

**CHALLENGES AND PRACTICES OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AT
TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF MOMBASA**

BY

AGUMBI PHOEBE FLORENCE

**RESEACH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE MASTER OF BUSINESS
ADMINISTRATION DEGREE, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**

AUGUST 2013

DECLARATION

This proposal is my original work and has not been submitted for a degree in any other University.

Signed: 

Date: 4th / 11 / 2013

Agumbi Phoebe Florence

D61/70782/2008

This proposal has been submitted with my approval as the University supervisor.

Signed: 

Date: 4 / 11 / 2013

Prof. Martin Ogutu

Dept of Business Administration

School of Business

University Of Nairobi

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my late parents and my family. May Jehovah God reward your immense support in a special way.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This project would not have been possible to complete without the direct or indirect support of many individuals. It is however difficult to mention the names of all the individuals who contributed in various ways. First, I am indebted to University of Nairobi, School of Business for providing a cool atmosphere of study and support that has led to the realization of this work.

Specifically I am indebted to Professor Martin Ogutu my research supervisor and Dr. Jackson Maalu who did the moderation. Thanks to you, the two brilliant scholars for providing me with professional guidance and insights on key aspects of this project. You painstakingly read through the work and offered critical evaluation and also edited it. I also feel very indebted to TUM employees who accepted to play the respondent part. You supported me dearly by supplying me with appropriate information to develop this project and sacrificed your time out of the busy schedule to respond to the interview guides. To you all receive my sincere gratitude.

Finally, I acknowledge the many and often neglected contributions made by my friends family and relatives whose encouragement accompanied me each step of the way. My dear husband peter, my three daughters Mercy, Julie and Peris Jackline, my son Randy , my nephew Oddy and niece Susan, my Aunt Jane Okoth, my two best friends Rachel Oyoo and Gladyce among others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abbreviation and Acronyms	vii
Abstract	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the study.....	1
1.1.1 Public Universities in Kenya.....	5
1.1.2 Technical University of Mombasa (TUM).....	7
1.2 Research problem.....	10
1.3 Research objectives.....	12
1.4 Value of the study.....	12
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Theoretical Foundation of the Study.....	14
2.3 Strategy implementation.....	17
2.4. Strategy implementation practices.....	22
2.5 Challenges of Strategy implementation.....	26
2.7 Summary.....	34
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Introduction.....	35
3.2 Research design.....	35
3.3 Data collection.....	36
3.4 Data analysis.....	37

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction.....	38
4.2 Strategy implementation practices at TUM.....	38
4.3 Challenges of strategy implementation at TUM.....	45
4.4 Discussions of the Findings.....	59

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction.....	61
5.2 Summary of the Findings.....	61
5.3 Conclusions of the Study.....	63
5.4 Limitations of the study.....	65
5.5 Recommendations for policy and practice.....	65
5.6 Suggestions for Further Research.....	67
REFERENCE.....	68
APPENDICES.....	78
Appendix A: Introductory questions.....	78
Appendix B: Questions on strategy implementation practices at TUM.....	78
Appendix C: Questions on challenges of strategy implementation at TUM.....	79

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEO - Chief Executive Officer

JKUAT- Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

MIOME -Mombasa Institute of Muslims Education.

MPUC - Mombasa Polytechnic University College.

M T E F-Medium Term Expenditure Framework.

M T I- Mombasa Institute of Technology

SBU- Small Business Unit

TIVET- Technical, Industrial, Vocational Entrepreneurship and Training.

TUM- Technical University of Mombasa

ABSTRACT

Strategy implementation is one of the stages in organizations decision making process crucial for translating strategies into desired actions then expected results by embracing all the actions that enable strategies to be put into practice. Organizations therefore need to consider the resources to be used, human resources required, structures, systems among other variables. The manner in which strategic management and strategy implementation is practised vary from one organization to another simply because the two are context sensitive. This study focused on a newly chartered university which has evolved through three distinct levels (from Tertiary institution to a University College and finally to a fully fledged University) and within the context of public University. Of the strategic management studies that have been conducted, very few have their focus on newly chartered public universities in Kenya. This study gets strength from this observation and therefore designed to fill the gap by establishing strategy implementation in a newly chartered public university context. The study sought to answer the questions: what are the strategy implementation practices adapted by TUM in implementing its strategic plans of 2010-2014? And what are the challenges that TUM encounters during the implementation process? The study purposed to achieve two objectives namely; to establish the strategic management practices adapted by TUM; and to identify the challenges faced by TUM in the implementation of its strategies. The major findings of the study were that TUM adapts various practices in implementing its strategies. TUM's strategic plan document of 2010-2014 reflects the institution broad action plans and the strategic thrusts practices such as planning and control systems, performance targets, direct supervision, and some social and cultural processes. The study found out that some of these practices just end on the paper, they are never applied for example, the study revealed that TUM has no standards of performance against which actual results can be measured, the reward system is also a major obstacle. The study also established that while the practices at TUM are used to support the implementation of strategies, some aspects like the organization structure and culture, resistance to change, unsupportive processes and procedures, uncontrollable factors in the environment like competition, inadequate training of staff and inadequate resources are among the major impediments to successful implementation of the institution strategies. This study is presented in five chapters with various sections discussing the above issues. The reliability and validity of this study should be understood and evaluated on the basis of the constraints on the study as expressed in chapter five. This study is especially useful to TUM and other similar institutions in Kenya. It should also benefit strategic management scholars, higher education policy makers and organization managers whose duties include formulation and implementation of strategies.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Strategic management is the set of decisions and actions resulting in the formulation and implementation of strategies designed to be achieved. Strategy implementation which is often referred to as the action phase of strategic management is key for the success of any organization (Pearce and Robison, 2004). Strategy formulation, analysis of strategies and strategic choice come first. While these phases are important, they alone cannot ensure success. The strategy must be translated into concrete action and that action must be carefully implemented otherwise accomplishment is left to chance.

Strategy implementation is the process by which strategies and policies are put into action through the development of programs, budgets and procedures (Wheelen and Hunger, 1998). Strategy implementation is involves converting strategic alternatives into operating plan. Additionally, the process might include changes within the overall culture, structure, and/or management system of the organisation (Pearce and Robinson, 1988; Thomson and Strickland, 1989; Hunger and Wheelan, 1995).

Successful strategy implementation involves three interrelated stages namely; identification of measurable, mutually determined annual objectives, development of specific functional strategies and the development and communication of conscious policies to guide decisions. According to Pearce and Robison (2004), annual objectives guide the implementation by converting long term objectives into specific short terms ends while functional strategies translate grand strategy at the business

level to correct action plans for sub units of the firm as policies provide specific guidelines for operating managers and their subordinates in executing strategies.

Effective implementation of strategies depends on working through others, organising, motivating, culture building and creating strong fits between strategy and how the organisation does things. According to Thomson and Strickland, (1993) implementation is successful if the company achieves its strategic objectives and targeted levels of financial performance. What makes it so demanding is the wide sweep of managerial activities that have to attend to the many ways managers can tackle each activity, the skill that is employed to get a variety of initiatives launched and moving, and the resistance to change that has to be overcome.

Strategy implementation practices are a critical element in organisational functioning, but whereas most organizations have good strategies, successful strategy implementation remains a major challenge. Within the organization structure, without formal and informal strategy implementation practices, strategy implementation cannot work effectively (Jonson and schools, 2002). Effective management practices are the bedrock of successful strategy implementation. The practices involve direct supervision, periodic progress review, planning and control systems, performance targets, self control and motivation amongst others (Harvard Business Essentials, 2005, Pechlaner and Saurwein, 2002, Johnson and Sholes, 2002). The practices can either hinder or help in translation of strategy into action. In reality a blend of these practices operates and some dominate others.

As strategy is implemented in a changing environment, the execution must be controlled and evaluated if the strategy is to be successfully implemented and adjusted to changing conditions. The control and evaluation process must therefore include three fundamental dimensions: establishing strategic controls that steer strategy execution, operating control systems that monitor performance, evaluate deviations, and initiate corrective functions and provide reward systems that motivate control and evaluation. The implementation of business strategy has been the subject of increased study and search for solutions, especially since the process from strategy formulation to strategy implementation is not efficient and is certainly in the present business environment inadequate (Hauc and Kovac, 2000).

Furthermore, several studies have shown that well formulated strategies only produce superior performance for the firm when they are successfully implemented (Robinson and Pearce, 1984; Noble, 1999). Even after the grand strategies are determined and long term objectives are set, the strategic management process is far from complete. The tasks of operationalizing, institutionalizing and controlling the strategy still remain a challenge. These tasks revolve around strategy implementation which translates strategic thought into strategic action.

The rate and magnitude of changes that affect organizations are increasing dramatically. More often than not the uncertainty of organizational environments poses serious challenges to many organizations. Moreover, managers in today's organizations are under fire throughout the world. Their ability to manage the affairs of the organizations is being called to question. The emergence of strict government regulations, corporate critics, and media attacks, and most importantly, substantial

competitions have put today's managers under watch. Managers therefore need to think strategically. Strategies constitute a means to an end and these ends are concerned with the purpose and objectives of the organization (Karami, 2007).

Due to these pressures, Mintzberg and Quinn (1991) note that managers make decisions quickly, often on the move and base their decisions on intuition and experience than reflection. They argue that the decision managers make take less than ten minutes and only ten percent take more than one hour. This trend calls for effective strategic management to enable managers to adapt effectively to changes in order to achieve organizational goals over the long run. The critical tasks managers are required to undertake are formulation of strategy, implementation and evaluation of strategy. The underlying issue is that managers must have new strategic management concepts that permit them to see their jobs realistically. These concepts help managers to view the world as it is today not as they think in order to confront and overcome the challenges that many organizations face.

This study focuses on the challenges to strategy implementation at TUM. This is an education institution of higher learning offering degree, diploma, higher diploma and certificate courses in various disciplines. Education institutions play a pivotal role in Kenya's economic development initiatives in many aspects. Education industry is an important sector because it trains the most qualified persons required in the job market by producing engineers, doctors, lawyers, teachers, technicians among others. These institutions are expected to provide quality education and quality services to all which can only be achieved through well thought strategies that would meet the set

goals and objectives. Best strategy implementation practices if adapted would aid organization managers succeed achieving the organizational objectives.

1.1.1 Public universities in Kenya

According to The Commission for Higher Education (CHE) Hand book (2011), public universities in Kenya are established through institutional acts of parliament. As service providers, public universities are mandated to offer academic programmes ranging from certificate to degrees courses. All public universities in Kenya receive capitation from the government. Among them are University of Nairobi (UON) which was established in 1970; Moi University (MU)-1984; Kenyatta University (KU)-1985; Egerton University (EU)-1987; Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT)-1994; Maseno University (MSU)-2001; and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology (MMUST)-2007.

In 2007, several university colleges were established by legal order under the Act of the university shown in brackets against each as indicated below: Kisii university college (EU); Kimathi University College of technology (JKUAT); Mombasa polytechnic university college (JKUAT); Kenya polytechnic university college (UON); Pwani university college (KU) among others. To date the above university colleges are chartered and expected to compete with the earlier established public universities. In 1985, The Commission for Higher Education (CHE) was established to regulate, coordinate and assure quality in higher education as a result of growth and expansion of the university sector in Kenya. The commission was therefore established by an Act of Parliament (Universities Act chapter 210B), as a body corporate to make better provisions for the advancement of quality university

education in Kenya. CHE looks at the strides made in ensuring the maintenance of standards, quality and relevance in all aspects of higher education, training and research. It provides a forum for all participating institutions to showcase their latest programmes, activities and future projections. For the advancement and quality assurance of university education, public universities are required to operate on the principle of best practices, while upholding quality assurance as a continuous process requiring flexibility and adjustments. Universities are also expected to embrace partnership and an all inclusive approach that ensures shared goals so that the kind of education offered to Kenyans by higher education institutions is of high quality.

According to CHE Hand book (2011), the rising demand of access has led to cases of unchecked enrolment which has had an impact on the quality of programmes offered. It is imperative that all institutions maintain programmes that are dynamic and responsive to expectations of market demands in line with Vision 2030. The bottom-line is to produce graduates that adapt and fit in the economic and technological global system. Individual universities have institutionalised internal procedures for attainment of appropriate standards for ensuring and enhancing the quality of the education provided.

The expected enactment of the university Bill hopefully will extend the work of CHE to public universities. Kenya's higher education system will take cognizance of enactment of the Bill, on-going reforms and other emerging issues in the provision of education. CHE Hand book (2011), warns that challenges and opportunities created by internationalization and cross-border higher education are likely to deeply affect education sector. Issues such as: development or regional, continental and even

international standards, infrastructure, evaluation and accreditation processes; increasing demands for closer scrutiny of trans-national higher education; credit accumulation and credit transfer are among challenges to be addressed. Since CHE was established to make better provisions for the advancement and quality assurance of university education in Kenya and for connected purposes, two and a half decades later, the university education landscape has broadened in scope both in terms of number of institutions and programmes offered.

The commission has to ensure that this rapid growth does not compromise quality by verifying resources in private and newly established constituent colleges and the newly chartered universities. The commission mainstreams quality assurance practices in higher education and encourages continuous improvement in the management of the quality of university education. This is mainly accomplished through a peer process of audits and reviews. Through these processes, a total of 11 universities have been awarded charters 10 granted letters of interim authority, 2 approved for award of charter and 2 with certificate of registration. Much as both public and private universities in Kenya remain autonomous, self governing institutions, they are required to be responsible for the standards and quality of their academic awards and programmes.

1.1.2 Technical University of Mombasa (TUM)

Technical University of Mombasa (TUM) has evolved through many phases since its inception. It started as an institution providing technical education (craft courses) solely to Muslim students pursuing technical and professional courses up to Higher National Diploma and Professional Accountancy (CPA, part 111) in 1940. On 22nd,

June, 1948, the then Governor of Kenya signed the charter bringing the Mombasa Institute of Muslim Education (MIOME) into being, managed by board of governors. Upon its inception, MIOME was charged with the prime objective of providing adequate technical education to Muslim students of East Africa.

The institute was opened to Muslim students on the 9th, May, 1951 for the technical courses of four years each. To play full role in the development of education system of independent Kenya, the institution admitted qualified students of all creeds. It was on this basis that in 1966 MIOME became Mombasa Technical Institute (MTI) and in 1972 it became known as The Mombasa Polytechnic being the second National polytechnic in Kenya. Since then the polytechnic has expanded its operations in all directions and dimensions. By Legal order no. 160 of 23rd, August 2007, the institution was converted to Mombasa polytechnic university college (MPUC) a constituent of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT). Grounded on the same order, the institution was granted charter in February 2013 which saw the institution change its name from Mombasa Polytechnic University College to Technical University of Mombasa. MPUC Corporate strategic plan covered five years (2006-2009) with the main purpose of facilitating transition into a full university status. However, owing to the need for full fledged university fresh demands, a new and suitable strategic plan (2010-2014) became necessary.

In light of this, TUM's vision as stated in its strategic plan is to transform the institution into "A World class university of Engineering Science and Technology." The strategic plan focus areas include; development of more academic programmes, infrastructure, information communication technology, research, innovation and

extension, human resource management, finance, enterprise and so on. The plan highlights measures to not only review existing diploma programmes but also to develop suitable and relevant degree (undergraduate and post graduate) programmes that meet the needs of the industry. As its core mandate, therefore, TUM strives to offer accessibility to quality education and training in Bachelor of Science programmes, diploma and certificate courses in both science and social studies for the country to achieve vision 2030, through innovation. It is on this understanding that the institution has strove to produce a strategic plan that will direct all its activities towards supporting the ideals and aspirations of the Kenyan Citizens.

The expanded academic programmes pose challenges on infrastructure, finance and human resource. A key role of a university that is wishing to attract the market is to conduct research, participation in innovation and disseminate the findings to industry (society), this role also is a challenge. Finance has been identified as a major resource together with human resource to fully actualize the university status. These two resources are given special treatment in terms of acquiring, expanding and developing programmes. While addressing a congregation during the award of charter to TUM by his Excellency the retired president H^{on}. Mwai Kibaki, on 30th January, 2013 the acting vice-chancellor, Professor Josephat Ziro Matelah admitted there were many challenges the institution faces "...indeed it was a challenge to attain all the required standards, and we acknowledge the mentorship by our mother university- JKUAT..."

The implementation aspects of the strategic plan require a detailed implementation plans indicating specific target areas, leadership and resources. TUM's each strategic focus area has been supported by an appropriate implementation plan for example,

departmental strategic plan which form the basis of the corporate plan also provides important details of necessary action. Monitoring and evaluation are important components in ensuring that the strategic plan is implemented well and in controlling to achieve the set goals. TUM has set performance indicators and applications of various qualitative and quantitative methods of collecting data. Also monitoring and evaluation focus on all priority areas set out in the strategic plan.

1.2 Research Problem

Strategy implementation has attracted much less attention in strategic and organizational research. Several reasons are advanced towards this statement, among the reasons are that people overlook it because of a belief that anyone can do it, it is less glamorous, people are not exactly sure what it includes and where it begins and where it ends. Furthermore, there are only limited numbers of conceptual models of strategic implementation (Alexander, 1991).

Organizations seem to have difficulties in implementing strategies, however, researchers reveal a number of problems in strategy implementation. For example, weak management roles in implementation; a lack of communication, lack of commitment to the strategy, unawareness or misunderstanding of the strategy, unaligned organization systems and resources, poor coordination and sharing of responsibilities, inadequate capabilities, competing activities and uncontrollable environmental factors(Alexander,1991;Lare-Mankki,1994;Beer and Eisenstat,2000). In Kenya, organizations operate under increasing competitive changing environment. In order to survive and deliver the goods and services effectively, there is need to engage in effective strategic management process. All organizations must grapple

with challenges of the changing environments in which they operate (Kiruthi, 2003). Various organizations develop and /or formulate their strategies variously, whatever the process, each organization ends up with what is called a strategy. According to Mintzberg and Quinn (1991), 90 percent of well formulated strategies fail at the implementation.

Also, David (2005) notes that only 10 percent of formulated strategies are successfully implemented. Furthermore, Haberberg and Riepel (2008) argue that the fact that management is sensitive to the context in which strategy is applied, one cannot assume that strategy implementation challenges are similar across various industries unless backed by empirical evidence through research findings hence, the fundamental basis of this study. The outcome of this study will no doubt provide useful information on strategy implementation challenges facing new public universities which evolved from tertiary institutions.

Many studies have been carried out however, none has especially examined strategy implementation challenges at TUM hence justification for this study. For example, Dwallow (2007) conducted a study on strategy implementation challenges of firms in the packing industries in Nairobi and found out that many managers in Kenya find themselves under severe competition and ever changing business environment. He recommends that in order to survive and deliver goods and services effectively, managers require sound strategic management process which not only address the formulation but also in-built sound implementation program. Also, Kung'u (2007) carried out a study on strategy implementation challenges in the mainstream churches in Kenya.

One of her findings was that organizational goals were not being understood by the employees. From the mentioned studies and many others, most of them are manufacturing industries based or non-governmental presenting different context hence, a gap exists. Strategy implementation requires actions and activities which obviously differ between manufacturing industries, service and governmental organizations which is why a study on challenges of strategy implementation in the context of a newly established public university (TUM) which represents new universities in Kenya whose origin is tertiary institutions is necessary so that the perceived gap is addressed. The study will specifically address the following questions: What are the strategy implementation practices at TUM? What challenges are encountered by TUM during the implementation of its strategies?

1.3 Research Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to investigate the strategic management processes at TUM. The specific objectives are:

- i. To establish strategy implementation practices adapted by TUM
- ii. To establish challenges encountered by TUM in implementing its strategies

1.4 Value of the study

The study seeks to identify strategy implementation challenges at TUM and also establish measures taken to deal with such challenges. With the increasing demand for University education, more tertiary institutions are getting converted to offer degree courses. The newly chartered universities are forced to respond to this demand pressed on the limited structure and inadequate funding. TUM is chosen as a setting

because of the changes that it has undergone namely; from Tertiary Institution to a University College and finally TUM.

TUM also plays a significant role as a service provider of education and training, offering science, social studies and technical based programmes ranging from certificates, diploma and degree with special focus on Technical, Industrial, Vocational Entrepreneurship and Training (TIVET). It also further access to TIVET graduates research and innovation undertakings. In so doing, it is imperative to undertake a study on TUM strategy implementation practices and challenges.

The findings of this study, is hoped will provide useful information to policy makers, mangers of strategic change and stakeholders on the extent to which strategy implementation can be addressed. Additionally, it is hoped the information will have wider applicability across University Colleges in Kenya, particularly those involved in the strategic management of change in the area of learning. More so, strategy implementation is increasingly being carried out in every sector and as it continues, many scholars are coming up to study either a successful strategy implementation or a failed one, this study will therefore provide an avenue to scholars of the preceding interests.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents theoretical arguments based on empirical evidence on strategy, discusses strategic management process, strategy implementation and challenges of implementation. Finally, the section provides a summary of the discussion, showing its relevance to the topic under study.

2.2 Theoretical foundation of the study

Several scholars have come up with a wide range of conceptual frameworks regarding strategy on small, medium and large organizations. Early scholars (Chandler, 1962; Ansoff, 1965; Andrews, 1971) in the field of strategy regarded strategy as a rational decision making process by which the organizations resources are matched with opportunities arising from the competitive environment. Others have stated that, environment has a strong domestic influence on the strategy making process in organizations (Porter, 1980; Bourgeois and Brodwin, 1984; Flood, Dromgoole, Carroll, Gorman, 2000).

The resource based view proponents however, argue that, it is not environment but the resources of the organization which should be considered as the foundation of the strategy (Grant, 1991; Boxall and Steenveld, 1999). Despite the apparent differences, these approaches to strategy have one thing in common; they all aim at maximizing performance by improving one organizations position in relation to other organizations in the same competitive environment and that is how the organization is differentiated from its competitors. The success and rapid growth of many organizations have largely

capabilities and company planning practices. Though interest in small business management has sharply increased on strategic management, much of it remains conceptual in approach. The few empirical studies that do exist have been criticised on the grounds that they lack academic rigour and do not illuminate the perceived relationship between formal strategic management and organizational performance (Shrader, Mulford and Blackburn, 1989).

Accepting the rational model of strategy, traditional thinkers define strategy in terms of planning to arrive at the optimum strategy for a given context. Chaffee (1985) argues that plans are naturally based on a linear model of decision making. Ansoff (1965) views planning as a process and divides it into two main stages: formulation and implementation. He points out that the formulation of a strategy is the prerogative of top management and more importantly it is a rational exercise, involving the objective analysis of company resources and external environment in which the company operates. Planning is often seen as the key to a company's success (Leidecker and Bruno, 1986), since it reduces uncertainty, it ensures that alternatives are considered and assists managers in dealing with investors (O'Gorman and Cunningham, 1997).

Robinson and Pearce (1984) observe that strategic planning is a contingent upon the nature of the business itself which includes the skills of the owner-managers and their predisposition to planning, company size and stage of development. Berry (1998) conducted a survey of 257 companies and found out that small high-tech firms do use strategic planning to direct their long-term growth, bearing in mind that planning processes become more complicated as firms grow. Bhide (1994) however notes that the value and applicability of strategic planning for the small firm has been questioned

by some who argue that lack of financial resources and constraints on management time are seen as obstacles to strategic planning. Mintzberg (1979) on the other hand argues that strategic planning loses its meaning in dynamic environment, where innovation, flexibility and responsiveness to perishable opportunities are key conditions for survival. While the majority of scholars share the view that formal planning is a necessity, they also acknowledge that planning in small firms should be different from that of large corporations (Carson and Cromie, 1989). It is therefore suggested that making the correct choices at start-up is crucial since investments made in people, technology and fixed assets cannot be easily altered.

As a departure from the rationalist theorists, Mintzeberg (1987) and McCarty and Leavy (2000), view strategy not much as the outcome of point-in-time planning exercise but more as a pattern in a stream of decisions made over time. For example Mintzeberg coined the term strategy formulation to highlight the empirical reality that strategies emerged over time and are often not realized as intended. Pettigrew and Whipp (1991) argue that a clear distinction between strategy formulation and implementation does not really exist. They have highlighted a no-linear nature of the strategy process. Thus, powerful political and cultural forces in large organizations tend to result in the convergence of planning and execution (Pettigrew, 1987; Johnson.1992; Pfeffe, 1994).

Quinn (1980) argues that the development of strategies is a process of logical incrementalism where managers implement strategies in a purposeful but gradual manner in order to minimize risk, hence remaining opportunistic, and experiment and learn, and fashion a broad consensus for change. Leavy and Wilson (1994) conducted a

study of Irish firms where they illustrated the interplay between leadership in the context of industry and history in the shaping of strategic outcomes. They skilfully show how leaders might best be viewed as “tenants of time and context” The tacit assumption in this argument is that strategies are not the outcome of a highly analytical and rational process. Instead strategists need to capture soft data such as feeling, intuition, vision, learning and judgement as well as hard data (Mintzberg, 1979; Quinn, 1980; Mintzberg, 1994).

Internal environment of the firm has been supported by many scholars (Hanlon and Scott, 1995; Meyer and Heppard, 2000). A study by Hanlon and Scott (1995) found that entrepreneurs were able to persuade others to buy into their dream or vision that they believe shapes the development of the firm. Another study by Bouwen and Steyaert (1990), located in the in the resource based school of thought, found that the values and core competencies of the firm tend to change in the growth phase.

2.3 Strategy implementation

Effective strategy implementation is an important part of strategic management process in the organization. Karami (2007) identifies key elements managers need to adapt in the strategy implementation process. They include organization structure, human resources, quality of leadership, costing of programmes and flexibility of business plans. Also (Rosen (1995) points out that implementation of a chosen strategy requires making any necessary adaptations to organization structure, the systems and people of the organization and managing the required acquisition of deployment of resources. To implement strategy successfully, attention must be paid to a number of organizational issues. Organizational managers must consider the role of structure, and exercising

appropriate leadership issues, especially structure. Miller (1988) and Hrebiniak (1990) argue that a firm's performance is correlated with the use of structural features that must support the strategy. Gupta (1987) examines the relationship between small business units (SBUs) strategies, aspects of the corporate- SBU relationship and the implementation and found that, structures that are more decentralized produce higher level of SBU effectiveness, regardless of the strategic context.

Drazin and Howard (1984) suggest that a proper strategy structure alignment is necessary if successful implementation of new business strategies is to be achieved. Goldsmith (1995) observes that implementing a strategy is critical. He identifies two main aspects namely; formal and informal which he recognises as organizational structure and culture respectively. Similarly, Johnson and Scholes (2002) point out that successful strategy implementation hinges on three strands namely; organizational structures, organizational processes and the management relationship. Culture refers to a company's values, traditions, and operating style.

Culture may be strong or weak. Strong cultures are difficult to change without great effort, time, and substantial disruption. Thus, companies with strong cultures are wise to adopt strategies consistent with their cultures. Doing otherwise creates implementation problems. Deal & Kennedy, (2006) note that organizational cultures influence the daily operation which in turn affects strategy implementation, either positively or negatively. That is, culture would influence what is acceptable or unacceptable in the organization.

Going by these arguments, some companies can recognize when a shift in direction is necessary, and have both the management competence and organizational culture required for successful change. Others do not. For example, it took many years for the management of General Motors (GM) to recognize the seriousness of the threat posed by Asian competitors. Once those executives were alert to the threat, their well intended plans for change were hobbled by a vast organization, installed plants, and labour contracts that made change difficult and painfully slow. Employees and critics alike joked that GM stood for “glacial movement” (Harvard Business Essentials, 2005). Like GM, every established organization faces problems of flexibility and adaptability to a greater or lesser extent.

Both managerial thinking and organizational forms are required to assess the existing strategies. That is a virtue as long as the strategy makes sense, but a potential handicap when it does not. Managers therefore need to ask the question: is the company ready for change? To manage culture organizations must ensure that managers are respected and effective, people feel personally motivated to change, the organization is non-hierarchical, people are accustomed to collaborative work, there is a culture of accountability for results and performance is rewarded.

Organizations that lack these characteristics face a stiffer challenge. According to Nutt (1983) leadership style of the senior managers including the CEO can have a significant effect on implementation of strategy. He considers the link between the organizational climate and various approaches to implementation. In his view, the power base should be used in the implementation process, suggesting that managerial tactics and leadership style play critical role in overcoming the low-level

obstructionism that is prevalent to some extent in many implementation efforts. Gupta and Govindarajan (1984) address the relationship between the characteristics of SBU's general manager and the perceptions of effectiveness in strategy implementation. They found out that successful SBUs have general managers with great marketing/sale experiences, greater willingness to take risk, and greater tolerance for ambiguity. Best (1997) cites ownership of the plan, supporting the plan and adaptive planning as the three major forces that contribute to the successful implementation of strategic plans. He contends that ownership enhances the process by leveraging the unique talents of team members.

Parsa (1999) investigated the impact of source of power on franchisees strategy implementation process and eventual performance. Results from the study indicate that financial performance of the franchisees was affected by the method of implementation they chose. This study demonstrates that interaction of power sources and strategy implementation could impact a firm's performance and satisfaction and that proper match between the implementation methods and the desired outcomes is essential.

Human resource management (HRM) plays a significant role in the development and the implementation of strategies. Analoui (2000) argues that successful strategy realization is determined by the coherence of decisions and actions of all employees at all levels of the organization, and not just by the people who originally defined the strategy. He recognises the importance of human resource in the implementation of organizational strategies advising that efficient and effective communication of organizations strategy to all within the organization is fundamental. Rousseau and

Rousseau (2000) conducted a survey in association with Robert Kaplan of the Harvard Business School and Business Intelligence and found that more than 40 percent of senior managers and more than 90 percent of all employees stated they did not believe they had a clear understanding of their company's strategy.

To ensure that strategy is realised at all levels of the organization, a mechanism is necessary to direct all employees towards the same strategic performance management. Managers should therefore view human resource activities as equal to finance, operations and marketing. Johnson and Scholes (2002) observe that the development of a new strategy requires significant strategic change for the organization. Such change they argue, do not take place simply because it is considered desirable but take place if it can be made to work and put in effect by members of the organization. Generally speaking, successful business strategies are implemented when top managers view employees as the strategic resources.

Strategy implementation therefore is the managerial interventions that align organizational action with strategic intention. It is the process by which strategies and policies are put into action through the development of programmes, budgets, and procedures. Robinson & Pearce (1991) argue that to be effectively implemented, a strategy must be institutionalized and must permeate the firms' day-to-day life. They observe that organizational action is successfully initiated in three interrelated steps namely; identification of measurable, mutually determined annual objectives, development of specific functional strategy and the development and communication of concise policies to guide decisions.

2.4 Strategy implementation practices

Periodic progress review is a powerful tool for monitoring implementation of strategy. Review using the performance metrics built into each action step, makes it possible for managers to gauge how well people are doing relative to plan (Harvard Business Essentials, 2005). Weekly or monthly progress reviews are the best mechanisms for catching problems that jeopardise implementation. Johnson and Sholes (2002), point out that formal and informal organizational strategy implementation practices are crucial for effective implementation of strategy. They clarify that practices can both be controls of the firms operations that either hinder or aid in the translation of strategy into action. Indeed, a blend of these practices operates but somehow key ones are frequently used.

Feurer, Chaharbaghi and Wargin (1995) recommend direct supervision which involves direct control of strategic decisions by one or a few individuals. The practice is commonly found in small organizations though can also be adapted by larger organizations undergoing little changes however they cautioned that larger organizations undergoing massive changes might find it difficult to supervise from a central point. Small family businesses—and public sector known to have hands-on political environment have successfully used it. Additionally the practice may be appropriate where there is a major change like major transformation taking place in the business environment that threatens the survival of the organization.

Direct supervision and autocratic control is necessary. Pechlaner and Saurwein (2002) identify performance targets as yet another strategy implementation practice worth adopting by organizations irrespective of the size. Performance targets translate to the

outputs of the organization or parts of it such as the product quality, prices or its outcome such as profit (Johnson and Scholes, 2002). This is where an organization is judged either internally or externally based on its ability to meet the targets, though within specified boundaries it remains free on how targets should be achieved. In situations where corporate centre control the strategies and also control performance of business units, performance targets practice may be employed to ensure that corporate objectives are achieved.

Performance targets are usually measured using performance indicators which are either qualitative or quantitative in nature. Pechlaner and Saurwein (2002) point out that the indicators give partial view of the overall picture of the organizations performance and that it is dominated by financial analysis. In trying to deal with this weakness, balance scorecards are used to identify a varied set of key measures. Balanced score card combine both qualitative and quantitative measures while acknowledging the different stakeholders expectations and relate an assessment of performance to choice of strategy. It usually links performance to both short-term outputs and to the way implementation processes are managed.

Freedman (2003) proposes planning and control systems for successful implementation of strategies. The adaptation of this practice he explains provides systems that plan and control the allocation of resources and monitor their utilization. He observes that a good plan should be that one that covers all parts of the organization showing clearly in financial terms the level of resources allocated to each unit as well as the detailed ways in which the resources were to be used. Revenue generation forms part of the plan and actual sales are monitored against it.

He recommends flexibility in the plans and budgets in order to achieve the intended objective. The dominance of detailed planning and coordination is very useful where the degree of changes is slow. Top-down planning accompanied by standardization of the work process, output; use of ICT through the introduction of Enterprises Resource Planning Systems (ERPS) should be considered as support planning strategies which enables the integration of the entire business systems. Also formula for controlling resource allocation within the organization is employed to give room for bargaining when necessary.

Social cultural processes and self-control as strategy implementation practices are fundamentally concerned with organizations standardization of its norms. To successfully implement strategies, organization managers need to adapt them. According to Sterling (2003), the historical formal processes of coordination might have been successful in the slower moving, less complex environment; however these may be inadequate to meet the challenges of the 21st century. The Social cultural processes and self-controls within the organizations are of major importance for effective implementation of strategy. They are important particularly for organizations facing complex and dynamic environments because the fostering of innovation is crucial to survive and succeed in these circumstances.

It should therefore be allowed to flourish through social processes, which exists within and between the informal processes whereby individuals and groups interact to share and integrate their knowledge. Pechlaner and Saurwein (2002) acknowledge the importance of social processes in the organizations however they warn that if not carefully practised can create rigidities when the organization wants to change

strategy since resistance to change may be legitimised by the cultural norms. Globalization and new technologies too can undermine these processes. They observe that many organizations commit significant resources to monitoring professional networks both inside and between organizations as a method of keeping in touch with best practices, as well as investing in training and development just to maintain social processes.

Johnson and Sholes (2002) advocate for self control and personal motivation as one of the best strategy implementation practices that result in successful implementation. They argue that self control and personal motivation achieve the integration of knowledge and coordination of activities by the direct interaction of individuals without supervision. They further note that motivation of individuals and their self control has become increasingly important due to rapid changes, increasing complexities and the need to exploit knowledge.

Managers therefore need to ensure that individuals have the channels to interact and that ICT infrastructure and social processes created by this interaction are regulated to avoid rigidities. Freedman (2003) points out that organization managers need to avail the necessary resources such as information to support individual employees have a greater say in their work performance and achieve organizational goals. He argues motivation of individual employees is strongly influenced by the type of leaders and leadership style employed. Crucial as it is, the credibility of leaders may be built from a member of the peer group as a professional role model, by demonstrating and shaping a favourable context for individuals to act and interact, or from the way in which leaders interface with the business environment like in securing a budget or

winning orders. Michael (2004) carried out a study on no-governmental organizations which to a greater extent are not profit oriented, she discovered that self-control and personal motivation comes top as a process that ensures effective strategy implementation. Second on the list is planning and control systems followed by performance targets. How organizations implement their strategies is important because it influences the achievement of their desired outcomes (Muthuiya, 2004).

Organizations are therefore required to have clear methods, procedures and systems in order to be able to implement their strategies effectively and efficiently. The process also requires organizations to have the capacity at the organization level and capabilities of the relevant staff as well as an enabling environment internally and externally. The skills of staff, resources, structures and systems, culture, leadership styles, organization policies, performance and reward systems are key factors that enhance successful implementation of strategy.

2.5 Challenges of Strategy implementation

The environments in which organizations operate have become increasingly uncertain posing a lot of challenges. Bryson (1995) observes that organizations need to think strategically as never before and respond promptly by translating their insight into effective strategies in order to cope with their changed circumstances and develop rationales necessary to lay the ground work for adopting and implementing strategies in this ever changing environment. Moreover, Aosa (1992) points out that once strategies have been developed, they need to be implemented, they are of no value unless they are effectively translated into action. That strategy implementation is a nightmare to many organisations is common knowledge. Several scholars have come

up with possible factors that hinder successful implementation. Organizational structure undeniably can and does influence strategy implementation. Formulated Strategies must be workable such that when a certain new strategy requires massive structural changes, it would not be an attractive choice. In this way, structure can shape the choice of strategies. What is more important is determining the type of structural changes needed to implement the new strategies and how these changes can be best accomplished.

David (2011) for instance, provides seven basic organizational structures necessary for strategy implementation, key among them are the functional structure, the divisional, the SBU structure and so on. the existing structures and processes in the organization support only the current ways of doing things such that if the new strategy indicates that organization need to behave in different ways then the likelihood of problems occurring is high should the existing structures be used to implement the change Campbell and Yeung (1991). Where no discernible change takes place, the current structure may as well distort the intended strategy.

McCarthy & Leavy (2000) observe that creating organizational structure and attendance behaviour change is a formidable challenge to many organizations. Strategy may fail in practice if the design of the organization context is inappropriate for effective implementation and control of the strategy. Organization strategy should be compatible with the internal structure of the business and its policies, procedures and resources. Pearce and Robinson (2005) refer to culture as a set of assumptions that members of an organization share in common. There are weak and strong cultures. However, Machuki (2005) points that culture affects not only the way managers

behave within the organization but also the decisions they make about the organization in relation to its environment and its strategy. Misalignment on human resources front is a common impediment to effective strategy implementation especially the absence of linking supportive activities to strategy jeopardise implementation. Also, Wang (2002) notes that deep rooted cultural bias like resistance to implementation of new strategies; especially with defender culture is a challenge. He explains that this group see change as threatening and tend to maintain statuesque. It is therefore strategy makers' responsibility to choose strategy that is compatible with the sacred or unchangeable parts of prevailing corporate culture (Thomson and Strickland, 1998). Similarly, Kotler, Amstrong, Sownders and Wong (2009) observe that organizational culture influence the daily operations which in turn affects strategy implementation positively or negatively.

Gibbs and Yorke (2000) state that resistance to change is a critical factor that undermines strategy implementation. Also, Thomson (1996) points out that all organizations irrespective of their levels, experience a natural resistance to change arguing that social relationship is more critical than economic factors, he claims that employees feel threatened by changes and fear of the unknown. More scaring is the likelihood of them losing their jobs or status (for top management).

Thomson and Strickland (1998) explain that if a leader is not involved in the change he/she does not value the importance of change hence, may not facilitate implementation process. Supporting the proponents of resistance to change as a challenge to strategy implementation, Okumus (2003) identifies main barriers to strategy implementation which includes; lack of coordination and support from other

levels of management and resistance from lower levels management, also, lack/ poor planning activities. Hill and Jones (1999) observes that the behaviour of individuals ultimately determines the success or failure of organizations endeavours and that top management concerned with strategy and its implementation must realise change.

Additionally, Lynch (2000) notes that change may result into conflict and resistance. People working in organizations sometimes resist proposals and make strategy implementation difficult due to anxiety caused by fear of economic loss, inconvenience, uncertainty and break in normal social pattern. Many organizations face resistance to change. For example, a new strategy produces more than a change in a company's competitive stance; it also upsets the statusquo inside the organization, producing change resisters who perceive change as endangering their livelihoods, their perks, their work place social arrangements, or their status in the organization while others fear that their specialized skills will be rendered less valuable.

Resource insufficiency is another common strategy implementation challenge. Sterling (2003) identifies insufficient resources as a great challenge to strategy implementation. Also Jonson and Scholes (2002) point out that redundant resources held by established organizations hinder implementation. They claim that established organizations may experience changes in the business environment that can make a large part of their resource base redundant and that unless they are able to dispose of those redundant resources, they may be unable to free sufficient funds to invest in the new resources required and their cost base may also be too expensive. Similarly, Koske (2003) recognizes resource allocation as a factor that constrains strategy implementation, particularly if resource allocation does not march structure with

strategy linking performance and pay to strategist and creating a strategically supportive culture. The quality of organization leaders determines the success or failure of strategy implementation. Beer and Eisenstat (2004) describe ineffective senior management team as a team of members who operate within their own “silos” rather than coordinate with other team members and departments. They argue that this group destroy the collaborative perspective required for successful strategy implementation. Inefficient leadership, they observe, result in conflict, absences and the use of a top team for administrative functions rather than strategic discussions and dialogue, unclear strategies and conflicting priorities. Among the “killers” of strategy implementation, the two scholars cite top-down or laissez-faire senior management style and inadequate down-the-line leadership skills and development.

Similarly, Ceelman (1998) points out that lack of understanding of the strategies in an organization among those that are to execute strategies because they are uneasy to transform into operative goals undermine strategy implementation since they are not linked coherently to overall strategy. Management commitment to strategy implementation has a significant influence on the intensity of subordinates (Pearce and Robinson, 1991). That is the management systems often are designed for operational and not strategic control and the focus remains on the traditional management control processes.

David (2005) refers to policies as specific guidelines and administrative practices established to support and encourage stated goals. Policies are instruments for strategy implementation. Okumus (2003) discovered that a policy needs to be in place that allows for recruitment of new staff as per requirement of the new business of

strategy implementation. Strategy implementation if not effectively linked with appropriate personal policy choice, a policy that ignores adequate staffing is detrimental to strategy implementation. Machuki (2005) opines that company strategies cannot be implemented without a number of support systems to business operations. Concurring with the preceding scholars, Mintzberg and Quinn (1991) state that effective policies, procedures whether formal or informal on capital budgeting systems, training systems cost accounting and budgeting systems are crucial policies and that in their absence, strategy implementation is ineffective. Unattainable vision is yet another strategy implementation challenge.

Kaplan and Norton (1992) note that visions and strategies which are not actionable cause major challenges to strategy implementation the organizations have to deal with. Meldrum and Atkinson (1998) also note that a flawed vision of what it means to be in a strategic position with an organization and a myopic view of what is needed for successful management of operational task and projects within a strategic brief can be a problem to strategy implementation.

Kaplan and Norton (1996) argue that if an organization cannot translate its vision and strategy into terms that can be understood and acted upon then failure occurs. Organizational employees typically recognize strategic issues as important and also understand their context in generic terms. Ineffective reward system is one of the factors that undermine strategy implementation. For effective strategy implementation to take place, effective reward system must be put in place. Bryson (1995) asserts that employees must be adequately compensated for their work.

Organizations often find it difficult to carry out their strategies because they have executive compensation system that measure reward performance in a way that ignores or even frustrates strategic thinking, planning, and action. McCarthy and Leavy (2000) claim that if strategy accomplishment is to be really top priority then the reward structure must be linked explicitly and tightly to actual strategic performance. They point out that many companies put enormous effort into both strategy formulation and resource allocation process as away to improve implementation but unfortunately, efforts have not been wholly effective because the necessary measurement and reward system that completes the cycle is lacking.

According to Hill and Jones (1999), organizational politics are the tactics that strategic managers engage in to obtain and use power to influence organizational goals and change strategy and structure to further their own interest. Organizations face challenges in the internal structure of power and that always lag behind changes in the environment because the environment changes faster than the organization can respond and because they engage more in politics. Lack of proper communication system is yet another factor that poses challenges to many organizations.

Aaltonen and Ikavalko (2001) observe that the form of strategic communication in most organizations is largely written and oral communication dominated by top-down communication. According to Beer and Eisenstat (2004), 60 percent of strategy implementation failures are due to ineffective communication among executive managers and line workers. In their claim, 85 percent of management teams spend less than one hour a month on strategy issues and only 15 percent of employees understand their corporate strategy, 92 percent of organizations do not report on the

lead performance indicators (Sterling, 2003). Relating to the preceding argument, Goold (2002) notes that only 11 percent of companies employ a fully fledged strategic control system and that nearly 70 percent of all strategic plans and strategies are never successfully implemented. Echoing the above sentiment, Awino (2001) points out that inadequate information and communication systems and failure to impart new skills are problems to strategy implementation. Among the “killers “of strategy implementation, Beer and Eisenstat (2002) identify poor vertical communication, poor coordination across boundaries and conflicting priorities. In support of the preceding argument, Wang (2002) assert that communication must be two-way so as to provide information in order to improve understanding and responsibility and to motivate staff as well as provide for effective coordination of strategy implementation.

Effective communication is not a once-off activity but should be carried out throughout the implementation process which he observes in many cases, is not so and therefore communication still remains a challenge to strategy implementation. Al-Ghamdi(1998) identifies competing activities as yet another challenge of strategy implementation. He describes competing activities as those that distract attention from implementing the decision change which includes: changes in responsibilities of key employees not clearly defined, key formulators of strategic decision not playing active role in implementation, problems requiring top management involvement not communicated early enough, key implementation tasks and activities not sufficiently defined, inadequate information systems used to monitor implementation, uncontrollable factors in external environments, surfacing of major problems which had not been identified earlier, advocates and supporters of the strategic decision

leaving the organization during implementation and implementation taking more time than the scheduled one. Many challenges are encountered by organizations during the implementation of strategies. While studying business market, Sterling (2003) discovers why strategies fail. He cites the following: unanticipated market changes, lack of senior management support, applications of insufficient resources, ineffective responses to strategies, failure to buy-in, and lack of focus. He states that strategy implementation sometimes fail because they are simply ill conceived just like a case where business models are flawed because of misunderstanding of how demand would be met in the market.

Gibbs, Habeshaw and Yorke (2000) discover additional factors that might undermine strategy implementation in institutions of higher learning: loss of front-line (top manager) autonomy, bureaucratisation of teaching local practices and organizational culture, the shift from teaching to learning, inadequate funding, resistance among others. Also, Tai (2007) identifies government interference and regulations as one of the challenges facing strategy implementation.

2.6 Summary

This study reviews literature on strategic management process with special focus on strategy implementation. Strategy implementation is the managerial interventions that align organizational action with strategic intention and it is the process by which strategies and polices are put into action through the development of programmes, budgets and procedures. In this study several factors associated with effective strategy implementation including leadership, organizational structure and human resources are addressed. Strategy implementation practices such as direct supervision,

performance progress review, performance targets, social cultural processes, self control and personal motivation are highlighted. Also several challenges that organizations encounter are considered.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research design, Data collection methods and data analysis that are employed in the study. The study was done in two phases. Phase one posed questions which intended to obtain information on strategy implementation practices while phase two questions were meant to get information on strategy implementation challenges. Selected top management, heads of departments and lower level employees were interviewed in order to obtain balanced and representative information.

3.2 Research Design

This study employed a case study design. This was necessitated by the fact that the objectives of the study was to establish how TUM implements its strategy and also establish the challenges facing TUM during the implementation.

The study required an in-depth study in order to achieve the above stated objectives. An emphasis on details provides valuable insight for problem solving, evaluation and strategy. Case study designs have been used successfully by many scholars (Koske, 2003).

3.3 Data Collection

A combination of primary and secondary data was used to establish practices of strategy implementation adapted by TUM and also to identify challenges that undermine the implementation. Primary data was collected within TUM in Mombasa County. Interview

guide (Appendices A,B& C) was used to collect information from 6 key people within TUM through in-depth interviews. The researcher personally interviewed the employees. This provided opportunity to clarify any issues that arose during the interview as well as gaining additional information. While secondary data was based on TUM's strategic plan 2010-2014, TUM profile, the business plan 2004-2009, TUM Academic Policy Manual, and the institution's News letter of February-April 2011 also the Ministry of Higher Education Institutions Handbook 2011. All these provided additional information and also aided the researcher with authentic and valid information sufficient enough to draw conclusions.

3.4 Data Analysis

Data was analyzed qualitatively using content analysis. Nachmias and Nachmias (1996) define content analysis as a technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics of messages and using the same to relate trends. Mbogo (2003) and Nyameya (2005) who employed this kind of approach argued that it is useful in gaining fresh materials in what was thought to be unknown.

The study employed content analysis to transcribe into information the interview data according to the responses given by key interviewees at TUM on the basis of the responses they give as guided by a list of pre-designed interview guide (Appendix A&B). The interview questions were fielded to about 6 key employees within TUM and then their responses were analysed for validity and reliability.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study with regard to objectives and discussions. The study intended to achieve two objectives. The first one was to establish the strategy implementation practices at TUM, and the second one was to determine the challenges facing TUM during the implementation process.

4.2 Strategy implementation practices at TUM

The study tried to establish how TUM implements its documented strategic plan of five years (2010-2014). For this objective to be achieved, the researcher studied the practices adopted by TUM management. The findings of this study indicate that TUM has a vision and mission whose main theme of transforming the institution into a World Class University of Engineering, Science and Technology which is to be achieved through the following pillars: offering quality Technical Education and Training through promotion of Scholarship, Entrepreneurship, Research and Innovation and Outreach to community for Industrial and Technological Development

TUM implements its strategies by developing planning and control systems setting performance targets on semester and yearly basis. The institution also adapts direct supervision of the implementation process. The study found out that some market mechanisms and cultural practices are carried out by individual departments and units within the University. The study revealed that the institution spells out in its strategic plan the major strategic thrusts and action plans designed for each specific unit to

draws it autonomous plan and action plans which upon implementation leads to the attainment of the overall objectives and goals of the institution. TUM's strategic focus areas include: Development of new academic programmes and review of the existing ones; Research, Science and Technology and Innovation; Access and Equity; Infrastructure; Information Communication Technology; Transition Management Quality and Relevance; Manpower plan and Human Resource Development; Student Management and Focus; Linkages and Collaboration; MPUC Marketing Plan, Finance and Resource Mobilization; Drug and Substance Abuse, HIV/AIDs Prevention and Mitigation. These focus areas define the institutions main business.

To translate the strategies and action plans into action and then into acceptable results, this study established that the choice of an implementation practice is determined by the area in which the implementation activities are undertaken like departments, units/sections even though a number of the practices are common across the areas. The study found out that direct supervision which involves direct control of strategic decisions by one or a few individuals is practised. This is commonly prevalent at departmental, faculty or unit levels.

In developing new academic programmes and reviewing the existing ones, it was established that academic staff in their respective departments are directly involved and are guided by the respective heads of departments who ensure that both the new programmes and reviewed ones are quality and market driven and also meet international standards before they are presented to the faculty dean and finally presented to the senate for approval using the CHE standards. With regard to Research, Science, Technology and Innovation, The director of this unit coordinates

the activities with various staff and students from different departments in order to enhance and promote research and extension activities of TUM. The acting vice chancellor (Ag.VC) and the acting deputy vice chancellor (Ag Dpt VC, AA) supervise them. To implement access and equity strategy, the study established that the institution provides modern infrastructure suitable for people with disability and special needs. Also affirmative action policies are developed direct equitable enrolment and recruitment of both gender. The institution has also opened three satellite campuses (in Lamu, Kwale and Marine) to cater for the ever growing varied needs. Business and Scholarship are also provided.

The staff development committee ensures the proper implementation of access and equity. Concerning infrastructure, the changing status of the institution into three distinct levels (from tertiary to University College and to full fledge university) poses unique requirements and demands to the institution. The study found out that the existing infrastructure is in adequate and to respond to this demand TUM embarks on constructing more lecture halls, accommodation hostels, dining halls, libraries, laboratories and so on. To achieve this strategy the institution has adopted a master plan for infrastructural requirements. The Ag.VC and the Ag. Deputy vice chancellor finance and planning (Ag. Dpt VC FP) supervise the activities. In order to acquire land and equipments and other necessary materials to increase teaching space, workshops, laboratories reading and studying facilities the procurement procedures are followed and tender committees are involved.

As far as Information communication technology (ICT) is concerned, this strategic focus area is meant to provide ICT solutions to support the management of the

university. The study revealed that the implementation of this strategy involves the director of ICT and the two acting deputies (AA and FP) together with the procurement officer. With regard to transition management, both the Ag. Dpt VC FP & AA ensure that there is requisite operational legal framework by drawing MPUC statutes, academic policy, quality assurance policy and student's rules and regulations manual.

The study also established that quality and relevance strategy is implemented through institutionalization of quality management systems. The main purpose is to ensure the institution develops market driven programmes with a view to achieving vision 2030. The director of quality assurance and the Ag. Dpt VC AA do market survey, review programmes, and benchmark. To achieve this quality management manuals are provided, internal auditors, quality assurance director and Ag. Dpt VC FP are involved in continuous supervision also of ISO.

The study discovered that Human Resource (HR) manpower and development strategy is meant to develop the existing staff by equipping them with relevant skills and attitudes in order to attract competent personnel in readiness to provide quality education. To implement this strategy, HR development policy is put in place, the human resource officer is directs the implementation process and also ensures the capacity building of staff, recruitment of qualified staff is achieved through workshops and seminars and also carry out work environment baseline survey. The two Ag. Dpt. VC are responsibility partners in implementing this strategy whose duration is continuous. One of the main objectives of TUMs strategies is to offer quality service to its clients (students).

Concerning student management strategy, the objective of this strategy is to offer conducive environment for student's campus life. The study established that the implementation of this strategy is coordinated by the dean of students. The students are also involved through their representative body known as Technical University of Mombasa Students Union (TUMSU) officials. The activities are supervised by both Ag. Dpt VC FP and AA. This can be achieved through institutionalization of policies for the well being of the students and developing student's information manuals. The study also found out that through TUMSU sporting and games activities are being promoted, catering services are being improved, reliable security services are also being enhanced. The building of modern hostels is on course. Through TUMSU, co-curriculum activities, open door policy, and guidance and counselling services are offered.

With regard to linkages and collaboration strategy whose main idea is to build manpower, physical and financial capacity of TUM, the study established that a number of collaborations take place and joint researches are also undertaken depending on the needs assessment. The implementation process is coordinated by director of research under the supervision of the Ag. VC and his two deputies. According to the report by the directorate of research and innovation performance indicators reveal that on a rating scale, TUM implementation of this strategy is 50 percent.

Concerning marketing plans, TUMs marketing plan thrives on the objective of the preferred public institution of higher learning in Engineering, Science and Technology in the Coast Province and in particular Mombasa County. This strategy

can be achieved through offering market driven training programmes, vigorously market TUM to prospective clients (students, parents, sponsors and so on) , collect relevant market resources and provide quality teaching, learning and practical oriented training programmes. The offices of public relations and marketing and exhibitions coordinate these activities though supervised by the Ag.VC and his two deputies (Ag. Dpt VC FP and Ag AA).

The study established that finance and resource mobilization strategy intends to consolidate the existing sources of funding and also to identify additional sources of funding. In order to achieve this strategy, the study found out that TUM first ensures that only bonafide students sign the nominal roll, it also delinks income generating activities from mainstream University functions. For effective management of income generating units, the institution Enterprises unit is registered and headed by a director who does the management and supervised by the Ag.VC and his two deputies (Ag. Dpt VC FP and Ag. AA). In this respect, the study established that market survey is continuous to inform the institution on which programme to develop. Government grants, scholarship trusts, as found out by the study add value to the implementation process.

Much as drug and substance abuse, HIV/AIDs prevention and mitigation is the last strategic focus area by no means it should be seen as a lesser strategy in terms of implementation. To achieve this strategy, the study established that TUM intends to prevent, control and manage drug and substance abuse, HIV/AIDs by setting up relevant centres. For example, HIV/AIDs unite and counselling centres are put up in strategic points within the institution to provide guidance and counselling services,

provide sufficient training, information and education. Communication on drugs and substance abuse is given prominence. The officer in charge of HIV/AIDS unit coordinates the activities through workshops and seminars. They also distribute and display relevant materials to this effect. Periodic Public lectures and campaigns are conducted to enhance communication on the same.

The Ag.VC supervises the management of these activities as they are managed by the officers in charge of the two units. In summary, from the findings of this study, direct supervision involves the direct control of strategic decisions by one or few individuals, mostly chief executive officer (CEO), and the directors, in charge of various units, deans of faculties and chairmen of departments (COD) in charge of various departments/sections. In all departments, it was established that the respective teams are directly supervised by their respective immediate bosses to ensure that they deliver. Customer members follow ups, finding potential clients, maintaining clients' satisfaction are undertaken periodically in order to hit the objectives as far as membership recruitment is concerned.

The study also revealed that departments individually develop plans for short courses and to ensure availability of participants so as to make profits as per the budget. This is drawn from a comprehensive plan designed at the beginning of the year, which outlines all the courses to be offered within that year and the costing. Such plan enables proper budgeting and eventual control of activities. The plan broadly guides the departments' teams on what is expected of them at the department level. The study also established that TUM sets performance targets to implement its strategies.

The study found out that the targets are set for all levels except they differ in magnitude depending on the level. At the top management level, TUM in consultation with the directors of units and deans of faculties set targets for each unit and faculty/department. The targets are set in light of what a unit or department has been able to achieve previously. Also targets are set in terms of the number of new academic programmes developed and reviewed, the number of students enrolled, the number of research activities among others, task operation times also considered. The targets are set to act as motivational tools to implement strategies within the set times because some attract special incentives.

4.3 Challenges of strategy implementation at TUM

This chapter presents the challenges faced by TUM during its strategy implementation. The study observed that TUM operates in a complex context. For example the nature of the industry in which the institution operates presents an environment that is very challenging, in addition the study established that the market in which TUM is organized has been dictated by the nature of services it is offering. Both aspects expose TUM to tremendous challenges as it endeavours to translate its strategy into action and then into acceptable results. One of the objectives of this study was to establish what challenges TUM is facing in implementing its strategies and determine their nature and source.

The study noted that TUM faces varied challenges at different levels of the organization and also at different strategic focus areas. However, some challenges cut across all levels and all strategic focus areas hence, are common across the board. The levels and strategic focus areas form the basis under which the challenges get

manifested and have been used to develop themes under which the challenges are analysed and discussed. The study further notes that the identified challenges at the different levels and strategic focus areas are either caused by internal or external factors or both.

4.3.1 Organization structure

Generally organization structure defines the roles, responsibilities, boundaries, processes and procedures, and relationships of the various positions. All these define the organization structure. For example at the top management level it is the responsibility of the CEO and his/her team to harmonize the implementation process in all the divisions of the institution with respect to the core business of TUM, the CEO is mandated to ensure the divisions work towards achieving the overall organizational goals and objectives. He /she is therefore expected to constitute the support of financial management and HRM among others outside the division specific business. The study views organization structures as one that provides impetus for the divisions and therefore has a crucial role in ensuring strategies are implemented efficiently and effectively.

It was the intention of this study to establish whether TUM's structural design support or impedes strategy implementation. Some interviewees felt that the structure was good enough to support strategy implementation process at TUM while the majority believe the structure slightly support the implementation of TUMs strategies. Those who supported the structure argue that TUMs structure is designed in such a way that it represents all levels in the organization from the CEO to academic divisions and non academic divisions thus the top management is in constant contact

with the lower level staff through their representatives in the hierarchy while those who are against the structure argue that most of the qualified and skilled staff are not considered, leaving the less qualified staff to deal with issues beyond their capacity.

The study revealed that the institutions structural design is tailored to meet the nature of business it is engaged in, hence inevitable but necessary and appropriate. However, in as much as the structure constitutes managers with long outstanding experience, unquestionable professional skills in their respective areas coupled with high degree of commitment towards effective and efficient strategy implementation, all geared towards achieving the organizational objectives, the study established challenges that they face in the process. For instance, some aspects of TUM structure were found to hinder successful strategy implementation.

The structure defines reporting procedures which prove to be unnecessarily long and time consuming, hence delaying the decision making process. The study also discovered that TUMs structure breeds a lack of authority especially where decisions to be made by one or more top management are constrained yet it is perceived that such decisions ought to originate from such officers. Notably, there lacks a clear line of authority on decisions to be made by the deans of faculties and the CODs, the ENT.director and the registrar academics affairs, the HR executives among others to the extent that there were duplication of activities and or the officers work at cross-purpose. Such lack of clarity raises the crucial question on the positioning and definition of some of the functions in the structure.

On further probing, the study established that lack of express line authority has led to some line managers deviating from their functions and as a result interferes with the others functions. These structural design issues are pertinent and hinder effective and efficient strategy implementation at TUM. The study established that the structure results into many positions causing confusion to some people while to others, some positions are unnecessary and can be done away with. However, the study observed that it is the nature and complexity of TUM's business that dictates the creation of such positions.

4.3.2 Organization culture

Many organizations strategy implementation fail because they address only structural issues and do not focus enough attention on engaging their people in the process. Most managers commit themselves in new ways of doing things ignoring the involvement and contribution of the workforce. Organization culture refers to the organizations ways of conducting its business. It constitutes norms, values and believes that are held overtime in the course of doing its business. The match between strategy and culture is crucial for successful implementation of strategy. The study sought to find out whether the culture at TUM supports strategy implementation.

TUM has evolved through three distinct stages (from tertiary institution to MPUC and finally to TUM) hence, its ways of doing things has been established over time. There is certainly a mix of values and beliefs that have been practised over time by people who have had senior management positions for a considerable long period of time. These aspects have been instilled in the other organizational members and define the way their ways of doing things. The study established that some aspects of

culture promote negative attitudes among staff towards implementation of strategies. For example the culture of seeking approval on every decision to be taken and rigid procedures (bureaucracy) followed create laxity hence drag implementation.

It is not the whole mix of values and beliefs that justify support for strategy implementation, some of them hinder successful implementation of the documented strategies. This study established that some aspects of TUMs culture are not supportive enough. For instance, the industry is fast developing and this pose a lot of stiff competition to the institution hence, it is necessary for the management to adopt fast to such development in order to survive in such competitive environments. Instances of resistance of top management to important initiatives were also discovered.

The study noted that crucial information concerning new initiatives is controlled by the management. There is reluctance and low morale within TUM staff. The majority of the interviewees concur that the culture was not conducive enough for strategy implementation. A few said that culture was not supportive at all. Most interviewees attribute elements of reluctance, resistance and low morale to financial constraints within TUM, there was no enthusiasm as they sometimes would be idle for a long time. They however, expressed confidence that they were up to task and that if TUM was well funded, the morale would be high and culture would be supportive.

The study found out that the trimester culture was causing students unrest in some departments. Some students would like to have a semester system while others would like to continue with the trimester so these conflicting interests hinder effective

implementation of academic programmes in some departments. It is truism that a match between strategy and policies, processes and procedures make strategy implementation successful. The study established that TUM has laid down broad policy guidelines and the procedures and processes to be followed in undertaking any action. However it was noted that some of the policies, procedures and processes hinder successful strategy implementation. As noted by this study some of them are rigid and are unnecessarily expensive in terms of time and money. The phenomenon is attributed to the beuaracretic culture of handling issues that involves long processes and procedures in the light of outdated policies resulting into actions even when urgent cases take too long to be addressed. The study also established that too much paper work arises from such processes making it so tedious and cumbersome handling them. Claim for part- time teaching was found to be a victim of this culture too.

4.3.3 Leadership style

Successful strategy implementation requires leaders to focus on the right strategic goals, led and championed by senior managers, that unite an organization behind the strategy, determines the measures and the milestones of success and makes sure that resources-financial, technological and human are allocated effectively, the mangers also ensure that freedom is granted to all parts of the organization. Individuals, teams, suppliers, and strategic partners encouraged to be creative in finding new ways of carrying out new goals. Thus leadership style of the senior managers including the CEOs has a significant effect on implementation of strategy. It was the aim of this study to determine TUMs leadership support towards its strategy implementation.

It was established that management support is hardly granted in some strategic focus areas. For instance, the suggestion for the development of some new academic programmes gets resistance from senior management. The study also found out that there is lack of appreciation that some training programmes are necessary yet these will go a long way in developing organizational capabilities in implementing its strategies. They are perceived as costly and time wasting activities rather than value adding.

It was also discovered that some TUM strategies take longer time to be implementation than originally planned due to a number of reasons most of which are unique and peculiar to departments. For example some new programmes in the faculty of Engineering fail to take off due to lack of qualified technical staff, room capacity and equipments. Lack of qualified facilities may also make the running of short courses impossible or cause delay. Obstacles encountered during implementation include lack of cooperation between the players, lack of coordination among others. In order to have an impact and to avoid duplication of activities, it is essential that managers in their respective departments, faculties, units and so on effectively coordinate their activities.

The study established that there was weak coordination between the top management and line management. The study revealed that some managers seem to work on their own with little or no liaison and coordination with others. The study further established that the uniqueness of some departments limit to a greater extent the degree of coordination and collaboration among their leaders.

The only collaborative aspect is based on finance where finances from highly generating departments are used to finance projects in other lowly generating departments when the former does not need the cash immediately. Effective communication throughout strategy formulation to implementation processes offers a great success to strategy implementation. Strategies can only be sustained by clarity of purpose and clarity can only be achieved through changes of behaviour. Strategy should be communicated and must be clearly understood by all implementers. The coherence of decisions and actions of all employees at all levels of the organization is fundamental, the study found this to be lacking at TUM.

The study sought to find out how strategy is usually communicated by TUM leaders to the implementers. It was established that during the planning sessions and board meetings, the strategy is well communicated to all departmental heads that are then to pass it to their members at the departmental or unit levels. However, the study established that this does not happen. Some interviewees argue that as the real implementers on the ground, they ought to be thoroughly acquainted with the new strategies. Departments offering common units also coordinate and collaborate with departments that need these services.

The study however, established that due to poor communication by those leaders in charge, some departments fail to offer these units or some start late and in complete disregard of timelines raising the greater question of quality and credibility of such services and the leaders concerned. The interviewees feel that the majority of top management, particularly at the strategic level are not open to embracing the changing environment. As such, they fail to appreciate the consequences in the

changing environment, and are often too slow to embrace new ideas. Matters are made worse by the dynamic economic landscape, a fact which constantly requires the institution to be flexible and highly responsive to changes.

4.3.4 Human Resource

Successful realization of strategy implementation is determined by the coherence of decisions and actions of all employees at all levels of the organization, and not just by the few people who originally defined the strategy. Effective strategy implementation requires not only adequate staff but also competent staff. The study sought to establish if human resource support TUMs strategy implementation. First, the majority of interviewees expressed dissatisfaction quoting under staffing in some academic departments. The study discovered that Engineering departments are mostly affected to the extent that some programmes are delayed or cannot take off as planned since TUM lacks the relevant qualified staff to facilitate the affected programmes.

More than two undergraduate classes are affected and by the time of this research some programmes are on course but not yet received accreditation by the ministry of education science and technology, since the Engineering Board of Kenya (EBK) has not okayed their existence. However, the study noted that business and social studies programmes have adequate staff and are effectively facilitated. On further probing the researcher found out that the non academic staffs have the necessary skills to enable them implement the strategies successfully.

The study established that of the non academic staff, the line managers are qualified since the majority have first degree and others pursuing masters programmes in

various institutions of higher learning. However it was noted that the lower level of non academic staff has no skills since they were recruited on political considerations they therefore have no capacity to effectively support the implementation of strategy effectively. Staff training is essential for strategy implementation since training enhances their ability to implement the strategy. It was established that TUM has a pre-arranged training development plan of its staff on paper. The interviewees concur that staff training was selective, rare and mostly occur to senior employees. In some cases however, staff were taken for workshops ranging from a day to three days to orient them with developments in the institution.

The study noted that from the year 2007, several academic staff were sponsored by TUM to further their studies in various fields since then the rate has gone down due to inadequate funds. Some elements of staff turnover were identified as a challenging phenomenon at TUM's strategy implementation efforts. The study found out that intense poaching of employees in the industry is rampant. Even though TUM also does the poaching it is done at the highly specialized technical level which proves to be very costly to reward the poached personnel in terms of recruitment, selection, training and development of the new staff to fill the positions left vacant. To implement strategy effectively, a high degree of collaboration and consultation among different individuals and groups involved in the formulation and implementation of strategies is required.

The study found out that in fighting was common among these groups particularly when seeking approval for some decisions to be undertaken. For example the Entrepreneurship unit, the ICT and other departments in the faculty of business and

social studies were found to have suffered setbacks trying to implement strategies. The challenge emerges when the immediate bosses refuse to cooperate when they actually are aware of what is on the ground. The study discovered that most part time lecturers who are competent in specific fields and qualified for the job and have worked in TUM for more than five years are denied recruitment even when recommended for the advertised vacancies by the respective CODs yet their services are highly required to enhance implementation of strategies.

The study established that this issue causes a lot of disquiet among line managers, their immediate bosses and the other employees. Some of the part time lecturers mostly the young ones feel frustrated and continue working on low morale or some look for other alternatives which is not very good for the implementation process.

Indiscipline among some employees was found to be a hindrance to effective strategy implementation at TUM. Some staff are lazy and do not perform as per the expectations. The study also found out that the economic factors such as inflation, exchange rates, interest rates and economic performance in general affect strategy implementation. All these factors affect individuals if not groups in the efforts to implement strategies effectively. Unstable economy, poorly performing government decisions on taxation, technological changes all together come a long with some financial roles that stand on the way to successful strategy implementation.

Politicking among lower level employees was reported as a challenge to the implementation process. TUM tailor makes its academic programmes locally to suit the needs of the society. This therefore means that the exercise to come up with

course outlines and sellable programmes contribute a great deal to the success or failure of the institutions implementation of strategies. The study found out that the personnel in this area is not easily available. This delay the whole implementation process which in the long run affect TUMs participation in a competitive market because timely presentation of the services into the market is very important in the prevailing competitive situation. The level of employees understanding of new concepts and ideas and response to strategic implementation was noted to be a challenge to strategy implementation. This was attributed to the level of education of some employees, which prohibit comprehension of abstract ideas.

This result in systematic resistance to any changes introduced because of some employees lack of necessary and adequate skills to implement the strategies. Others resist not just because they are unqualified but because of motivation and behavioural reasons. HRM is a factor that can or at least should play an important role in the development and implementation of effective strategic plans. Both technical (task related) managerial skills (people and self related) are necessary to implement strategic plan.

The study established that some senior managers and several employees did not believe they had a clear understanding of TUMs strategy. Also, the study noted that most line managers and even top management lack marketing skills. This observation is reflected in many cases when looking at the bigger picture where all decisions are made throughout the institution and are consolidated and these decisions are sometimes found to be inconsistent with the objectives or may even have conflicting objectives. Human resource alone is not enough to effectively implement strategies,

other resources too add value to the process of implementation. The study was interested in establish whether TUMs financial base sufficiently support its strategy implementation. The study revealed that TUM does everything possible to mobilize its financial resources to ensure successful implementation of its plans and achieve the set goals and objectives. However the study the established that some personnel from the faculty of Engineering claim the unavailability of some materials (stationary, lecturers) and insufficient workforce as compared to the duties done. The interviewees concurred that in some cases even if finances are known to be available, cash is not readily availed when required to purchase materials.

Requests put forward by the individual personnel concerned are not quickly acted upon while some are completely ignored. The study noted that departments have different demands. Two or more departments request through their respective deans, the procedure is so long and cumbersome that immediate feedback is not easy. This means that such departments lag behind in its implementation efforts. The study further established that instances of top management not seeing the need for additional staff or replacement also lags implementation process.

It was established that some top managers who are responsible for implementing strategic initiatives agreed upon, are not well equipped with the necessary management skills. The area of in adequate technical skills is also a major challenge. For instance, it was expressed that changes that have been implemented in finance and accounting departments failed to yield much positive results as expected because technical resources are not consistent with the department, yet these were expected to improve the department's productivity. There was a general feeling that employees

are not equipped with sufficient skills to implement documented strategies. This they attribute to lack of sufficient training opportunities for some managers who are responsible for the implementation of strategies.

4.3.5 Competition

It was established competition was common across departments. Rivalry among the existing players in the industry is a phenomenon that the study noted to pose tremendous challenge to departments and TUM at large as they endeavour to achieve the stated objectives and goals. The interviewees concur that the proliferations of both public and private universities and commercial colleges in Mombasa county is threatening and presents unhealthy competition mostly to the faculties of business studies and social science and also applied science. The study noted that some interviewees tie low enrolment in some departments at TUM to competition. Also to introduce a new service in the market and gain acceptance coupled with the complexity of the customer for some services prove very challenging in the wake of competition.

4.3.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

This is a fundamental element in determining whether activities are being implemented as planned. The study sought to find out whether there existed a monitoring and evaluation system and how effective it was. The study established that the monitoring and evaluation system at TUM was poor and that writing reports on status or progress reports on implementation were the only monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Performance contract introduced to the non academic staff a couple of months ago still meet resistance and has not effectively been put to

use. All in all, proper mechanism for monitoring and evaluation is found to be lacking at TUM and therefore poses a challenge to the implementation process.

The interviewees agreed that TUM hardly performs formal monitoring and evaluation exercises to ensure that strategies are moving in line with the master plan. Monitoring and evaluation would be greatly aided by adherence to the annual work plans. Unfortunately, there is a general feeling among interviewees that the annual work plans are more in paper work than deeds. They pointed out that many of TUMs annual work plans often discussed but little is done by way of implementation. Others said evaluation is performed irregularly but when asked to say at what intervals, it appears that even this irregular evaluation escapes the attention of some employees particularly those who are newly recruited. Another reason could be that monitoring and evaluation is casually carried out.

4.4 Discussions of the findings

In general, TUM is found to have made a great stride from tertiary institution, MPUC, and now a fully fledged public university. This is evidenced primarily by the increased structures, infrastructures and human resource. The improvement was especially evident in the improved business learning environment. This could have contributed significantly to the improved enrolment of degree and diploma students. This together with the introduction of reforms by CHE that are now impacting positively on higher education management practices at the operational level. There is evidence that TUM is showing increased concern for human capital. For instance there is greater appreciation of the role of the human resource in driving the activities of the institution and its positioning. Some questions however, linger, for instance,

the study found out that many TUM professionals are seeking and obtaining part-time employment outside the institution. In fact the trend is going to continue if not properly addressed. The emergence of both private and public universities in Mombasa County comes with desperate need for HR especially lecturers who are hired to provide extra services to these institutions. There is therefore a strong case for TUM to facilitate HR department because the attention and allegiance of her employees are divided, this may possibly interfere with quality delivery which is the core objective of the institution. There is great need for TUM to review her policies to ensure that they are appropriate, coherent, and consistent.

TUM should also review her curriculum to ensure that trainees are equipped with skills they can employ both locally and abroad. Adoption of modern management skills and practices will enable the institution enhance efficiency, accountability and good governance. The bureaucratic red tape in the chain of command can be changed from wasteful decision making mechanisms to effective corporate approach structures and systems. Although TUM has continued to improve its information management practices, there is need to have programmes that incorporate all its aspects, that is: information communication, and technology. There were certain instances where TUM showed strength in one or two of these, instead of all the three.

Finally, TUM has come from far (from tertiary, MPUC, and TUM). It is important that those efforts get the support of the government, particularly in the field of research and development. Concerning HR incentives should be provided and reward systems be improved so that the implementation of strategies is effective.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises the findings and analysis of chapter four on strategy implementation practices at TUM and challenges that the institution encounters during the implementation. The study examined the implementation of the documented strategies (master plan-2010-2014) to be accomplished in five years.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

From the findings of this study, TUM faces numerous unique challenges in implementing its strategies. These challenges emanate from the nature of the institution having evolved from three distinct stages (from tertiary to MPUC and to TUM). The findings were obtained from the research questions posed in the interview guide (Appendices A, B & C). The main challenges TUM encounters in the implementation of strategic plans can be summarised into organization structure, organization culture, leadership style, human resource, finance and communication and also lack of embracing best strategic implementation practices or weak application of best practices.

With regard to organization structure, it is evident that the structure is not conclusive enough in helping TUM to achieve its objectives, missions and vision hence, a challenge to strategic plan implementation. However the study noted that TUM is rolling out a plan to design a strategic plan that is relevant to its present status. The

study noted that the strategic plan (MPUC Strategic Plan -2010-2014) the institution is currently using has been overtaken by events given that it is now a fully fledged university.

Organizational culture proved to be a major and unique challenge to strategy implementation at TUM. Having evolved from the three distinct levels (from tertiary to MPUC and to TUM), the drastic shift of cultures from tertiary mind set to University College mind set and to a fully fledged university mind set present tremendous strategy implementation challenges. Policies, procedures and processes were singled out as cultures that impede strategy implementation because they are time wasting, lengthy and cumbersome and not good for effective strategy implementation.

However, the institution strategy of taking staff through training, workshops, management talks and service charter talks is slowly but surely cultivating the desired culture. TUM is also planning to review/design a strategic plan that is in tandem with its current status that ensures that TUMs policies are adhered to by its entire staff. It is hoped that this problem will be overcome."

Leadership was also cited as a challenge to strategy implementation. The study found out that leadership traits are lacking in some management staff posing challenge to capacity to direct and supervise strategic plans implementation. The capacity is essential because it influences the activities and even the attitudes of the lower level employees. Lack of leadership is evident in the recurrent staff complaints about some of their supervisors. However, the management decision to meet regularly with

leaders at various levels and the introduction of performance appraisal will hopefully minimize this gap. Concerning resources, it came out strongly from the interviewees that human resource is a very challenging area and has adverse effect on TUMs strategy implementation process. The study noted that human resource was not given much attention.

Most noted was the poor reward system that the top management has often fail to address. This was seen as a challenge when lack of motivation was cited as one of the factors that hinder effective strategy implementation at some level of the institution. Inadequate facilities and understaffing in key Engineering programmes were noted as among crucial challenges worth giving attention by top management. Monitoring and evaluation was found to be lacking. Controls and checks to ensure tasks are undertaken within the budgeted time frame were cited as a major challenge to strategy implementation.

The study noted ICT as a key management tool that enhances implementation was weak. It was discovered that where data was not captured adequately, it impacted negatively on the clients and a loss to the institution. Weak accounting systems have also seen expensive revenue leakages. However, the top management has taken note of this challenge and trying to invest in a more robust ICT system to minimize complaints by clients and staff of TUM of delays caused by weak ICT processes.

5.3 Conclusions of the study

The overall result indicate that the practices TUM adopts to implement its strategy are effective. However, these practices have been to some extent affected by the

challenges the institution is currently facing. The findings show that TUM is experiencing challenges associated with its structure, culture, human resource, leadership style. All the key factors affecting implementation of strategic plans were found to be causing some level of challenge to the management at TUM. The top management, the line management, directors and section heads are partially addressing the challenges. The study further concludes that some areas were causing greater challenges than others. The issue of culture, HRM, leadership style and competition were cited as posing greater challenges to the institution. While the management has to a greater extent well managed the issues of organization structure, policies and procedures, resources and systems, the study found out that the institution offers training to its employees to keep them well versed with the required skills in the market.

It is hoped this will reduce the level of the challenges cited like lack of adequate, relevant and necessary skills. Training is offered on the job, in house and some staffs are sent to seminars organized by other recognized professional institutions to equip them with the necessary skills. However, the training offered is inadequate in terms of duration and to some extent content. Those with low retention rate, it proves futile for them to grasp. This study concludes that if TUM top management makes it a culture to explain new strategic moves to their juniors, highlighting the benefits that will accrue out of the new moves every time such moves are made, when done continuously and promptly and involving them, then some of these challenges may not occur.

5.4 Limitations of the study

This study encountered a number of limitations. Perhaps the most important one surrounds the nature of the research which required a case study involving an in-depth study provided by content analysis. Subjectivity of the researcher in the way she understands information given and the generalization of the findings may not be favourable since no set rules are followed in collection of the information and only few units are studied and the fact that it is based on several assumptions which may not be very realistic at times. Telephone and mobile call interruptions were common. The researcher had to put up with these although the interruptions never interfered with the search for information. At any time there were such interruptions, interview time was extended as agreed by both parties.

5.5 Recommendations for policy and practice

TUM staff requires adequate training in the area of strategy making and strategy implementation. Training should target both top level managers who are responsible for driving the strategy formulation processes and the lower level employees whose daily activities transform strategies into actions. Specific training in the area of strategic management would greatly improve the capacity of TUM in implementing its strategies.

It is also recommended that TUM source for enough funds. The Enterprise unit should put a lot more efforts in this to facilitate full implementation of TUM's documented strategies; it should also formulate financial plans and policies that will enable access funds for effective implementation. It is also recommended that TUM involves its staff in the strategy formulation. From the findings of this study, it is evident that the

evident that the institution did not involve its staff in formulation of the documented strategies. This may have contributed to lack of ownership and slow and sluggish implementation at lower employees level. More importantly, separating strategy development and implementation may lead to a situation where critical issues are ignored during formulation. This situation can be corrected if the organization involves the staff in the new strategies. Discussing the strategies is equally important. The institution should ensure that the staff especially those at the implementation levels discuss the strategies already developed in order to own the implementation process.

TUM needs to design the best way that communication can flow from top to bottom (downward flow of communication) and vice versa. This may require a proactive process of creating new communication channels, which may include regular meetings between top management and lower level employees. These meetings should provide a forum for concepts clarification and reports on progress displayed and way forward discussed. In this way, employees commit themselves to achieving the organizational goals and initiatives. It also creates a sense of ownership of the entire process.

To align the strategies to the demands of the chartered Public University status, TUM must speedily rethink and review the current documented strategic plan of 2010-2014 just to ensure that the strategy is relevant in the face of dynamics on the ground and the institution should proactively review the contents of the master plan in the light of emerging challenges like competition from other players in the industry from which TUM operates.

5.6 Suggestions for further research.

First, more organizations which are similar to TUM should be studied in order to understand what challenges they face with respect to strategy implementation. Secondly, this study be continued over a longer period of time in order to understand if any change has taken place with respect to challenges facing strategic implementation. Lastly, a comparative research should be conducted on challenges of strategy implementation and practices in newly chartered public universities in Kenya so as to ascertain whether the challenges are universal given the different context in which the institutions exist. The findings of such a study is hoped would help policy makers address adequately challenges that affect the institutions across the country.

REFERENCE

- Aaltonen,P.&Ikavalko ,H., (20001). *Implementing Strategies Successfully: A Paper Presented at the world productivity Congress.*
- Alexander, L.D. (1991).“*Successfully Implementing Strategies Decisions* ” Long Range Planning, 18 (3).
- Al-Ghamdi,S.M (1998). “*Obstacles to successful Implementation of Strategic Decisions: TheBritish Experience*” European Business Review, Volume 96,6, MCBUP.
- Analoui, F. (2000). “*What Motivates Senior Managers? The Case of Romania,*” Journal of Managerial Psychology, 15 (4) 324-326
- Analoui, F. &Karami, A.(2003).*Strategic Management in Small and Medium Enterprises.* London: Thomson.
- Andrews, K. (1971).*The Concept of Corporate Strategy.* Homewood, 111: Irwin.
- Ansoff, H.I. & McDonnell, E., (1990). *Implementing Strategic Management.* 2nd Edition, UK, Prentice Hall.
- Ansoff, H.I. (1965).*corporate strategy.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Aosa, E., (1992). *AnEmperical Investigation of Aspects of Strategy Formulation and Implementation within large private Manufacturing Companies in Kenya.* Unpublished Thesis University of Strathcyde, Scotland , Feb.
- Awino, Z.B., (2001). *Effectiveness and Problems of Strategic Implementation of Financing Higher Education in Kenya by the Higher Education Loans Board.*Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.
- Beer, M. &Eisenstat, R.A(2000).*The silent killer of strategy implementation and learning.*Sloan management Review, Vol.41.No.4,pp.29-84.
- Beer, M. &Eisenstat, R.A(2004).*How to have an honest conversation about your business strategy.*Havard Business Review,February,82-89.

- Berry, M. (1998). "Strategic Planning in Small High Tech Companies," Long Range Planning, 31(3), 455-466.
- Best, R.J. (1997). "Market-based Management", Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall.
- Blide, A. (1994). "How Entrepreneurs Craft Strategies that Work," Harvard Business Review, March/April, 150-161.
- Bourgeois, L. J. & Brodwin, D.R. (1984). "Strategic Implementation: Five Approaches to an Elusive Phenomenon" Strategic Management Journal, 25, 241-264.
- Bowman, C. (1998). *Strategy in practice*. London: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Bowman, C. & Faulkner, D. (1997). *Competitive Corporate Strategy*. London: Irwin.
- Boxall, P. & Steeneveld, M. (1999). *Human Resource Strategy and Competitive Advantage: A Longitudinal Study of Engineering Consultancies*, Journal of Management Studies, 36(4), 443-463.
- Bouwen, T. & Steyaert, C. (1990). "Constructing organizational Texture in Young Entrepreneurial Firm". Journal of Management Studies, 27(6), 637-649.
- Byars, L.L. (1991). *Strategic Management: Formulation and Implementation*. 3rd Edition, Harper Collins Publishers
- Bryson, J.M., (1995). *Strategic planning for Non-profit organizations*, Revised Edition, Jossey-Brass.
- Campbell, A. & Yeung, S. (1991). "Brief Mission, Vision, and Strategic Intent", Long Range Planning, 24 (4) 145-147
- Carson, D. & Cromie, S. (1989). "Marketing Planning in Small Enterprises": A Model and Some Empirical Evidence, Journal of Marketing Management, 5(1) 33-51
- Celman, J.C. (1998). "Building and Implementing balanced Scorecard", Graphic Direct, Hampshire.

Chandler, A.D. (1962). *Strategy and Structure*. Cambridge, Mass:MIT Press.

Chaffee, E.e. (1985). "Three Models of Strategy", *Academy Management Review*, 10(1), 89-98.

Collin, C. (1995). *Cases in strategic management*, 2nd edn. New York, NY: Pitman Books.

Coulter, M. (2005). *Strategic Management in Action* (3rd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ:
Pearson Prentice Hall

David F.R. (2005). *Strategic Management Concepts and cases*. Tenth Edition. New Jersey
Pearson Education

David F.R. (2011). *Strategic Management Concepts and cases*. Thirteenth
Edition. New Jersey Prentice Hall.

Dwallow, A.M. (2011). *Challenges of Strategy implementation in the Packing Industries
in Nairobi-Kenya*. Unpublished MBA Project University of
Nairobi.

Deal, E.T. & Kennedy, A.A. (2006). *Corporate Culture*. Pearson's Cambridge.

Deem, R., (2001). *Globalization, New Managerialism, academic Capitalism and
Entrepreneurism in Universities: Is the local dimension still
important?* *Comparative Education Review* 37, no.1:7-20.

Deloitte & Touche, LLP (2003). *Business Planning and Strategy
Implementation*. <http://www.deloitte.com>.

Drazin, R., & Howard, P. (1984). "Strategy Implementation: A Technique for
Organizational Design," *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 19,
40-46.

Feurer, R. & Chavarbaghi, K. & Wargin, J. (1995). "Analysis of Strategy Formulation and
Implementation at Hewlett-Packard" *Management Decisions*,
33(10), 4-16.

Feurer, R. & Chavarbaghi, K. (1995). *Researching Strategy Formulation and
Implementation in Dynamic Environments Benchmarking: An
International Journal*, Volume 1, 2, 4.

- Flood, P. C., Drmgoole, T., Carroll, S.J. & Gorman, L., eds. (2000). *Managing Strategy Implementation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Freedman, M. (2003). *The Genius is in the Implementation*. Journal of Business Strategy, vol 24, 2
- Freedman, M., (2003). "The Genius is in the implementation," Journal of Business Strategy, Vol. 24,2
- Galbraith, J. and Nathanson, D.A. (1978). *Strategy Implementation: The Role of Structure and Process*. West Publishing Company, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- Grant R.M (1991). "The Resource-Based Theory of *Competitive Advantage; Implications for Strategy Formulation*," California Management Review, 33(3), 114-135.
- Grant R.M (2005). *Contemporary Strategy Analysis*. USA, Blackwell Publishing.
- Grundy, T. (1998). "Strategy Implementation and Project Management," International Journal of Project Management, 16 (1) 43-50.
- Gibbs, G. (2000a). *Learning and Teaching Strategies: The implications for education development*, Educational Development, 1pp.1-5
- Gibbs, G. (2000b). *Learning and Teaching Strategies: Key issues*, Presentation at one-day HEFCW Seminar.
- Gibbs, G., Habeshaw, Y. & Yorke, M. (2002). *Institutional Learning and Teaching Strategies in English Higher Education*, Higher Education, 40, pp.351-372.
- Goldsmith, A. (1995). "Making Managers More Effective: Applications of Strategic Management," Working Paper No.9, USAID March.
- Goold, M. (2002). *Nine tests of organization design*. Directions, The Ashridge Journal, 16(2), 23-38.
- Gupta, A.K. & Govindarajan, V. (1984). *Business Unit Strategy: Managerial Characteristics and Business Unit Effectiveness at Strategy*

Implementation, Academy of Management Journal Vol.2YNO1PP.24-41.

Gupta, A. (1987). *SBU Strategies, Corporate-S.B.U. Relations, and SBU Effectiveness in Strategy Implementation*, Academy of Management Journal 27, 25-41.

Hanlon, D. & Scott, M. (1995). *Strategy Formulation in the Entrepreneurial Small Firms in International Entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge.

Hauc, A. & Kovac, J. (2000). "Project Management in Strategy Implementation - Experiences in Slovenia," *International Journal of Project Management*, 18 (1) 61-67

Haberberg, A. & Rieple, A. (2008). *Strategic Management Theory and Application*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hill, C.W. & Jones, G.R., (1995). *Strategic management theory: An integrated approach*, 3rd edition. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Hill, C.W. & Jones, G.R., (1999). *Strategic management theory: An integrated approach*, 5th edition. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Hunger, J.D. & Wheelen, T.L. (1995). *Strategic management*, 5th ed., New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, USA.

Hrebiniak, L.G. (1990). "Implementing Strategy." *Chief Executive*, 57, 74-78.

Johnson G. (1992). "Managing Strategic Change: Strategy Culture and Action", *Long Range Planning*, 25 (1) 28-36

Johnson G. & Scholes, K. (2001). *Exploring Corporate Strategy*. 4th Edition, India, Prentice-Hall.

Johnson G. & Scholes, K. (2002). *Exploring Corporate Strategy*. 6th edn: USA, Prentice-Hall.

Kalai, E. & Ledyard, J. (1998). "Repeated Implementation", *Journal of Economic Theory*, 38 (2) 308-317

- Kaplan, R.S. & Norton, D.P. (1992). *The Balanced Scorecard-Measures that Drive Performance*. Harvard Business Review, 70, No, 1 (January-February), 71-114.
- Kaplan, R.S. & Norton, D.P. (1993). *Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work*. Harvard Business Review, September-October, 134-142.
- Kararni, A. (2007). *Strategy Formulation in Entrepreneurial Firms*. England, Ashgate publishing Limited
- Kiruthi, J.N. (2003). *The State of Strategic Management Practices in Non-Profit Making Organizations: The Case of Public Membership in Nairobi*. Unpublished MBA Project University of Nairobi.
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research methodology, methods and techniques*. (Revised 2nd edition). New Delhi, India: New International Publishers.
- Koske, F.k. (2003). *Strategy Implementation and its challenges in public corporations: The Case of Telkom Kenya*. Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.
- Kortler, P., Armstrong, G., Sownders, J., & Wong, V. (2009). *Principles of Marketing*, 3rd FT/Prentice-Hall.
- Kung'u, D.W. (2007). *Strategy Implementation Challenges in the Mainstream Churches in Kenya*. Unpublished MBA Project University of Nairobi.
- Lares-Mankki, L. (1994). *Strategy Implementation Bottlenecks: Identification Analysis and Removal*. Lappeenranta: Lappeenranta University of Technology.
- Leavy, B. & Wilson, J. (1994). *Strategy and Leadership*. London: Routledge
- Leidecker, L. & Bruno, A. (1986). "Identifying and Using Critical Success Factors," Long Range Planning, 17(1), 23-32.
- Lynch, R. (2000). *Corporate Strategy*, 2nd ed, Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- McCarthy, B. & Leavy, B. (2000). "Phases in Strategy Formulation: An Exploratory Study of Irish SMSs", IBAR, 21 2 55-80..

Machuki, V.N.(2005). *Challenges to Strategy Implementation at CMC Motors*,
Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.

McCathy, D. J., (1986). *Business Policy and Strategy: Concepts and Readings*, 4th edition,
Richard, D., Irwan, Inc.

Meyer, G.D. & Heppard, K. A. (2000). *Entrepreneurship as Strategy: Competing on
Entrepreneurial Edge*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage

Meldrum, M. & Atkinson, S. (1998). "Meta-abilities and the implementation of strategy:
Knowing what to do is simply not enough" *Journal of
Management Development*, Vol, 17, 8.

Michael, J.M. (2004). *Factors influencing strategy implementation by NGO's Operating in
Kenya*. Unpublished MBA project, University of Nairobi.

Miller, D. (1988). "The Relationship of Porters Business Strategies to Environment and
Structure", *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 280-308.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). "An Engineering Strategy of Direct Research", *Administrative
Science Quarterly*, 24, 582-589.

Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*, London: Prentice-Hall
Inc.

Mintzberg, H. & Quinn, J.B. (1991). *The Strategy Process, Concepts and Cases*, 3rd
edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Mintzberg, H. & Quinn, J.B. (1998). *Reading in the Strategy Process, Concepts and Cases*, 2nd
edition. Prentice-Hall Inc.

Mombasa Polytechnic University College, PolyNewsletter, edition 1: February-April, 2010.

Mombasa Polytechnic University College, Business Plan 2010

Muthuiya, F.A. (2004), *Strategy Implementation and its challenges in public corporations in
Kenya: The case of African Medical Research Foundation (AMREF-
KENYA)*. Unpublished MBA project, University of Nairobi

Munene, I.(2008).*Privatising the Public: Marketisation Transformation as a Strategy in Public Universities*. Research in Post-Compulsory Education, Vol.13, No.1.March.

Noble, C.H. (1999). “*Building the Strategy Implementation Network*”, Business Horizons, 42 (6)19-28.

Nutt, P.C. (1983). “*Implementation Approaches for Project Planning*”, Academy of Management Review, 8,600-611

O’Gorman. & Cunningham, J.(1997).*Enterprise in Action An Introduction to Entrepreneurship in Irish*. Context Dublin: Oak Tree Press.

Okumus,F.(2003). “*A Framework to implement strategies in organizations*”.Management Decisions, Vol.41, 9MCB UP.

Parsa, H.G.(1999). “*Interaction of Strategy Implementation and Power Perceptions in Franchise Systems: An Empirical Investigation*”, Journal of Business Research, 45 2 173-185

Pechlaner, H. &Saurwein, E. (2002)“*StrategyImplementation in the Alpline Tourism Industry.*” International Journals of contemporary Hospitality Management, vol.14, 4, MCB University Press.

Pearce J. A .& Robinson, J. R.B. (2005).*Strategic Management: Formulating, Implementation and control.9th edition*, New York. McGraw-Hill.

Pearce J. A. & Robinson R.B Jr. (1991).*Strategic Management: Formulating,Implementation and control*. USA, R.RDonnely.

Pfeffer, J. (1994). *The Competitive Advantage Through People*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Publishing

Pettigrew, A. &Whipp, R. (1991).*Managing Changes for Competitive success* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Pettigrew, A. (1987).“*Context and Action in the Transformation of the Firm*”, Journal of Management Studies, 24,649-670.

- Pitts, R. A.& Lei, D.(1996). *Strategic M management Building and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. New York, NY: West Publishing Company.
- Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive Strategy Technics for Analysing Industries and Competitors*. New York: Free Press.
- Porter, M.E. (1985). *The Competitive Advantage*. New York: The Free Press.
- Porter, M.E.(1995). “*The Competitive Advantage of the Inner City*.” *Havard Business Review*, Vol.72 No.1, pp7
- Quinn, J.B. (1980). *Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism*. New York: Irwin
- Robinson, R.B.& Pearce, J.A.(1984). “*The Relationship Between Sage of Development and Small Firm Planning and Performance*”, *Journal of Small Business Management*, April,45-52.
- Robson.W. (1997). *Strategic Management and Information Systems*. 2nd Edition, England, Pearson Education Ltd.
- Rosen R.(1995). *Strategic Management, An Introduction*. United Kingdom, British Library Catalogue.
- Rousseau, Y. & Rousseau, P.(2000). “*Turning Strategy into Action in Financial Services*,” *CMA Management*, Hamilton, Dec/Jan,73 (10),25-29.
- Rumlet, R. P.(1991). “*How Much Does Industry Matter?*”, *Strategic Management Journal*, March,1991,167-185.
- Shrader, C.B., Mulford, C.L. & Blackburn, V.L. (1989). “*Strategic and Operational Planning, Uncertainty, and Performance in Small Firms*”, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 27(4), 45-60
- Sterling, J.(2003). *Translating strategy into effective implementation: Dispelling the myths and highlighting what works*. *Strategy and Leadership*, 31(3), 27-34.
- Tai, J. K. (2007). *Strategy Implementation in Kenya Ports Authority*. Unpublished MBA Project, University Of Nairobi.

The Higher Education, Institutions Handbook. (2011), A publication of Commission of Higher Education.

Thomson, J.L. (1996). *Strategic Management: Awareness and Change*, 2nd edn: London Chapman and Hall.

Thomson, A.A., & Strickland, A.J. (1998). *Grafting and implementing strategy*, 10th Edition, USA, Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Thomson, A.A. & Strickland, A.J. (1996). *Strategic management: Concepts and Cases*, 9th Edition, New York, Richard D. Irwin.

Thomson, A.A., & Strickland, A.J. (2003). *Strategic management: Concepts and Cases*, 13th Edition, New York, Richard D. Irwin.

Thomson A.A., Strickland A.J. & Gamble J.E. (2007). *Crafting and Executing Strategy*. 5th Edition. New York, McGrawHill Publishers.

Wang, Y. (2002). *Strategy implementation*. TU.91.6167, Seminar study in strategy and International Business, Helsinki University of Technology, Institute of Strategy and International Business, Unpublished Report.

Webb A., (1994). *Two tales from reluctant Manager, in: Weils. (Ed.) Introducing Change from the top in University and Colleges : 10 personal accounts .* London; Kogan Page

Wheelen, T.L. & Hunger, J.D. (1998). *Strategic Management and Business Policy*, 6th edn: New York: Addison-Wesley

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

The information obtained from this interview guide will be treated with high confidentiality and will not be used for any purpose other than academic.

A. To be answered by employees of Technical University of Mombasa

Introductory questions:

1. How old are you?
2. What position do you hold within TUM?
3. How long have you been serving in this capacity?
4. What is your main responsibility here?
5. What is the level of your education?
6. Have you had any management training?

Appendix B. Strategy implementation practices

7. Does TUM have a strategic plan? If yes, what time frame does it cover?
8. Did you employ specific indicators of the formal business planning like mission statement? If yes, what is the purpose of TUM mission statement?
9. Did TUM engage in environmental scanning? If yes, did you find it important?
10. Are there specific strategy implementation practices that TUM adapt? If yes, identify them and explain how the institution benefits from such practices.
11. To what extent are organization structure, leadership, human resource and ICT important for the implementation of TUM strategy?
12. State briefly whether strategy implementation at TUM has been successful. Why do you say so?

13. Did any changes take place in the organization during strategy implementation?

State whether they were structural, cultural, leadership or otherwise.

14. Who are the players in strategy implementation?

15. What are some of the support systems put in place by TUM for successful implementation of strategy?

16. Is there a continuous monitoring or evaluation of strategy implementation to ensure it is in tandem with the master plan? If so, how often?

Appendix C: Challenges of strategy implementation

17. How did the employees view and respond to strategic planning initially and now?

18. Are there challenges facing the implementation of TUMS strategies? If yes, describe them. 19. How have you responded to the challenges?

20. What is the future of strategy implementation in TUM?

21. Please give any other comment you may have that may add value to this research.