening up the organizational culture to be receptive to the change. It is however notable to state that resistance to change is especially relevant if the vision of a leader differs from the values and beliefs of the existing organizational culture. If that is the case, then cultural issues must be addressed (Schein, 1991; Trice and Beyer, 1991). Further, (Ioanis, Jones and Sabir 1998) view management commitment and leadership, continued improvement and, above all, culture change as the cornerstones for a successful strategy implementation. They further note that this is especially difficult when there is no apparent crisis, but rather the long-range vision of a leader who anticipates the time it takes to implement organizational change.

1.1.5  Strathmore University - Kenya

Strathmore University is a private university which was started in 1961 as an Advanced-level Sixth Form College offering Science and Arts subjects by a group of professionals, who formed a charitable Educational Trust (now the Strathmore Educational Trust). In 1986**,** in response to a request by the Trustees, the Government of Kenya donated 5 acres of land on Ole Sangale Road,

Madaraka Estate. Soon after, the European Union (EU) and the Italian Government agreed to back the Madaraka Campus development project. The donors were keen to support a co-educational College that would offer courses in Management and Accountancy. Kianda College,

an undertaking of Kianda Foundation, which was planning new developments at the time, agreed to run their professional courses in the new Madaraka campus. Construction of the new campus commenced in September 1989.

In January 1991, the Information Technology Centre was started in the Lavington Campus to run computer courses leading to the Institute for the Management of Information Systems (formerly Institute of Data Processing Management) Diploma and Higher Diploma. In January 1992 a Distance Learning Centre was opened to offer correspondence courses in Accountancy to students who are unable to attend lectures. Strathmore College merged with Kianda College and moved to Ole Sangale Road, Madaraka Estate in January

In August 2002 the Commission of Higher Education awarded Strathmore a Letter of Interim Authority to operate as a University with a Faculty of Commerce and a Faculty of Information Technology. The first undergraduate students to enroll in these faculties completed their 4-year degree course in December 2004 and graduated in August 2005.  In June 2007, Kenya's Commission for Higher Education approved the award of a charter to Strathmore University. His Excellency Mwai Kibaki, the President of Republic of Kenya awarded a Charter to Strathmore University on 23rd April 2008. The Charter gave Strathmore full legal recognition under laws of Kenya to operate as a University.

Strathmore University is a fully fledged university with a Vice Chancellor, two Deputy Vice Chancellors, the University Secretary, a number of senior management staff, the University Council, the Management Board, the Academic Council, and various committees. Today, the staff population in Strathmore University is 422 in total. This includes 208 academic staff, 150 administrative and 64 support staff. Of this population 246 are Full-time staff while 176 part-time staff members. Strathmore is a fully fledged university with a Vice Chancellor, three Deputy Vice Chancellors, a University Secretary, a number of senior management staff, the University Council, the Management Board, the Academic Council, and various committees Information obtained from:  http://www.strathmore.edu/aboutus.php?id=123

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Pressure to improve on performance standards and the goal to compete on the global platform has resulted in a paradigm shift for most institutions of higher education. (Kabiru 2007)

highlighted that a paradigm shift which entails transformation of higher education institutions, their concrete context of meeting national challenges of socio-economic development, innovation, creativity, adoption and adaptation of scientific and technological changes for the benefits of Kenyans, and to confront global challenges of competition in the Knowledge economy was necessary if the education sector was to be effective in its mandate. This transformation will encounter obstacles and hindrances especially at the implementation stage. In order to address the emerging challenges legitimately, local higher education institutions should review inherited traditions their missions, visions and strategic objectives to capture the essence and ideal characteristics of the developmental and entrepreneurial tertiary (university) of the 21st century.

Strathmore University being an institution offering higher Education has embarked on adopting specific change strategies that are geared towards revolutionizing and changing its operations and activities thus positioning itself to meet clients demands both current and future. These strategic moves are geared towards positioning strathmore as the University of Choice globally and also equipping itself with the capacity to become an entrepreneurial university that is capable of transforming Africa through leadership and quality Knowledge and information transfer. In its strategic plan some of these changes have necessitated training of  staff members on the new way of doing things. In spite of concerted management initiative, some of the implemented changes are yet to be fully integrated as they require a complete change of mind set and way of doing things by all the implementers. The vice chancellor and the senior management are currently faced with the arduous task of changing prior practice against a background of what was previously perceived as a way of doing things.

The consciousness of the university's senior management team to the effects of culture and how to manage it when implementing change is therefore critical. By understanding the challenges and opportunities posed by culture as a factor of strategy implementation in any organization, the senior management team will be better equipped to manage the future strategic change initiatives specific to Strathmore University. Aosa (1996) concluded that it was important to synchronize management and implementation of change with the context within which such change is being carried out. Nyaigoti-Chacha (2004) notes that globally, the environment of higher education is facing relentless and rapid change. For .effectiveness; managements' understanding and

perception of and towards the prevailing organizational culture should be a true reflection of what is on the ground. This synchronization is a necessary tool as managers cannot effectively manage that which they do not understand. It was therefore the purpose of this study to highlight and establish senior management's perception of the influence of culture on change implementation at Strathmore University. By asking the question: What is management's perception on the influence of culture on strategic change implementation? Conclusions were thereby be drawn from the responses given.

1.3 Research Objective

The objective of this study was to establish managements' perception of the influence of culture on strategic change implementation at Strathmore University.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be of significance to scholars and researchers in the area of strategic change management and Culture as some of the concepts and principles reviewed from various literatures can be used as future reference material to further other studies. The study will also be of great significance to Strathmore University's management team and employees as they review their strategic performance. Being a relatively young institution of higher education, and given the dynamic nature of the educational environment; the effects of globalization and internationalization are bound to demand a culture of continuously changing towards best practice for effectiveness in service delivery. The findings of this study will equip the senior managers with an understanding of some of the critical cultural factors that may hinder or promote the implementation of future strategies. The study will also be of significance to other institutions irrespective of industry since cultural identity exists in all organizations. By understanding the dynamics of culture as reviewed from various literatures, the managers of these institutions will be better equipped to plan and implement change in their respective institutions. Finally,

*CHAPTER TWO*

*LITERATURE REVIEW*

2.1 Introduction

New strategies demand new ways of thinking. Change is inevitable while implementing strategies irrespective of whether the change is planned or emergent. In the 21st Century, organizations are operating in a highly dynamic environment that demands flexibility. A Change of processes, perceptions, attitudes and ways of doing things must be inculcated in organisational cultures to prepare all stake holders of impending changes and to ease friction and resistance when strategies that threaten the status qua are being implemented. This calls for a paradigm shift amongst employees of all cadres if the vision, mission and strategic goals of a company are to be realized. The role of leadership in formulating, implementing and spearheading all efforts towards strategic change implementation in all organizations is critical.

2.2 Concept of Strategy Implementation

According to Mintzberg (1978) implementation of strategy means carrying out the pre determined strategic plans. Usually, the process of strategy implementation follows the strategy formulation phase where the Top management of an organisation map the way forward for the organisation by highlighting the vision, mission goals and objectives towards which the organisation will be working towards. Aalton and Ikavalko (2002) contend that implementing strategy successfully is vital for any organisation either public or private. Without proper implementation, even the most superior strategy is useless. Strategy implementation is all about converting ideas into action. To successfully implement a strategy, those mandated with managing the implementation process must understand the various dynamics that influence strategy implementation. These are such as the available resources, time available, the scope and reach of the strategy to be implemented and the people dynamics within the organisation. Pettigrave (1987) suggests that the framework for strategic change contends that content, context and process of organisational change have an intertwined impact on strategy implementation.

## 2.3 Implementing Organizational Change

Educational institutions around the world are undergoing a change and are competing like business enterprises. The slow pace of changes in a number of government institutions has encouraged the private sector to invest in educational infrastructure, impart quality education, and take advantage of this great business opportunity. Because of globalization, growing competition in the higher education sector and external pressure of market forces, the universities are undergoing change to stay current and competitive in their areas of operation

Change in organisational terms is referred to by Kanter et al. (1992) as "the shift in behaviour of the whole organisation, to one degree or another" change of whatever magnitude is geared to bringing a transformation in organizations. Transformation, according to Head, is the 'step-by-step process of restructuring an existing organisation removing what does not work, keeping that which does, and implementing new systems, structures, or cultural values where appropriate' Head adds that transformation occurs when an organisation taps into the complete potential of their human resources and aligns both the structural and the cultural processes involved in the overall goals of the organisation. Caldwell (2003) sees a key inhibitor to the successful implementation of change theory as being the complex interaction that takes place between different change agents within an organization.

## 2.4 Approaches to Change Management

Hammer and Champy's (1993) hold views that ". . . change has become both pervasive and persistent" Stace and Dunphy (2001) complement this view by adding that "…change comes in many shapes and sizes; sometimes change is incremental and hardly noticed, whilst at other times change is large and dramatic."  There are a variety of approaches to change and an important element in achieving successful change is to choose the most appropriate approach for the type of change being undertaken and the circumstances in which it is being undertaken. There are two main approaches to organisational change management. The first approach is a more traditional and planned approach representing a variety of models, most of which descend from the practice of organisational development. The second major approach represents emergent perspectives as will be briefly discussed.

### 2.4.1  Planned Change

According to Genus (1998) the three most important models of the planned change are the; action research model, the three-step model and the phases of planned change approach. Action research was designed to address social and organisational issues and involves a collective approach where all parties involved participate in the formulation of research problems as well as the action taken to solve these problems and the changing process thereby becomes a learning process. In the second model (Burnes 1996) proposes that change according to Lewins theory should involve three steps of 'unfreezing', 'moving' and 'refreezing', which means that old behaviour has to be discarded before new ways can be adopted successfully. The third model is the planned change, which consists of change phases (distinct states an organisation moves through), and change processes (methods to move the organisation through these states). Criticisms against these three models are that they are still seen as too rigid and mangers need to appreciate the fact that the environment within which most organizations operate is dynamic and unpredictable. This therefore means that irrespective of meticulous change planning, managers and implementers of change are bound to encounter the unexpected and it is therefore critical that they are prepared and are flexible enough to respond to the unexpected situations as they may arise from the unpredictable operating environment both internal and external to the organisation. Based on these criticisms, culture-excellence proponents called for organizations to adopt flexible cultures which promote innovation and entrepreneurship and that encourage bottom-up, continuous and co-operative change.

### 2.4.2  Emergent Change

The dynamic nature of many organizational environments is seen as rendering episodic planned change unrealistic to some who prefer instead to view change as continuous and emergent in nature (Burnes, 1996). The emergent perspective stresses the roles of culture, power, and cumulative low-level adaptations in shaping organizational change in a manner that may appear continuous in nature (Burnes, 2005; Hatch, 1997).

Weick (2000) states that, emergent change consists of ongoing accommodations, adaptations, and alterations that produce fundamental change without a priori intentions to do so. Emergent change occurs when people re accomplish routines and when they deal with contingencies, breakdowns, and opportunities in everyday work. Much of this change goes unnoticed, because

small alterations are lumped together as noise in otherwise uneventful inertia. Hayes (2002) believes that ". . . the key decisions about matching the organization's resources with opportunities, constraints and demands in the environment evolve over time and are the outcome of cultural and political processes in organizations

2.5 Organizational Culture and Environment for Change

Beliefs and practices embedded in a company's culture can originate from anywhere: an influential individual, work groups, departments or it can even start at the bottom of the organisational hierarchy or from the top Kotter and Heskette (1992). In building a strategy supportive culture, it is important to understand according to Thompson and Strickland (1995) that every company has its organisational culture. It has its own way of approaching problems and making decisions, its own pattern of "how we do things around here", its own taboos and political don'ts and its own cache of stories that are told over and over to illustrate company values and their meanings.

Thompson and Strickland further emphasize on fact that the entire organisation needs to appreciate that "the taproot of corporate culture is the organization's shared beliefs and philosophy about how its affairs ought to be conducted. According to Eldridge and Crombie (1974) culture is a characteristic of all organizations, through which at the same time, their individuality and uniqueness is expressed. The culture of an organization refers to the unique configuration of norms, values, beliefs, ways of behaving and so on that characterize the manner in which groups and individuals combine to get things done.

Management of change for the better is made possible through change of an organization's culture and the organization's behaviour. This involves change in the ways that things are handled and done. (Handy 1986) explains that culture is not homogeneous and in any organization there will be subcultures. However, the influence of these will depend on the strength and appropriateness of the dominant culture. As discussed by Deal and Kennedy (1982) company cultures vary widely in strength; that is the degree to which they are embedded in company practices. They note that a company's culture can be weak and fragmented in the sense that many subcultures exist, few values and behavioral norms are widely shared and there are few strong traditions. On the other hand, the company's culture can be strong and cohesive in the

sense that the company has a clear and explicit philosophy about how its business will be conducted, management spends a lot of time shaping and fine tuning these values to its business environment and communicating them to the organization's members, and values and culturally approved behavioral norms are known and shared widely across the company by senior executive and the rank and file employees alike.

Burnes and James (1995) explain that the environment in which change takes place strongly influences the perceived appropriateness of proposed changes and the way these are planned and implemented. In a similar fashion, the types of changes, the way they are undertaken and their outcomes can have a strong influence on the environment. These two are interrelated and interdependent. Deal and Kennedy (1982) state the role of culture in a situation of change is to confirm or deny the legitimacy of the new arrangements. Burnes further states that in organizations where a culture of trust exists, where change is the norm, and the expectation is of positive outcomes, then the need to consult and involve employees (in order to gain their commitment) is less necessary because they are already receptive to change. In a situation where the reverse is the case, it becomes necessary to overcome suspicion and resistance and gain the confidence and commitment of staff by giving them a positive role to play in the process. In terms of the environment for change, Burnes places significant emphasis on the role of organizational culture. Organizational culture acts as a sort of sheet anchor for climate, stopping it from being too easily transformed with each new situational contingency, while individuals in their interactions can create either a supportive or countervailing pressure to that exerted by culture, depending on the particular circumstances within an organization (Mullins 1989).

Carr and Littman (1990, p. 195) identified nine key steps in the cultural transformation process. These are planning for cultural change, assessing the current state of the quality culture, training managers and the workforce, management adopting and modeling the new behaviour, making organizational and regulation changes that support quality action, redesign individual performance appraisal and monetary reward systems to reflect the principles of total quality management, changing budget practices, rewarding positive change and using communication tools to reinforce principles

Diagnosing and analyzing the character of the organization will provide a clear view of strengths and those things that must be retained and built on (Ciampa, 1991). It will also uncover weaknesses and barriers to moving from where the organization is now to where it should be. Such insight will enable management to choose the correct road to launch the effort to achieve total quality and prepare the entire organization for implementation of strategy.

The beliefs, goals and practices called for in the formulation and implementation of a strategy may not be compatible with a firm's culture. When they are not, a company usually finds it difficult to implement any strategy successfully (Kotter and Heskette, 1992). Therefore, A strong culture and a tight strategy- culture fit are powerful levers of influencing people to do their jobs better.

2.6 Leadership and Culture Management Strategies

Arthur and Strickland (1995) indicate that most managers based on their own experiences as well as from case studies reported accepted that an organisational culture in an important contributor or obstacle to successful strategy execution (implementation). Kotter (1995) further states that the importance of leadership to the change management process is underscored by the fact that change, by definition, requires creating a new system and then institutionalizing the new approaches.

In a relatively short period of time the need to manage culture and the need to develop strong cultures Deal and Kennedy (1982) has become something close to an orthodox set of beliefs among management. Ford and Ford (1994), hold the view that leaders create change by providing a vision that is attractive to followers rather than creating dissatisfaction with the status quo. Burnes (1978) developed the initial ideas on transformational and transactional leadership in the political context and Bass (1985) further refined them and introduced them into the organizational context. Transactional leadership develops from the exchange process between leaders and subordinates wherein the leader provides rewards in exchange for subordinates' performance. (Bass, 1985) however explains that transformational leadership behaviors go beyond transactional leadership and motivate followers to identify with the leader's vision and sacrifice their self interest for that of the group or the organization. (Manz and Sims, 1990) allude that a transformational leader would be a good facilitator of the strategy implementation process by promoting the creation of a culture that encourages team-decision making and

behavioral control. Transformational change within organizations requires basic shift in attitudes and beliefs

Brown and Eisenhardt (1997) describe three key characteristics of successful managers in continuously changing organizations. They propose that the successful leader creates a system (i.e. an organizational culture) that is neither too rigid (over controlling the change process) nor too chaotic (so the change process falls apart). Effective implementation of a strategy requires a manager whose style has strengths consistent with the competencies required by the strategy Gupta (1984). The attitudes of an organization's members are the primary determinants in the future of the organization, including failure or growth Management's failure to recognize the importance of attitudes and to foster a change in them are the primary reasons for the failure of the quality transformation process Vermeulen (1997).

The transition management team must be responsible for managing the emotional connections that are essential for the successful completion of any transformation Kanter (1983). Culture is something that every person in the organization contributes to and has a role in either perpetuating or changing over a very long period of time. Management has the most significant role to play in the transformation of attitudes. According to Ciampa (1991) management must put in place ways to promote: a belief that the employer has the right and the responsibility to improve his or her immediate surroundings, a sense of ownership in the product or service delivered to the customer, the ability of the people, and through them, the systems, to  Innovate and to create something new that adds value, a feeling of co-dependence,  the desire to change and to improve what currently exists and commitment to a commonly-held vision of the sort of organization that could be.

There are a number of theoretical perspectives from which managers and consultants currently draw their knowledge about the process of change in organizations. Deal and Kennedy (1988) emphasize the following important aspects which must be taken into consideration by those managers who take on the challenge of change:  they need to; recognize that group consensus will be the major influence on acceptance or willingness to change, convey and emphasize two-way trust in all matters related to change,  think of change as skill building and concentrate on training as part of the change process, allow enough time for the change to take place, encourage people to adopt the basic idea for the change to fit the real world around them. Cultural change is

therefore a sensitive issue and management must lead the whole process all the time. Employees must be convinced that the change is in the best interest of the organization and all the employees.

Vijay Sathe (1985) identified three factors that contribute to the development of strong strategy-supportive cultures: these are; Strong Leaders who establish values, principles and practices that are consistent and sensible in light of customer needs competitive conditions and strategic requirements, A sincere longstanding commitment to operating the business according to these established traditions, thereby creating an internal environment that supports making decisions based on cultural norms and finally having a genuine concern for the wellbeing of the organization's three biggest constituents; customers. Employees and shareholder.

Kotter and Heskette (1992) also noted that there are a number of cultural characteristics that are unhealthy and that tend to undermine a company's performance. These are highlighted as; a highly politicized internal environment with conflicting cultures and sub cultures, a culture that is hostile to change and to people who champion new ways of doing this to achieve business goals and implement companywide strategies, promotion n of managers who only understand structures, systems, budgets and controls better than they understand vision, strategies, inspiration and culture building, an averse tendency for the organisation to look outside the company for superior practices and approaches.

It is important for all managers to be aware that successful strategy formulation does not at all guarantee successful strategy implementation. Developing an idea is always considered easier than actualizing the idea and transforming it to practical activities. The dynamics involved in strategy formulation are less invasive to the comfort zone and the familiar territory in comparison to those involved in strategy implementation. Strategy implementation demands action and therefore means a change be it of structure, policies or even culture.

## CHAPTER THREE
## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Introduction

The aim of this study was to consider the strategic importance of perceptions and cultural management when implementing change in an institution. A review of literature was undertaken and key issues discussed. The methodology chapter describes the design, respondents, data collection, analysis and data presentation techniques that were used to conduct the study.

### 3.2 Research design

The research design constitutes the blue print for the collection, measurement and analysis of data. It aids the researcher in the allocation of limited resources by posing crucial choices in the methodology (Cooper and Schindler, 2007). The research was conducted as a case study. The study was concerned with describing the perception that managers at Strathmore University have towards the influence of culture on the successful implementation of change strategies.

3.3 Data and data collection

An introduction letter was obtained from the relevant persons at the University of Nairobi to facilitate the research process. A structured questionnaire (Appendix 1) was prepared and used to collect data from the respondents for purposes of analysis. The questionnaire contained three sections. Section I contained questions that give general organisation and respondent profiling. Section II contained questions on strategic issues and changes within the organisation where as section III contained questions on the various perceptions of Culture within the institution. A pilot study was conducted by issuing the sample questionnaire to a selected manager. This was to enable the researcher test it for reliability and validity. Thereafter, the researcher distributed the questionnaires with amendments and collected the questionnaires within two weeks. The research study incorporated both secondary data as reviewed in chapter two and primary data collected from the respondents to draw conclusions. Respondents were not be expected to include their names on the questionnaires for confidentiality purposes.

## 3.4 Data analysis

Data once collected will be edited for errors and completeness. The data will then be coded to facilitate efficient analysis of data in the categories which will be categorized into homogenous clusters based on the codes awarded to each response. The data that is of a qualitative nature will be classified according to attributes while that which is of quantitative nature will be entered into an excel sheet and tabulated and graphs plotted to draw conclusions. The tabulated data will then be analyzed using SPSS. Averages and percentages will be used in the analysis. Distribution tables, charts and /or graphs will be used to present the data so as to show where most responses featured and thus make the research more focused.

# CHAPTER FOUR

# DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

## 4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and findings of the research study based on the data collected from the various respondents. The study was carried out at Strathmore University among senior and middle level management staff in the 30 departments. The findings are presented in form of tables, graphs and pie charts. Analysis of quantitative data is done by use of Scientific Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 15.0). Statistical methods were used to summarize data applying rules of descriptive statistics. In addition, patterns in the data have been modeled in a way that accounts for randomness and uncertainty in the observations, and then used to draw inferences on the subject of study. The findings are based on responses from a total of 23 respondents out of the 30 to whom questionnaires were issued.

## 4.2 Response rate

From the target 30 respondents, 23 questionnaires were collected representing a response rate of 76%. This response was deemed to provide a reasonable confidence level that data collected can be deemed as representative of Strathmore University Management.

Response rate = actual number of responses x 100

Planned number of responses

**4.3 Sample characteristics**

When respondents were asked how long they had worked at the University. 74% had worked for the institution for less than 10 years with a majority 47.8 % of them having worked for the institution for between 3- 9 years. As illustrated by Table 4.2. The results of these findings indicated that most of the management level employees at the university were relatively new as only 26% of them had worked for the institution for more than10 years.

Table 4.2:  **Number of years in the organisation**

|       |                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|-------|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|
| Valid | Less than 1 year | 4         | 17.4    | 17.4          |
|       | 1-2 years        | 2         | 8.7     | 8.7           |
|       | 3-9 years        | 11        | 47.8    | 47.8          |
|       | 10-15 years      | 5         | 21.7    | 21.7          |
|       | 16-19 years      | 1         | 4.3     | 4.3           |
|       | Total            | 23        | 100.0   | 100.0         |

On further enquiry of how long the respondents had held their managerial position, 87% stated that they had held their positions for between 0- 4 years. This means that for most of the respondents their job entry level into the institution was either at management level or that they scaled the corporate ladder soon after joining the institution. See Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: **Mangerial Experience**

|       |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|
| Valid | 0-4 years   | 20        | 87.0    | 87.0          |
|       | 5-9 years   | 2         | 8.7     | 8.7           |
|       | 15-19 years | 1         | 4.3     | 4.3           |
|       | Total       | 23        | 100.0   | 100.0         |

**4.4     Institutional History**

On enquiring about the departmental history, respondents indicated that 52% of the departments had been in existence between 3-9 years. And a cumulative 65% having existed for more than 10 years as indicated on Table 4.4. It was important for the researcher to gather data on the age of departments within the institution because culture is affected by time.

Table 4.4: **How long has the department been in existence in Strathmore University?**

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | 1-2 years | 3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
|  | 3-9 years | 12 | 52.2 | 52.2 | 65.2 |
|  | 10-15 years | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 73.9 |
|  | 16-19 years | 4 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 91.3 |
|  | Over 20 years | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**4.5**   Awareness of organisational Strategy

The researcher also sought to find out if the respondents were aware of the organisational strategy as documented on the strategic plan. 91% 0f the respondents said they were aware of the strategy with 8.7 % indicating that they were not aware of the strategy see Table 4.5 below. On further analysis, it was deduced that the 8.7% who were not aware of the strategy had worked at the institution for less than 1 year.

Table 4.5: **Are you aware of the University's strategic plan?**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Yes | 21 | 91.3 | 91.3 | 91.3 |
| | No | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

## 4.6 Formulation of Strategy

**When the respondents were asked who in their opinion formulated the organisational strategy, 47% stated that top Management was responsible. Only 4% agreed that it was a consultative process between top management, a selected committee of employees and consultants. See Table 4.6.**

Table 4.6: **Strategy Formulators**

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Vice Chancellor | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| Top Management | 11 | 47.8 | 47.8 |
| Selected committee | 4 | 17.4 | 17.4 |
| All employees | 5 | 21.7 | 21.7 |
| Top management and selected committee | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| Top management, selected committee, consultants, all employees | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

When respondents were asked if their departments had annual objectives, 95% of the respondents also indicated that their departments set annual objectives and a further 30% indicated that the departmental were the ones who set these objectives.

Table 4.7: **Existence of departmental annual Objectives**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 22 | 95.7 | 95.7 | 95.7 |
| No | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Only 8% of the respondents indicated that the departmental objectives were set by departmental heads in consultation with the departmental employees as indicated on Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: **Setting of Departmental Objectives**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Top Management | 5 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 21.7 |
| Departmental Heads | 7 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 52.2 |
| Selected Committee | 4 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 69.6 |
| All Departmental employees | 4 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 87.0 |
| Departmental heads and   all departmental employees | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 95.7 |
| Top management and departmental heads | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**4.7** Strategic Change

The researcher also sought to find out the last time a major change in structure or function took place within the various departments. From this enquiry, 76% of the respondents indicated that a major change had taken place less than a year ago. A further 68 % and 86% respectively agreed that the policies and procedures followed by the departments to **support**

**the implementation of the changes were supportive as indicated on Table 4.9, 4.10 and 4.11 respectively.**

Table 4.9: **Frequency of Change in the Departments**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Less than 1 year ago | 16 | 69.6 | 76.2 | 76.2 |
| More than 2 year ago | 1 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 81.0 |
| Not in the recent past | 4 | 17.4 | 19.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 21 | 91.3 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | | |

Table 4.10: **Relationship between Policy and Strategy**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 15 | 65.2 | 68.2 | 68.2 |
| No | 7 | 30.4 | 31.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 95.7 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | | |

Table 4.11: **Change and Supportive procedures**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 19 | 82.6 | 86.4 | 86.4 |
| No | 3 | 13.0 | 13.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 95.7 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | | |

## 4.8    Reasons for change

When the respondents were asked to rank several reasons why there is was need for change, they ranked the variables as either minor or major as is shown in Table 4.12.  From the analysis, it was evident that the respondents thought that the three Major reasons for change at the university

were to demonstrate efficiency in functions and work processes, to incorporate new goals in line with the revised strategy and to incorporate technology as depicted by 87%, 81% and 81% respectively for the three reasons.

It was also deduced that the bottom three reasons for change at the university were to incorporate authority systems, to incorporate new behaviour and to enhance accountability with each response rate being 81%, 66% and 60% respectively.

Table 4.12: **Reasons for Strategic Change**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To incorporate new values | M | 9 | 39.1 | 40.9 | 40.9 |
| | N | 13 | 56.5 | 59.1 | 100.0 |
| Incorporate new goals | M | 18 | 78.3 | 81.8 | 81.8 |
| | N | 4 | 17.4 | 18.2 | 100.0 |
| To incorporate new behavior | M | 7 | 30.4 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| | N | 14 | 60.9 | 66.7 | 100 |
| To incorporate new technology | M | 18 | 78.3 | 81.8 | 81.8 |
| | N | 4 | 17.4 | 18.2 | 100.0 |
| To incorporate structural changes | M | 8 | 34.8 | 38.1 | 38.1 |
| | N | 13 | 56.5 | 61.9 | 100.0 |
| To Incorporate authority systems | M | 4 | 17.4 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| | N | 17 | 73.9 | 81.0 | 100.0 |
| To | M | 20 | 87.0 | 87.0 | 87.0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| demonstrate efficiency | N | 3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 100.0 |
| To demonstrate effectiveness | M | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| To respond Flexibly to new ideas | M | 12 | 52.2 | 52.2 | 52.2 |
| | N | 11 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 100.0 |
| To enhance Accountabilit y | M | 9 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 39.1 |
| | N | 14 | 60.9 | 60.9 | 100.0 |

**When respondents were asked what in their opinion were the factors that had led to changes in the institution.**

27 % of the respondents indicated that technological changes and establishment of new evaluation and accreditation procedures were the main factors that had led to changes in the university. This was consistent with the responses given earlier where 81% of the respondents indicated that the reasons for incorporating technological change was a major reason for adoption of the new strategy at the university as indicated in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: **Drivers of Change**

| Factor | Count | Responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Emergence of new types of institutions | 1 | 8 | 17.0 |
| Establishment of different evaluation and accreditation Procedures | 2 | 13 | 27.7 |
| Curriculum reforms | 3 | 5 | 10.6 |
| Technological changes | 4 | 13 | 27.7 |
| Changes in types of financing and governance | 5 | 8 | 17.0 |
| Total responses | | 47 | 100.0 |

**4.9 Successful Change Implementation**

When the respondents were asked whose action in the university change depended on, 39% of the respondents were of the opinion that Top management was responsible for Change with only 8% saying it was dependant on all institutional employees see Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: **Organisational Structure**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individual faculty | 7 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 |
| Administrators | 5 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 52.2 |
| All employees | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 60.9 |
| Top management | 9 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

These findings were also consistent when the respondents' were asked to define the organisational structure the university was aiming for as indicated on table 4.15 with the highest number of respondents i.e. 40% saying the university was geared towards a Hierarchical based structure where authority and decision making is vested amongst a few management individuals at the top of the Hierarchy.

Table 4.15: **Forces that influence Strategy Implementation in an organisation**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hierarchical based | 9 | 39.1 | 40.9 | 40.9 |
| Economical bases | 4 | 17.4 | 18.2 | 59.1 |
| Flat structure | 8 | 34.8 | 36.4 | 95.5 |
| Hierarchical and economical based | 1 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 95.7 | 100.0 | |

The researcher further sought to find out the opinion of the respondent on the forces they perceived to affect the university's ability to formulate and Implement its strategies. The respondents were left to give a combination of options as indicated on Table 4.16. The most

influential combination was shown to be the University's structure and culture. On further analysis it was noted that cumulatively, 69% of the possible combinations given by the respondents had the cultural aspect featuring as a major force. The researcher further analyzed each individual aspects rating and it was shown that respondents indicated that the university culture was one of the prime forces from 13% of the responses.

Table 4.16: **Powerful Cultural Dimensions**

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| University culture | 3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Employee motivation and awareness | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 21.7 |
| Management processes | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 30.4 |
| University structure and culture | 5 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 52.2 |
| University culture and employee motivation and awareness | 3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 65.2 |
| Employee motivation and awareness and management processes | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 73.9 |
| University culture and management processes | 3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 87.0 |
| Univ. structure, employee motivation & awareness, mgt process | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 91.3 |
| Culture, employee motivation & awareness, mgt processes | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 95.7 |
| Structure, culture, employee awareness and motivation | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

## 4.10    University's powerful cultural manifestation

The study also sought to determine what Managers deemed to be the institution's powerful cultural manifestations were. From the responses given, it was evident that the Values, Mission

& Vision and Beliefs & Behaviour were the most prominent cultural manifestations with 26.1 % and 13% respectively as shown in the following Table 4.17

Table 4.17: **Powerful Cultural manifestations at the University**

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Values | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| Mission and vision | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 13.0 |
| Beliefs and behavior | 3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 26.1 |
| Values. beliefs and behavior | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 34.8 |
| Values, policies and procedures, beliefs and behavior | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 43.5 |
| Symbols, policies and procedures, beliefs and behavior | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 47.8 |
| Values, mission and vision, beliefs and behavior | 3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 60.9 |
| Values, mission and vision | 6 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 87.0 |
| Mission and Vision, policies and procedures | 2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 95.7 |
| Values, mission and vision, policies and procedures | 1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The respondents were further asked to indicate which aspect of culture the university measures and 40% and 36.4% indicated Mission & Vision and the Policies& Procedures aspects respectively as depicted by the Table 4.18.

Table 4.18: **Cultural aspects Measured by the University**

| Aspects | Frequency | % |
|---|---|---|
| Values | 5 | 22.7 |
| Mission & Vision | 9 | 40.9 |
| Policies & Procedures | 8 | 36.4 |

In any institution, the various cultural aspects are usually visible in the interactions amongst different stake holders. The researcher therefore sought to investigate how the cultural manifestations cited above influenced various facets of the university such as the members' diversity, the control mechanisms, how the culture is passed on and the extent of buy in amongst employees. From the findings, the aspect of diversity within the university was rated as the most dominant layer of culture. The aspect of citizenship and belonging amongst members within the university was however the weakest layer with only 6% of the respondents indicating that there is a sense of belonging among employees as depicted in the Table 4.19.

Table 4.19: **Various layers of culture at the university**

| Layers of culture at the University | frequency | % |
|---|---|---|
| Students of all cultures and background are admitted to the university | 22 | 26.8 |
| Men and women interact freely in an uncontrolled setting | 4 | 4.9 |
| There are symbols and places that hold special meaning | 16 | 19.5 |
| There exists a set of unspoken rules about conduct and expectations | 18 | 22 |
| There exists mentoring programs for new faculty and students | 17 | 20.7 |
| There is a sense of Identity ,belonging and citizenship among the members of the university | 5 | 6.1 |

**4.11    Emphasis on Cultural Change to support Strategic Change Management**

When respondents were asked whether the aspect of culture was addressed during strategic management planning, a majority 55% said that the aspect of culture was not addressed with 45% of the respondents saying that the aspect of culture was addressed.

**4.12    Hindrances to effective Change Management and Implementation.**

The researcher also sought to investigate the factors that could hinder the successful implementation of change at the University. When respondents were asked what in their opinion was the major hindrance to implementation of change at the university, 80% listed poor or lack of communication as a major hindrance. Some of the other reasons given by respondents were; resistance to change due to poor change management and lack awareness amongst employees hence there was no buy in.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents summary of the findings, conclusions and also offer recommendations for future improvements and studies. The primary purpose of this study was to achieve the following primary objective: To determine management's perception on the influence of culture on the implementation of strategic change at Strathmore University. To achieve this objective, the researcher administered questionnaires to Managers of various departments at Strathmore University. The responses from the respondents were then analyzed as reported in chapter four and will be discussed in this chapter. The researcher used descriptive statistics to gain insight into the perceptions of managers.

## 5.2 Discussions

The researcher sought to profile the respondents and the organization first. This would provide a background against which some of the conclusions would be drawn from. On analysis of the data collected, it was evident that most of the management team was relatively young in the institution with a working history of less than four years in their managerial roles. It was also evident that for most of the respondents, their entry level positions at the institution were in their management roles. This implies that they did not have informal interaction with peers within the lower cadre where most of the informal institutional cultures are shared and discussed. This was further confirmed because when respondents were asked what the powerful cultural manifestations were; the highest number of respondents said it was in the mission and vision of the institution. As such it was evident that they are more aware of the formal cultural dimensions and not the informal dimension which is also critical in an organization.

It was also notable from the responses that the university focused more on the Mission, vision, policies and procedures aspects to realize its strategy. However on further analysis of the findings, it was noted that 95% the respondents were in agreement that there were informal sets of beliefs, rules and assumptions that guided member attitudes and behavior at the university. According to (Alpandre and Lee1995) "a critical question related to strategy is whether or not the company has the appropriate structure to implement its goals. A series of questions must also be asked with respect to corporate culture. Management must determine what changes, if any, are needed to align the culture or values which affect the way the company operates. A need to sensitize them and enhance their understanding of the prevailing institutional culture is critical if they are to gain an understanding of the employees working under them." Corporate culture does not only refer to the formal ways of doing things but the informal components as well that mesh the employees together. It important that organizations realize that the informal group dimensions play a critical role in in the implementation of strategic change.

From the finding it was also evident that 81% of the departments had undergone some form of structural or functional change within the last two years. This change was not however supported with focused attempts to incorporate new behavior as was reported by 67% of the respondents. Change of whatever nature demands a change in thought processes, behavior, attitudes and culture. Sometimes the changes required are small and incremental while in other instances the changes are substantial and require a totally new way of doing things if a fit between the strategy and culture is to be developed. In the findings chapter, when respondents were asked what aspect the university had focused its conscious attempts to realize its strategy, it was reported that the organisation main focus was on impersonal components such as technology and efficiency of processes. The focus on the employees was minimal. (Deal and Kennedy 1982) stated that "we need to remember that people make businesses work and there is need to relearn old lessons about how culture ties people together and gives them meaning and purpose for their day to day lives." As such when the people aspect of any institution is not well managed, there are bound to be gaps which can hinder the institution from attaining its mission and vision effectively.

To show how critical the human aspect is in an institution, when respondents were asked which forces in their opinion affect the institutions ability to formulate and implement its strategies, the

university culture and employee motivation and awareness of the on goings of the institution were ranked as the highest aspects respectively.

Getting organization employees to adopt a new mindset is not easy. Gagliardi (1986) writes that "Culture, … understood as a coherent system of assumptions and basic values which distinguishes one group from another and orients its choices, is of its very nature a tenacious and unalterable phenomenon". He points out that "the more deeply rooted and diffuse these values are, the more tenacious and unalterable is the culture", and that "organizational cultures usually change in order to remain what they have always been". That is, every organization has a primary strategy which is the maintenance of its cultural identity and a series of secondary strategies which are instrumental to or expressive of the primary strategy. However, if the new values threaten the status quo, this may necessitate transformational change resulting in considerable upheaval in order to create suitable conditions to develop a critical mass of support for the new mindset.

In Gagliardi's words (1986), "Where a value postulated by a new strategy is antagonistic towards an older one a real cultural revolution is needed". On the other hand "values postulated by the new strategy may not be antagonistic towards traditional ones but simply different". Their acceptance would then involve "broadening the nucleus of basic values"

When respondents were asked in their opinion where the university focused its purposeful efforts when altering existing policies and structures, employee motivation was ranked as the least considered aspect. However, (Lloyd and Trompenaars, 1993) shows that the salient components of any change model consist of five broad categories representing the open system's approach to organizational change, at the centre of which lie the core dimensions. The five broad categories are the setting, the organization, the manager, the group and the results. The core dimensions are culture, assumptions, and mind-sets or psyches of those involved.

(Zeffane 1996) states that corporate culture can be a practical management tool and should be incorporated into the organizational processes aimed at managing strategic change. The best practical use of corporate culture is as a contingent variable within an open systems framework of strategic analysis. He further notes that in recent years, the role of culture in driving change has surpassed that of strategic planning.

Form the findings, it was evident that the organization's main structure was of a hierarchical nature where most of the authority. Power and decision making is vested among a few individuals in the institution. Hierarchical organizations tend to also be tailed with a lot of bureaucracy and communication most often tends to be of a top down nature. This was further confounded because when the respondents were asked what in their opinion were the hindrances or barriers to effective change implementation, the three main components cited were poor communication, lack of awareness and poor change management. The first two components are interrelated in that where there is lack of or poor communication channels, more often or not people are not aware of what is happening. A lot of the information is either relayed through rumors and the grapevine and often tend to be incorrect usually escalating fears of the unknown amongst employees thus being a barrier to effective change implementation. . According to Nadler (1989), an early and critical step is to communicate a clear vision of the desired future state. People need to know how the change will come about how they will be affected by the change. The most effective reorientations include a fully developed description of the vision. Nadler (1989) indicates that most visions touch in some way on the following points: a description of why the vision is needed, or why the change is desired, a discussion of the organization's stakeholders and what it seeks to provide for them a definition of the core values and/or beliefs that drive the organization of the change, how the organization will be structured or will work to achieve the vision and a discussion of some of the specific elements of how people in the organization will operate and interact with each other.

## 5.3 Conclusions and Recommendations

While the culture of an organization is constantly evolving (Trice and Beyer, 1993), it is important to note that fundamentally changing an organization's culture is a long-term endeavor. To some extent, the lengthy nature of the cultural change process could be a by-product of the resistance that might accompany some planned changes to an organization's culture (Barney, 1986). In fact, it is important for leaders to recognize that changing an organization's culture may evoke emotional reactions from employees (Trice and Beyer, 1993). Providing employees with training should help mitigate some of these reactions by laying a foundation to support changes in an organization's culture. In addition, the examples set by leaders within an

organization can have a profound impact on the willingness of employees to support or resist cultural change.

It is therefore recommended that the institution refocuses its efforts on training and sensitizing its employees towards adoption of new forms of behavior that support its entrepreneurial strategy. Some of this can be encouraging innovation and exploration within acceptable limits. According to (Alpander and Lee 1995) Managerial policies, practices and style facilitate or hinder goal attainment. Managers play a central role in the success of an enterprise by planning, coordinating and facilitating goal-directed activities. To perform these functions managers must be effective communicators, leaders, policy makers, motivators, trainers, counselors, recruiters and, above all, good decision makers. It is their responsibility to ensure that the structure of the organization is consistent with and advantageous for, the prevailing technology and environment.

## 5.4 Limitations of the study

The researcher encountered some limitations in the process of data collection. The respondents being from a private university were at first skeptical that the information being collected would be given to a competitor in the public sector. However this skepticism was allied after the respondents were informed that all the data collected would be used primarily for academic purposes and that the feedback from questionnaires would be treated with confidentiality to protect the respondents.

## 5.5 Areas for further study

When senior management has a clear understanding of the variables contributing to their company's success, the next step is to develop an in-depth understanding of the problems facing the organization. It is important to determine how close or how far removed the current organization is from the ideal situation. Since this study only targeted employees in key Management positions at Strathmore University, it would be important to also know what other employees in various levels from supervisory to team leaders and the rank and file perceives to be the role of culture and its impact on implementation of new strategies at the university. It is therefore recommended that a study to determine the perceptions of employees on the role of culture on implementation of strategic change at the university be conducted. The findings from these two studies be compared and

contrasted to harmonize the perceptions of management and the rank and file employees and either draw similarities or divergence in views that can guide the institution as it implements and review its current and future strategies.

## 5.6 Implications on Policy and Practice

Appreciation and recognition of the important and critical role of organisational culture by all individuals in an organisation is paramount for successful strategy realization. With the world becoming a global village, diverse racial, economic, geographical and even technological cultures are merging and multinational institutions being established. By understanding the intricate role of culture, organisational managers who more often are the policy makers within the institution are better placed to develop and work towards establishing and harnessing relevant and effective organisational cultures. Total Quality Management is very prevalent as a management practice for organizations that want to have a competitive advantage in the 21$^{st}$ Century irrespective of whether the institution is a private or public entity. Total Quality Management emphasizes aligning corporate cultures to those of the employees working in the organisation. If harmony is not created then conflicts that hinder the realization of the corporate strategies arise. As discussed early, managers need to recognize that people make things get things done and their actions are guided by cultural tendencies developed over time. With this information, it is therefore imperative that Managers develop both the necessary infrastructure in terms of communication and information flow within an organisation that accurately communicates and facilitates a flow of information from top to bottom and vice versa to mitigate against conflicts that may arise due to cultural ignorance or misinterpretation thus further the realization of the institutional goals. It is also important to note that good policies without proper practice are only as good as the sound but have no results to show.

# REFERENCES

Almaraz Jeanne. (1994), Quality Management and the Process of Change *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 6-14. © MCB University Press.

Aaltonen and Ikavalko. (2002), *Implementing strategies successfully and integrated manufacturing systems* pg 415 - 418

Andrews, Cameron and Harris. (2008), *Journal of Organizational Change Management* Vol. 21 No. 3, 2008 pg 300-314

Armstrong, M. (2006), *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (10[th]edn), London, Kogan page

Aosa E, (1992), An empirical Investigation of aspects of Strategy Formulation and Implementation within large private manufacturing companies in Kenya (unpublished) PHD thesis

Bass, B.M. (1985), *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*, New York Free Press, NY

Brown, S.L. and Eisenhardt, K.M. (1997), The art of continuous change: linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly journal*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pg 1-34

Burnes, B. (2005), Complexity theories and organizational change, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pg 73-90.

Burnes, B. (1996), Managing change: *A strategic approach to organisational dynamics*, Pitman Publishing, London.

Barney, J.B. (1986), "Organizational culture: can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 656-65.

Burnes, B., 1992Managing Change, London, Pitman.

Burns, J.M. (1978), Leadership, New York, Harper & Row.

Burnes B. and Hakeem J, (1995), Culture, Cognitive Dissonance and the Management of Change. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 15 No. 8, pg 14-33.

Burnes, B. (1996), *No such thing as a 'one best way' to manage organizational change*, Management Decision, Vol. 34 No. 10, pg 11-18.

Caldwell, R. (2003), Models of Change agency: a fourfold classification, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pg 131-42.

Cameron, K., Freeman, S. and Mishra, A. (1993), "*Downsizing and Redesigning Organizations*", in Dawson, P. 1994, Organizational Change: a Procession Approach, Paul Chapman Publishing, London

Carr, D. and Littman, I. (1990), *Excellence in Government: Total Quality Management in the '90s*, Coopers & Lybrand, Arlington, VA, pg 190-203.

Ciampa, D. (1991), *Total Quality*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Cooper, D and Shcindler, P. (2007), *Business research methods*, Tata Mcgraw Hill, New Dheli

Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A.A., 1982 Corporate Cultures: *The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA,.

Eldridge, J.E.T. and Crombie, A.D. (1974), *A Sociology of Organizations*, George Allen & Unwin, London,.

Ford, J.D. and Ford, L.W. (1994). *Logics of identity, contradiction, and attraction in change, Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pg 756.

Gagliardi, P. (1986), "The creation and change of organisational cultures, a conceptual framework", *Organisation Studies*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 117-34.

Genus, A. (1998), *The management of change: Perspectives and practice*, International Thomson Business Press, London.

Graham, H. and Bennet, R. (1998), Human Resource Management (9[th]edn), Great Britain, Pearson Education Limited.

Guvenc G Alpander and Carroll R, Lee *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 14 No. 8, 1995, pp. 4-18. © MCB University Press, 0262-1711

Gupta, A. (1984), Contingency linkages between strategy and general manager characteristics: a conceptual examination, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9, pg 399-412.

Hammer, M. and Champy, J. (1993), Re-engineering the Corporation, Nicolas Brealey, London.

Handy, C., (1986), Understanding Organizations, Penguin, Harmondsworth,.

Hatch, M.J. (1997), *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic and Postmodern Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Hayes, J. (2002), *The Theory and Practice of Change Management*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Head, C. W. (1997), *Beyond corporate transformation: A whole systems approach to creating and sustaining high performance'*, Productivity Press, Portland, OR.

Helms, M. M. (2006) 'Participative Management', *Encyclopedia of Management Education*, (online) (cited 1 September 2009).

Helms, M. M. (2006) 'Theory X and Theory Y', *Encyclopedia of Management Education*, (online) (cited 1 November 2009). Available from URL: http://www.enotes.com/management-encyclopedia

Huber, G. and Glick, W., *Organizational Change and Redesign*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, pg 19-63.

Ioannis Angeli Jeffrey Jones and Bahir Sabir. (1998), *Managing Service Quality* Volume 8 · Number 3, pg 198–211 © MCB University Press

Kabiru K. (2007), "The transformation of higher education in Kenya: challenges and opportunities. Paper Presented at the 'Mijadala on Social Policy, Governance and Development in Kenya' sponsored by Development Policy Management Forum on 9 July, 2007 at Nairobi Safari Club

Kanter, R.M. (1983), The Change Masters: *Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the American Corporatio*n, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.

Kanter, M R., Stein, B. A. and Jick, T.D. (1992), '*The challenge of organisational change'*, Free Press, New York. 7.

Kotter, J.P. (1995), *Leading change: why transformational efforts fail"*, Harvard Business Review, pg 59-67.

Kotter J. P. and Heskette J L. (1992) *Corporate Culture and Performance*; NY free press pg 7

Leavitt, H.J. (1965), Applied Organizational Change in Industry*: Structural, Technological, and Humanistic Approaches, Handbook of Organizations*, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL.

Lloyd, B. and Trompenaars, F. (1993)," Culture and change: conflict or consensus", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 17-23.

Minzberg H., (1978), *Patterns of strategy formulation: management Science* Vol24. No. 9 pg 934- 48

Mullins, L., (1989), Management and Organizational Behaviour, Pitman, London,.

Nadler, D. (1988), Concepts for the Management of Organizational Change, in Tushman, M. and Moore, W. (Eds), *Readings in the Management of Innovation*, 2nd ed., Ballinger, Cambridge, MA.

Nadler, D.A. (1989), "*Organisational frame bending: principles for managing reorientation*", The Academy of Management Executive, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 194-204.

Nyaigoti – chacha. (2004), Reforming higher education in Kenya:  challenges, lessons and opportunities.   Presented at the state university of new York workshop with the parliamentary committee on education science and technology.

Pearce J. A and Robinson R. B, (2009), *Formulation, Implementation and Control of Competitive strategy*. McGraw Hill, Eleventh edition pg 388

Pettigrew, A.M., Woodman, R.W. and Cameron, K.S. (2001), *Studying organizational change and development: challenges for future research, Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44, pg 697-713.

Pettigrew A.M. (1987), Context and action in the transformation of a firm, *Journal of management studies* Vol 24 No. 6 pg 649- 70

Revenaugh D. L (1994), *Implementing Major Organizational Change The TQM Magazi*ne, Vol. 6 No. 6, pg 38-

Schein, E. (1991), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Senior, B. (1997) 'Organisational change', Pitman Publishing, London.

Stace, D. and Dunphy, D. (2001), Beyond the Boundaries: *Leading and Recreating the Successful Enterprise*, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, Sydney, Australia.

Tichy, N. (1983), Managing Strategic Change, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Tichy, N. and Devanna, M. (1986), *The Transformational Leader*, John Wiley, New York, NY Thompson A. and Strickland III, 1995 "Crafting and Implementing Strategy"

Trice, H. and Beyer, J. (1991), "*Cultural Leadership in Organizations*", Organization Science, Vol. 2 No. 2, May, pg 149-69.

Trice, H.M. and Beyer, J.M. (1993), *The Cultures of Work Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Vijay Sathe, (1985). *Culture and Related Corporate realities*; home wood I L : Richard D. Irwin

Weick, K.E. (2000), "Emergent change as a universal in organizations", in Beer, M. and Nohria, N. (Eds), *Breaking the Code of Change*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Weller L. David (1996) Benchmarking *a paradigm for change to quality education The TQM Magazine* Volume 8 pg 24–29 © MCB University Press

Werner Vermeulen, (1997), *Cultural change: crucial for the implementation of TQM Training for Quality* Volume 5 · Number 1 pg 40–45 © MCB University Press

Zeffane R. M,  Dynamics of strategic change*: critical issues in fostering positive organizational change Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 17/7 [1996] 36–43

**Appendix 2**

*Appendix 1: Survey Questionnaire*

---

**PART I:**

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

*For the questions below, select one option among the given. Use a tick (☑) or a cross (☒) to indicate your choice where appropriate.*

1. School / Institute/ Department

   _____

2. What is your position in the department?

   _____

3. How long have you worked for this organisation?

   | | | |
   |---|---|---|
   | ❑ Less than a year | ❑ 1-2 years | ❑ 3- 9 years |
   | ❑ 10-15 years | ❑ 16- 19 years | ❑ over 20 years |

4. How long have you held your current position?

   | | | |
   |---|---|---|
   | ❑ 0- 4years | ❑ 5-9 years | ❑ 10-14years |
   | ❑ 15 -19years | ❑ 20-24years | ❑ 25-29years |
   | ❑ other (*specify*) _____ | | |

5. How long has the department been in existence at the university?

   | | | |
   |---|---|---|
   | ❑ Less than a year | ❑ 1-2 years | ❑ 3- 9 years |
   | ❑ 10-15 years | ❑ 16- 19 years | ❑ over 20 years |

6. What is your highest level of education?

   ❑ Diploma

   ❑ Bachelor's degree

   ❑ Masters

   ❑ PHD

   ❑ Other (specify)

7. What is your gender?

   ❑ Male                                    ❑ Female

8. In your opinion, who formulates strategy at the University?

   ❑ The Vice Chancellor

   ❑ Top Management

   ❑ Selected Committee

   ❑ Consultants

   ❑ All employees

   ❑ Other (specify)

9. Does your department have annual objectives?

   ❑ Yes                                    ❑ No

10. Who sets the objectives for your department?

    ❑ Top Management

    ❑ Departmental Heads

    ❑ Selected Committee

❑ Consultants

❑ All departmental employees

❑ Other (specify)

11. When was the last time major changes in structure or function take place within your department?

❑ Less than 1 year ago

❑ More than 2 years ago

❑ More than 3 years ago

❑ More than 4 years ago

❑ More than 5 years ago

❑ Not in the recent past

12. Please indicate your agreement with the following:

| Aspect | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Do the current university policies adequately support the institutional strategic plan? | | |
| Does the current organisational structure support implementation of the strategy as documented in the 2007- 2010 strategic plan? | | |
| Are the procedures followed by the department's support of change implementation as documented in the strategic plan? | | |

**PART II:**

13. Are you aware of the Universities strategic plan?

☐ Yes                              ☐ No

14. Which of the following factors in your opinion have led to transformation and change at the university as intended by the new strategy?

☐ Emergence of new types of institutions

☐ Establishment of different evaluation and accreditation mechanisms

☐ Curriculum reforms

☐ Technological changes

☐ Changes in types of financing and governance

15. Does the university in its strategic plan emphasize institutional improvement and renewal rather than injecting something new to the university?

☐ Yes                              ☐ No

How?

_____

_____

_____

16. Do you think the University has made deliberate and conscious attempts to manage events so that the outcomes are directed to some pre determined end?

☐ Yes                              ☐ No

How?

_____

17. What in your opinion are some of the University's specific outcomes in its purposeful effort to alter existing policies and practices?

_____

_____

_____

18. What are some of the major reasons for the university's purposeful effort to alter the existing policies and practices? Please rate the following factors with the (M) indicating a major reason and (N) indicating a minor reason.

| | | M | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | To incorporate new behaviour | ❑ | ❑ |
| 2 | To incorporate new Values | ❑ | ❑ |
| 3 | To incorporate new goals | ❑ | ❑ |
| 4 | To incorporate new technology | ❑ | ❑ |
| 5 | To incorporate structural changes | ❑ | ❑ |
| 6 | To incorporate authority systems | ❑ | ❑ |
| 7 | To demonstrate efficiency of resource utilization | ❑ | ❑ |
| 8 | To demonstrate effectiveness in service delivery | ❑ | ❑ |
| 9 | To respond flexibly to new ideas. | ❑ | ❑ |
| 10 | T be accountable to a diverse consistency of stake holders | ❑ | ❑ |

19. Whose action in the university does change depend on?

❑ Individual faculty

❑  Administrators

❑ Students

❑ Others (specify)

20. Where does the university focus its purposeful efforts when altering existing practices?

❑ Emotions

❑  Needs

❑ Motivation

❑ Rewards

❑ Entrepreneurial Judgment

❑ Others

21. What are some of the forces that affect the universities ability to formulate and implement it strategies?

❑ University Structure

❑  University Culture

❑ Employees' motivation and awareness

❑ Management processes

22. Which organisational structure is the university aiming for with its current strategy implementation?

❑ Hierarchical based

❑ Economical based

❑ Flat Structures

**PART III:**

23. Are there sets of shared values, beliefs and assumptions established that shape and guide the member attitudes and behavior in the university?

    ❑ Yes                                    ❑ No

24. What are the universities powerful cultural manifestations?

    ❑ Symbols

    ❑ Values

    ❑ Mission and vision

    ❑ Policies and procedures

    ❑ Beliefs and behavior

25. Which of the above aspects related to elements of culture does the university measure?

    _____

    _____

26. Which of the following layers of culture does the university demonstrate?

    ❑ Students of all cultures and backgrounds are admitted to the university

    ❑ Men and women interact freely in an uncontrolled setting

    ❑ There are symbols and places that hold special meaning

    ❑ There exists a set of unspoken rules about conduct and expectations.

    ❑ There exists mentoring programs for new faculty and students

    ❑ There is a sense of Identity, belonging and citizenship among the members of the University

27. In the university strategic planning process, which cultural archetypes do you think are highly prioritized?

❑ Collegial Culture

❑ Managerial Culture

❑ Developmental Culture

❑ Negotiating Culture

❑ Other (specify)………………………………………………………

28. On a scale of 1-5 please rate the how the above mentioned sets of values, beliefs, assumptions and perceptions of the university influence in:

| | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | They have allowed strathmore University to adopt to the external environment | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 2 | My boss makes the decisions that affect the department through consultation with members of the department. | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 3 | The decisions in my department are made solely by those individuals in the department charged with that responsibility. | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 4 | My boss/supervisor asks me politely to perform certain tasks and invites my suggestions. | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 5 | If I wanted extra duties and responsibilities my boss/supervisor would allow me to take them up. | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 6 | The suggestions I give at my level of employment contribute towards departmental policy, work processes | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and strategy. | ❏ | | | | |
| 7 | The suggestions that I give at my level of employment contribute towards overall organisational policy and strategic plan. | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ |
| 8 | I have total control over my work and can make decisions concerning various aspects of my job without necessarily consulting my immediate supervisor. | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ |
| 9 | The decisions that I make concerning my work do not alter the work processes. | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ |

29. Is there emphasize on cultural change during the strategic change management planning process?

❏ Yes                    ❏ No

30. What are some of the change inhibitors in the University?

_____

_____


**The End.**

**Thank you for completing the questionnaire.**

**Appendix 3:**

**List of Officers/ Departmental Heads at Strathmore University from whom the data will be collected**

**Principal Officers of the University**

Vice-Chancellor

Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs)

Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning & Development)

University Secretary

**Senior Offices of the University**

Dean, Faculty of Commerce

Dean, Faculty of Information Technology

Dean, Institute of Humanities, Education and Development Studies

Dean, Strathmore Business School

Dean, School of Tourism and Hospitality

Dean, School of Graduate Studies

Dean of Students

University Librarian

Registrar (Academic)

Registrar (Finance)

Director of Strategy

Administrative Services Manager

Director of Advancement

Director of Research

Director of Information and Communication Technology Centre

Director of University Relations

**Directors of Professional Schools/Institute/Centres**

Director, School of Accountancy

Dean, Institute of Continuing Education / Director Strathmore Enterprise Centre

Acting Manager, Distance Learning Centre

**Heads of Administrative/ Service Departments**

University Chaplain

Buildings and Estates Manager

Director, Human Resources

Catering Manager

Director of Admissions

Director of Operations

Examinations Officer

Quality Assurance/Records Manager

Communications Officer

Academic Officer

**Source:  Strathmore University 2009.**