

**IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES AT UNITED
STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT IN KENYA**

BY

CALORS NZOMO MUSEMBI

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS**

ADMINISTRATION

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

OCTOBER 2013

DECLARATION

This Research project is my original work and has not been presented for examination to any other University.

Signature..... Date:

CALORS NZOMO MUSEMBI

D61/62820/2010

This research project had been submitted for the examination with my approval as university supervisor.

Signature: Date:

DR. JOHN YABS

LECTURER

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to my wife Bendetta, my Son Israel land My brother Joseph for their support during my study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project has been accomplished with the encouragement, support and contribution from a number of people whom I am deeply indebted to.

Special mention is made to my lecturers at University of Nairobi for their dedication, unconditional support and mentorship throughout the programme. Further, I am heavily indebted to my university supervisor, Dr. John Yabs for the able guidance in the phases of this study.

I wish to thank my family for their unconditional understanding, support and continuous endurance throughout my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
ABBREVIATION AND ACRONYMS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.1.1 The Concept of Strategy Implementation	3
1.1.2 Grant Agencies in Kenya	5
1.1.3 United States Agency for International Development in Kenya	9
1.2 Research Problem	12
1.3 Research Objectives.....	14
1.4 Value of the Study	15

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.....	16
2.2 Theoretical Underpinning of the Study.....	16
2.3 The Concept of Strategy and Strategy Implementation.....	18
2.5 Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation.....	21

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction.....	26
3.2 Research design	26
3.3 Data Collection	26
3.4 Data Analysis.....	27

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.

4.1 Introduction.....	28
4.2 Global Health Strategic Framework	28
4.2.1Kenya’s Feed the Future (FTF) 2011-2015	29
4.2.2 USAID's Global Climate Change and Development Strategy.....	29
4.2.3 The USAID first Global Water and Development Strategy	29
4.2.4USAID’s Strategy on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance	30
4.2.5 Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy (March 2012).....	30
4.2.6 Counter Trafficking In Persons Policy (February 2012)	31
4.2.7 The Influence of Management on Strategy Implementation	31
4.2.8 Organizational policies guiding implementation of strategies.....	32
4.2.9 The Influence of Organizational Policies on Implementation of Strategies	34
4.3 Leadership and Implementation of Strategies at the USAID.....	36
4.3.1: Leaders policies on Strategy Implementation.....	36
4.3.2 The Influence of Leadership on Strategy Implementation at the USAID	37
4.4 Communication and Strategy Implementation	38
4.4.1 Effective communication structures for implementation of strategies	38

4.4.2 Influence of Communication on Strategy Implementation..... 39

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction..... 40

5.2 Summary 40

5.3 Conclusion 41

5.4 Recommendations..... 41

5.5 Limitations of the study 43

5.6 Suggestion for further research..... 43

REFERENCES 44

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE 49

ABBREVIATION AND ACRONYMS

DFID	Department for International Development
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FTF	Kenya's feed the Future NGO Non-Governmental Organization
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, Threats
U.S.	United States
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations,
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors influencing implementation of strategies at United States Agency for International Development in Kenya. This study was a case study of the USAID and used both primary and secondary data in order to achieve the study objectives. This design gave a descriptive and explanatory analysis of the USAID and its strategy implementation process. It also gave intensive description of the strategies that have been proposed at the USAID and how they have been implemented, their success and failures. The study findings suggest that implementation of strategies at the USAID is mixer of other major factors related to strategy formulation. They are both an institutional and an interpersonal process that gathers data and viewpoints and ultimately results in strategic decisions. These strategic decisions and how they have been reached have a major impact on strategy implementation success. Institutional factors (management and organizational policies) and people-oriented factors (leadership and communication) influence implementation outcome dialectically. Commitment has been achieved with the help of proper implementation tactics and communication activities by stakeholders in the organization. These factors in turn are influenced by four generic phases of strategy implementation, pre-implementation, organizing implementation, managing implementation, and sustaining performance. A leader is viewed in this study as a managerial employee who is tasked to oversee the successful execution of strategic initiatives. While issues of strategic planning have presented challenges to strategic leaders, it is in the area of strategy implementation where these leaders have encountered a number of challenges. The respondents said that the management helps in translating strategies from just theories into action plans that enables the strategy to be successfully implemented and sustained. Based on the findings above, the study recommends that the management at the USAID should emphasis a vertical management system to ensure all stakeholders are made part of any project/programmes proposed. The company should keep on improving of the organizational policies guiding the implementation of its projects to ensure that they are carried out as envisioned in the guidelines. The study revealed that most strategies implemented were not backed by well crafted visions to guide them. Thus for the purpose of strategy implementation leaders should be able to craft a vision that create a fit between intended strategy and the specific personality profile of the implementation's key players in the different departments of the organization. Most of strategies implementation failed due to lack of two way communication. It is therefore recommended that they should adopt two way communication tools that permit and solicit questions from employees on issues related to the formulated strategy and its implementation.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The manner in which an organization positions itself in the market in terms of its product is considered its strategy. A company may decide to be always the first on the market with the newest and best product (differentiation strategy), or it may decide that it will produce a product already on the market more efficiently and more cost effectively (cost-leadership strategy). (Johnson and Scholes, 1999). Each of these strategies requires a structure that helps the organization reach its objectives. In other words, the structure must fit the strategy. Such strategies helps the companies to stay focused in market with the newest and best product probably which permit them to respond quickly to change,(Richard, 1998).

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) just like other organizations has a strategic plan in place, (HHS Strategic Plan FY 2010-2015). However there are several factors affecting effective implementation of the strategies that have been spelt out in the strategic plan. These include a cultural context that is relatively homogeneous and open to group activities, and social capital (trust, relationships, reciprocity and social norms) that facilitate cooperation and collective action. It has a rationale for group formation such as advocating for better roads, bulk purchase of inputs or access to markets, members' knowledge and resources those who have similar interests and economic status are more likely to be a cohesive group. The organization

has adopted leadership abilities that include knowledge, experience and the trust and respect of members, (Gupta, 2008).

There are also external factors that affect group formation which include government policies and regulations that facilitate group formation and formalization and promote business and infrastructure such as roads, electricity, communications systems, markets and warehousing facilities. The nature and competitiveness of the industry has been structured such that it is able to salvage its products if markets are weak and there is little demand for its products or services. If the industry is not competitive due to detrimental government policies or an inability to upgrade, horizontal linkages may not be able to help overcome the constraint (Bantel, 1997).

The organization has development a framework of internal drivers of its key agendas inform of a respected or innovative chief, business leader or farmer who have realized that cooperation can help remove obstacles to achieving a common goal. These internal drivers have been able to apply social pressures on potential members to participate, but they have been hampered by knowledge and resource limitations, social norm constraints, and members who want the benefits of membership, but not the responsibilities and who free ride rather than contribute (Bantel, 1997). They have also formed partnerships inform of external drivers that drive cooperation and group formation with other firms, NGO, donor or government entities. The private-sector drivers are usually market-driven and savvy about business and the cooperation they foster is more purpose-bound, clear about costs and benefits and easier to initiate than that of others (Barney, 1991).

1.1.1 The Concept of Strategy Implementation

Every organization takes on some direction, in terms of what customers/clients it serves and what functions it performs for these customers. This direction is often called its purpose, mission or realized strategy. An organization's mission is a set of statements that define the exchange relationship between the organization and its stakeholders or claimants, (Gregory and Dess, 2008). More specifically a mission defines the population served and the function it fulfills or the need it satisfies for that claimant. This direction, or mission, may be the result of a deliberate planning process or it may emerge as the result of a set of incremental decisions. Most realized strategies are the result of a combination of purely deliberate and purely emergent strategies (Gerry, 2005).

The deliberate strategy process starts with an analysis of a company's current mission and strategies. The most popular tool used in this process is the Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, Threats(SWOT) model (Alfred, 2005). The external environment in terms of opportunities and threats, is analyzed by examining threats to the company's current position and new opportunities. The analysis proceeds by examining the company's internal environment in-terms of its strengths and weakness. A mission and competitive strategy is formulated that matches opportunities with strengths and plans are made to strengthen areas of weakness (Lamb, 2007). The next step is to develop functional strategies that support the overall business level competitive strategy.

Finally, a control system is designed to ensure that operational decisions are made consistent with the business and functional strategies. When every day decisions do not

conform with the business and functional strategies, the intended strategy becomes an unrealized strategy. Many strategic plans have taken this route as they sit on shelves of corporate offices in nicely bound volumes (Schuck, 2002). Emergent strategies are the result of incremental decision making that achieve some degree of consistency over time and launch the organization into a direction.

When decisions are made or problems are solved, they have potential strategic impact. When there is a strong control system that ensures that decision makers satisfy managerial constraints, intended strategies tend to become realized. However, when other influences are stronger, or there is not clear direction from above, decisions are made without regard to intended strategy and the organization takes on direction that is a result of the combined affect of these incremental decisions, (Pearce and Robinson, 2007).

Strategy implementation is the process of allocating resources to support the chosen strategies. This process includes the various management activities that are necessary to put strategy in motion, institute strategic controls that monitor progress, and ultimately achieve organizational goals. According to Steiner (1994), the implementation process covers the entire managerial activities including such matters as motivation, compensation, management appraisal, and control processes.

As Higgins (2004) has pointed out, almost all the management functions -planning, controlling, organizing, motivating, leading, directing, integrating, communicating, and innovation are in some degree applied in the implementation process. Pierce and Robinson(2007) says that to effectively direct and control the use of the firm's resources,

mechanisms such as organizational structure, information systems, leadership styles, assignment of key managers, budgeting, rewards, and control systems are essential strategy implementation ingredients. The implementation activities are in fact related closely to one another and decisions about each are usually made simultaneously.

Mintzberg (2000) has identified that the greatest challenge faced by organizations lie not in the formulation or evaluation of the strategies, but in the implementation of already formulated strategies. Strategy implementation is an integral component of the strategic management process and is viewed as the process that turns the formulated strategy into a series of actions and then results to ensure that the vision, mission, strategy and strategic objectives of the organization are successfully achieved as planned.

Strategy implementation process addresses the ‘who, where, when, and how’ which are very are critical to the strategies success. Companies gain competitive advantage through proper strategy implementation if done effectively. Often overlooked are five key components necessary to support implementation which include people, resources, structure, systems, and culture. All components must be in place in order to move from creating the plan to activating the plan, (Thompson and Strickland, 2007).

1.1.2 Grant Agencies in Kenya

Grants Agencies are state agencies charged with the issuance of federal grants in form of economic aid on behalf of the state out of the general federal revenue. A federal grant is an award of financial assistance from a federal agency to a recipient to carry out a public

purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the states, (Oyugi, 2011). Jonathan (2006) defines grants as non-repayable funds disbursed by one party (grant makers), often a government department, corporation, foundation or trust, to a recipient, often (but not always) a nonprofit entity, educational institution, business or an individual. In order to receive a grant, some form of "grant writing" often referred to as either a proposal or an application is usually required, (Michelle, 2008).

For Kioko (2011) grants are sums of money awarded to finance a particular activity or facility. Federal agencies and other organizations sponsor grant programs for various reasons and most grants are the result of an identified need. A public or private entity often appropriates funds to develop resources, conduct research or support existing services. Grant makers usually distribute funds through solicitations such as Request for Proposals (RFP), concept papers or grant announcements and bidding processes, (Stephene, 2003). Review committees read, score and make recommendations for funding. In allocating funds, grant makers base their decisions on the applicant's ability to fit its proposed activities within the grant maker's interest areas, (Michelle, 2008). In the United States, grants most often come from a wide range of government departments or an even wider range of public and private trusts and foundations.

Examples of grant organizations in Kenya are, the United Nations (UN), United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), and Department for International Development (DFID), Red Cross, and the USAID among others. The UN is an international organization whose stated aims include promoting and facilitating cooperation in

international law, international security, economic development, social progress, human rights, civil rights, civil liberties, political freedoms, democracy, and the achievement of lasting world peace, (Stephene, 2003).

The UN was founded in 1945 after World War II to replace the League of Nations, to stop wars between countries, and to provide a platform for dialogue. The UNICEF is a United Nations Programme headquartered in New York City, that provides long-term humanitarian and developmental assistance to children and mothers in developing countries, (Lindblom, 2005). It is one of the members of the United Nations Development Group and its Executive Committee. UNICEF was created by the United Nations General Assembly on December 11, 1946, to provide emergency food and healthcare to children in countries that had been devastated by World War II, (Horton, 2004).

The DFID leads the UK's work to end extreme poverty by creating jobs, unlocking the potential of girls and women and helping to save lives when humanitarian emergencies hit. The Kenya Red Cross Society is a humanitarian relief organization created through an Act of Parliament, Cap 256 of the Laws of Kenya of 21st December 1965, (Jonathan, 2006). It exists to provide relief to those affected by disasters, work towards the improvement of health, the prevention of diseases and reduction of suffering in times of peace or war, provide aid to the sick, wounded and non-belligerents in times of war, to prisoners of war and civilian sufferers, and relieve the effects of war, promote the Junior Red Cross Movement among the youth of all races, propagate the ideals and

humanitarian principles of the Red Cross, with a view to developing a feeling of solidarity and mutual understanding among all human beings and all nations, (Stephene, 2003).

These organizations have formulated excellent strategies but have not achieved excellent results due to poor strategy implementation and this therefore implies that implementing strategy is challenging and more time consuming than crafting strategy. The findings by Oyugi (2011) shows that some grant agencies do not have mission and vision, strategic plan and those which have strategic plans do not train their employees on strategy implementation. He emphasized that the factors affecting strategy implementation in such organizations are resource allocation, communication, organizational structure, management commitment and change management, (2011). Kioko (2012) added that some of the managers lack the capacity to oversee the process and well as lack of employee empowerment, motivation and reward systems in the strategy implementation.

Michelle, (2008) observed that in grant agencies most resources are multi-targeted and intended either for the general population or multiple target populations, although this does not necessarily mean that most of these resources are devoted to populations at little to no risk. However gathering reliable data is not possible as most of the data have caveats as a result of lack of a common system of reporting on the specific uses of funding across the agencies and offices, distribution of resources to state, tribal, and local governments which, in turn, distribute resources based on state, tribal, or local-level

planning processes, allocation of funding to support research that will broadly benefit all populations in need, (Lindblom, 2005).

1.1.3 United States Agency for International Development in Kenya

United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is an independent federal government agency that receives overall foreign policy guidance from the Secretary of State of the United States of America. Their work supports long-term and equitable economic growth and advances U.S. foreign policy objectives by supporting economic growth in agriculture and trade, global health and democracy, conflict prevention and humanitarian assistance. Its history goes back to the Marshall Plan reconstruction of Europe after World War Two and the Truman Administration's Point Four Program. In 1961, the Foreign Assistance Act was signed into law and USAID was created by executive order. Since that time, USAID has been the principal U.S. agency to extend assistance to countries recovering from disaster, trying to escape poverty, and engaging in democratic reforms, (USEA, 2010).

USAID played a lead role in planning and implementing programs following the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. USAID programs helped establish functioning democracies with open, market-oriented economic systems and responsive social safety nets. The year 2000 brought more evolution for USAID and foreign assistance with government officials once again calling for reform of how the agency conducts business. With the Afghanistan and Iraq wars in full swing, USAID was called on to help those two countries rebuild government, infrastructure, civil society and basic services such as health care and education. The Agency began rebuilding with an eye to getting the most bang out of its

funding allocations. It also began an aggressive campaign to reach out to new partner organizations, (USAID, 2011).

In Kenya the organization has helped many youths to acquire education by offering scholarship programmes for the needy children mainly from poverty stricken communities. Many of the beneficiaries have been able to realize their life time dreams through these programmes that are offered from elementary level to higher education through its partnership in the *Wings to Fly* program. The program is a partnership between USAID, UKAID, Master Card, and Equity Bank that provides not only scholarships for secondary school, but also mentoring, networking, and internships for orphans and vulnerable children, (USAID, 2012) USAID's contribution of \$17.5 million supports 3,000 students in Kenya. Overall, the initiative supports more than 10,000 young Kenyans with access to a full secondary education, (USEA, 2010).

The USAID, through its AIDS, Population and Health Integrated Assistance program, and working with the Government of Kenya supports outreach activities ensuring that all Kenyans have access to health care. They utilize the community health workers and mobile clinics to bring the care closer to the people. The antiretroviral therapy outreach enables the patients access health screenings and treatment, antiretroviral therapy and counseling and testing. They also receive health education on topics such as nutrition and how HIV-positive individuals and protect their partners. These efforts are saving the lives of approximately 125 Kenyans living with HIV/AIDS in the villages, (USAID, 2013).

USAID/Kenya's *Yes Youth Can* program supports the empowerment of Kenyan youth as envisioned in the 2010 constitution. Young people organize themselves in youth-run and

youth-led *bunges*, (parliaments). The bunges provide a structure and a forum for young women and men to mobilize and take action to improve their own lives and those of their neighbors. Today, nearly three years later, the young fathers have improved their livelihoods and also transformed their community. The young men plant maize that they sell at both local markets and large-scale granaries. Their profits have enabled them open a tailoring business and also venture into tomato farming. The group also inspired women in their bunge who have started a young mothers group to practice commercial farming, USAID, 2013). Research conducted after the 2008 post-election violence showed that Kenyan youth wanted their own voice in affairs that affect them, through youth-run organizations.

However effective implementation of the above programmes have been greatly hampered by low agricultural productivity, increasing population pressure, the unsuitable implementation process, increased urbanization, climate change, poor soil fertility, inadequate access to financial and poverty, high unemployment rate especially among youth, poor governance, inadequate infrastructure, and a variety of cultural challenges. With the current population growth rate, demand for food is expected to outweigh growth in productivity. Stagnant productivity combined with limited ability to expand the area under production pose critical challenges to food security, (USAID, 2012).

While the poverty rate has declined from 53 percent in 1999 to 46 percent in 2009, the total number of poor has increased from 15.2 million to 17.8 million. Female headed households and, in particular, households headed by widows and single mothers have lower income and higher poverty incidences, estimated at 44 percent by the World Bank, (USAID, 2012). Decreasing rainfall, soil degradation, and plot subdivision, are expected

to exacerbate these issues in the coming decade. On the nutritional challenges side, the GOK's nutrition policy and planning is fragmented between several ministries and, unfortunately, comprises a very small percentage of the GOK's health budget. It effectively relies on support from donors, such as United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), to address many nutrition-related issues.

1.2 Research Problem

Alfred's (2002) famous statement that 'structure follows strategy' describes the guiding principle in organizational orientation. It implies that the structure of a firm doesn't develop randomly but is built as adaptation to the selected strategy. A strategy, in turn, is chosen as a best response on conditions a firm is faced with, and therefore a function of environmental conditions (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). There is a causal relationship leading from business environment to business strategy (Porter, 1998) therefore, reorganization can be seen as a consequence of changes in the grant agencies environment which in turn leads to strategic decisions. Serious challenges present the greatest opportunities for strategic changes and grant agencies must be prepared not only to respond, but to help their beneficiaries prepare to meet these challenges. One way of demonstrating this is through investing in strengths and abilities to quickly mobilize stakeholders and other partners to address these challenges across the countries they operate in and around the world, (Thompson and Strickland, 2007). These organizations should possess the ability, through the organization's coordination structures and personnel to address local and state priorities of national importance and play a significant role, through innovation and creativity, in addressing the goals set through

development of strategies that are geared towards the realization of its goals and objectives. The grant programs must strive to achieve the national goals in a manner that reflects the particular needs of individual states and communities and the nation as a whole as well aid the agencies in the realization of its mission and vision (Pearce and Robinson, 2007)

Previous studies in the area of strategies and firm performance have relegated the factors influencing strategy implementation. For instance, a study by Dinney (1998) investigated the relationships of business strategies to the structures and environments of undiversified firms as carried out by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The purpose of the research was to seek for scientific solutions for sustainable and healthy operations. It was shown that strategies in grant agencies must be matched with complementary environments and structures to promote success (Steiner, 1994).

To understand the environmental and health impacts of climate change and to provide sustainable solutions for adapting to and reducing the impact from a changing climate, Osborn (2008) compared voluntary organizations and their innovative capabilities in public services. He established that the strategy of innovative differentiation is most likely to be pursued in uncertain environments and correlates with the use of technocrats and liaison organizations. The strategy of cost leadership is associated with stable and predictable environments and correlates with the use of control. In his study on the performance of grant agencies Robinson (2011) stated that a lot of grants agencies are quick in the creation and formulation of strategies that re-align their organizations to be able to adapt to the changing environment but they remain stack in shelves with no

implementation in sight. This has led to the failure of many organizations with excellent strategies that were formulated to adapt to changes in their environment.

Sterling (2003) has also identified that nearly 70% of strategic plans are never implemented successfully placing the success rate of strategy implementation at 10% among grant agencies, Gerry (2005) has explained how complex it is to implement strategies. He states that strategic management is about dealing with complex, ambiguous and non-routine situations within the organization and not just the operational matters. Mwangi (2010) conducted an empirical test on the proposition that strategy content is a key determinant of organizational performance in the public sector. He observed that strategy content comprises two dimensions: strategic stance (the extent to which an organization is a prospector, defender, or reactor) and strategic actions. He concluded that organizational performance is positively associated with a prospector stance and negatively with a reactor stance. Furthermore, local authorities that seek new markets for their services are more likely to perform well (Mwangi, 2010).

Therefore this study filled this gap by examining strategy implementation at USAID-Kenya that would maintain its trend of success as well as sustain its competitive advantage.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objective of this study was to determine the implementation of strategies at USAID-Kenya.

1.4 Value of the Study

The agency would benefit in that it would get to know where it earlier went wrong in regard to strategy implementation, understand its environment and the dynamics around it and be able to set milestones that are realistic and useful to know whether its strategy implementation process is successful or not. Understanding the factors that affect implementation process would enable the agency put measures in place that would enable effective the implementation.

New and existing grant agencies would benefit through the findings from this study. They would use the findings in developing a framework that would work towards effective strategy implementation process. This would avoid costs that could come as a result not implementing already formulated strategies.

The study would be of great significance to other researchers who may undertake further research on the same topic in future. They would have a better understanding of the factors that affect strategy implementation in grant agencies and have data that could assist them come up with conclusions and fill in the gaps left out by this study. The findings would also help them in developing empirical studies in the future.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents related literature on strategic management and grant agencies. The literature has been reviewed on strategies management, strategy implementation and Grant Agencies.

2.2 Theoretical Underpinning of the Study

Strategic is a management tool used to help an organization do a better job - to focus its energy, to ensure that members of the organization are working toward the same goals, to assess and adjust the organization's direction in response to a changing environment. It is seen as a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, what it does, and why it does it, with a focus on the future (Gerry, 2005). The process is strategic because it involves preparing the best way to respond to the circumstances of the organization's environment, whether or not its circumstances are known in advance; nonprofits often must respond to dynamic and even hostile environments. Being strategic then, means being clear about the organization's objectives, being aware of the organization's resources, and incorporating both into being consciously responsive to a dynamic environment (Barney, 1991).

The strategic management process is about planning because it involves intentionally setting goals and developing an approach to achieving those goals. The process is disciplined in that it calls for a certain order and pattern to keep it focused and productive

(Barney, 1991). The process raises a sequence of questions that helps planners examine experience, test assumptions, gather and incorporate information about the present, and anticipate the environment in which the organization will be working in the future. The process is about fundamental decisions and actions where choices must be made in order to answer the sequence of questions mentioned above (Osborne, 2008).

The plan is ultimately no more, and no less, than a set of decisions about what to do, why to do it, and how to do it. Because it is impossible to do everything that needs to be done in this world, strategic management implies that some organizational decisions and actions are more important than others - and that much of the strategy lies in making the tough decisions about what is most important to achieving organizational success (Thompson and Strickland, 2007)

The strategic management can be complex, challenging, and even messy, but it is always defined by the basic ideas outlined the organization's mission and vision. Strategic planning is only useful if it supports strategic thinking and leads to strategic management the basis for an effective organization (Mintzberg, 2000).

It means making that assessment using three key requirements about strategic thinking: a definite purpose, an understanding of the environment, particularly of the forces that affect or impede the fulfillment of that purpose; and creativity in developing effective responses to those forces. It follows, then, that strategic management is the application of strategic thinking to the job of leading an organization (Gerry, 2005).

According to Lamb (2007) in strategic management the managers draws their efforts which entails attention to the "big picture" and the willingness to adapt to changing circumstances, and consists of formulation of the organization's future mission in light of changing external factors such as regulation, competition, technology, and customers development of a competitive strategy to achieve the mission creation of an organizational structure which will deploy resources to successfully carry out its competitive strategy. Strategic management is adaptive and keeps an organization relevant (Pearce and Robinson, 2007).

2.3 The Concept of Strategy and Strategy Implementation

Michael (2003) argues that sustainable competitive advantage cannot be achieved through operational effectiveness alone. Most of the popular management innovations of the last two decades-total quality, just-in-time, benchmarking, business process reengineering, out sourcing all are about operational effectiveness (Johnson and Scholes, 1999). Operational effectiveness means performing similar activities better than rivals. Each of these is important, but none leads to sustainable competitive advantage, for the simple reason that everyone is doing them. Strategy is all about being different from everyone else. Sustainable competitive advantage is possible only through performing different activities from rivals or performing similar activities in different ways (Mintzberg, 2000).

2.4 Implementation of strategy

Is the process through which a chosen strategy is put into action. It involves the design and management of systems to achieve the best integration of people, structure, processes and resources in achieving organizational objectives (Steiner, 1994). Once the creative

and analytical aspects of strategy formulation have been settled, the managerial priority is one of converting the strategy into operationally effective action. Indeed a strategy is never complete, even as formulation until it gains a commitment of the organization's resources and becomes embodied in organizational activities. Therefore, to bring the result, the strategy should be put to action because the choice of even the soundest strategy will not affect organizational activities and achievement of its objectives. Therefore, effective implementation of strategy is a must for the organization (Higgins, 2004).

The scope of managerial activities associated with strategy implementation is virtually coexistence with the entire management process. This is because the entire management process is geared up according to the needs of the strategy, (Gregory and Dess, 2008). The first basic action that is required for putting a strategy into operation is its institutionalization. Since strategy does not become either acceptable or effective by virtue of being well designed and clearly announced, the successful implementation of strategy requires that the strategy framer acts as its promoter and defender. Often strategy choice becomes a personal choice of the strategist because personality variables become an influential factor in strategy formulation (Johnson and Scholes, 1999).

Thus, it becomes a personal strategy of the strategist. Therefore, there is an urgent need for the institutionalization of strategy because without it, the strategy is subject to being undermined. Therefore, it is the role of the strategist to present the strategy to the members of the organization in a way that appeals to them and brings their support. This

will put organizational people to feel that it is their own strategy rather than the strategy imposed on them. Such a feeling creates commitment so essential for making strategy successful (Steiner, 1994)

Setting organizational climate relevant for strategy implementation is important for making strategy to work. Organizational climate refers to the characteristics of internal environment that conditions the co-operation, the development of the individuals, the extent of commitment and dedication of people in the organization, and the efficiency with which the purpose is translated into results, (Higgins, 2004). Organizations whose strategy is implemented with conducive climate are more effective than those whose are not. People are the instruments in implementing a particular strategy and organizational climate is basically a people-oriented attempt. A top manager can play an important role in shaping the organizational climate not only by providing standards for what others do but also what he does because organizational climate is a matter of practice rather than the precept (Lamb, 2007).

Operating plans are the action plans, operational program and decisions that take place in various parts of the organization. If they are made to reflect desired strategic results, they contribute to the achievement, of organizational objectives by focusing attention on those factors, which are important (Schuck, 2002). For example, in budgeting, more resources will be allocated on those factors, which are critical to the success of the organization as spelled out during the strategy formulation process. There are various ways of making sure that operating plans contribute. If every manager understands strategy, he can

certainly review the program recommendations of staff advisers and line subordinates to see that they are consistent with the requirements of the strategy (Ansoff, 2005).

Strategic management is an ongoing process that evaluates and controls the business and the industries in which the company is involved; assesses its competitors and sets goals and strategies to meet all existing and potential competitors; and then reassesses each strategy annually or quarterly or regularly to determine how it has been implemented and whether it has succeeded or needs replacement by a new strategy to meet changed circumstances, new technology, new competitors, a new economic environment or a new social, financial, or political environment (Pine and Gilmore, 1999). Strategic Management can also be defined as "the identification of the purpose of the organization and the plans and actions to achieve the purpose. It is that set of managerial decisions and actions that determine the long term performance of a business enterprise. It involves formulating and implementing strategies that will help in aligning the organization and its environment to achieve organizational goals (Gregory and Dess, 2008).

2.5 Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation

It is obvious that strategy implementation is a key challenge for today's organizations. There are many (soft, hard and mixed) factors that influence the success of strategy implementation, ranging from the people who communicate or implement the strategy to the systems or mechanisms in place for co-ordination and control, (Akan, Allen, Helms and Spralls, 2006). It is therefore important to understand the factors highlighting the importance of individual factors for strategy implementation and those that emphasize how such factors interrelate and form a strategic implementation environment. The major

factors affecting implementation of strategies are strategy formulation process, the strategy, executors (managers, employees), the organizational structure, the communication activities, the level of commitment for the strategy, the consensus regarding the strategy, the relationships among different units/departments and different strategy levels, the employed implementation tactics, and the administrative system in place (Akan et al, 2006).

It is clear that a poor or vague strategy can limit implementation efforts dramatically. Good execution cannot overcome the shortcomings of a bad strategy or a poor strategic planning effort (Hrebiniak, 2006). Several studies mention the fact that the kind of strategy that is developed (Alexander, 2005; Allio, 2005) and the actual process of strategy formulation, namely, how a strategy is developed (Kim &Mauborgne, 1991, 1993; Singh, 1998) will influence the effect of implementation. Alexander (2005) believes that the need to start with a formulated strategy that involves a good idea or concept is mentioned most often in helping promote successful implementation. As Allio notes, good implementation naturally starts with good strategic input: the soup is only as good as the ingredients (Allio, 2005).

Whether a strategy itself is consistent and fitting or not is a key question for successful strategy implementation, but even a consistent strategy cannot be all things to all people. Bantel (1997) suggests that particular product/market strategies are effective at achieving particular performance goals to the exclusion of others. One of his conclusions is that synergies between strategy types and implementation capabilities exist and should be

exploited. The central conclusion of the research of Kim and Mauborgne (1991) is that the *procedural justice* of the strategy formulation process ultimately affects the commitment, trust, and social harmony as well as the outcome satisfaction of managers in subsidiaries.

Several studies treat institutional relationships among different units/ departments and different strategy levels as a significant factor that affects the outcome of strategy implementation (Slater & Olson, 2001; Chimhanzi, 2004; Chimhanzi and Morgan, 2005). Walker and Ruekert (2007) divide business strategy behaviors into three types: prospectors, differentiated defenders and low cost defenders. These distinctions are based on the strategy categories introduced by Noble 1999) (prospectors, defenders, analyzers, reactors).

Walker and Ruekert stipulate that corporate-business uni-relationships, inter-functional structures and processes, marketing policies and processes may all significantly influence business strategy implementation. Three aspects of the corporate-business unit relationship are especially likely to affect a unit's success in implementing a particular strategy, business unit autonomy, sharing programs and synergies across the organization, as well as control and reward systems. In addition, functional competencies, allocation of resources, decision-making participation and influence, inter-functional conflict and coordination may have vastly different effects on the implementation of different kinds of strategies (Walker and Ruekert, 2007).

Walker and Ruekert (2007) also assume that decision-making and coordination structures in the marketing department, and marketing policies and programs within the business unit, affect the performance of different business strategies in different ways. Gupta (2008) classifies organization's strategic contexts into two dimensions, strategic mission (such as a build strategic mission and a harvest strategic mission) and competitive strategy (such as differentiation and low cost).

Gupta finds that mutual coordination, incentive systems and the level of decentralization between and firm's general manager and his or her superior influence its effectiveness in strategy implementation. For a firm trying to build market share or to pursue differentiation as a competitive strategy, openness in corporate-firms relations and subjectivity in performance assessment were found to be positively associated with effectiveness. For firms trying to maximize short-term earnings or to pursue low cost as a competitive strategy, the corresponding association was found to be negative (Gupta, 2008).

In contrast, corporate-firm decentralization emerged as positively associated with its effectiveness, irrespective of their strategic contexts; although SBS's competitive strategies moderated the magnitude of that association, their strategic missions did not. Chimhanzi (2004) suggests that cross-unit working relationships have a key role to play in the successful implementation of marketing decisions. Implementation effectiveness is affected negatively by conflict and positively by communication and specifically,

interpersonal, not written. In turn, these interdepartmental dynamics are affected by senior management support, joint reward systems, and informal integration.

Chimhanzi (2004) also points out that the marketing and R and D interface remains the most extensively researched dyad within the specific context of the new product development (NPD) process. Chimhanzi provides a multitude of references to such studies in his 2004 article. Other relationships that have received empirical attention, albeit to a lesser extent, include marketing, and accounting, finance, manufacturing, engineering, quality, and sales.

There are also those studies, according to Chimhanzi, that have not focused on dyadic and multiple relations, but rather on marketing as the only one of many departments within a network of relationships. Chimhanzi and Morga's (2005) findings indicate that firms devoting attention to the alignment of marketing and human resources are able to realize significantly greater successes in their strategy implementation. Specifically, these findings imply that marketing managers should seek to improve the relationship with their human colleagues by emphasizing two of the process-based dimensions: joint reward systems and written communication.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology employed to achieve the objectives of this study. It presented the study design, study respondents, data analysis and presentation methods used.

3.2 Research design

This study was a case study of the USAID on strategy implementation. This design was chosen because according to Orodho (2005) it gives a descriptive or explanatory analysis of the USAID and its strategy implementation process. This method would give an intensive description of the strategies that have been proposed at the USAID and how they have been implemented, their success and failures.

The design was used to explore the factors influencing strategy implementation as a causation factor in order to find the underlying principles of the organization in its actual state. It includes the process or record of research in which detailed consideration is given to the development of a particular matter over a period of time. A particular instance of something used or analyzed to illustrate a principle, (Dul and Hak, 2008).

3.3 Data Collection

The study used both primary and secondary data in order to achieve the study objectives. Primary data was obtained from the top management who include, the directors, the

programme managers, operations managers and finance managers of the USAID using interview schedules while secondary data was obtained from their strategic plans, and other relevant documents from the organization. These managers were chosen in this study because they are the ones who formulate and oversee the implementation of the various strategies that have been proposed in the organization.

3.4 Data Analysis

After the data collection, it was subjected to content analysis which involves an objective and systematic identification of specified characteristics of information given by the respondents from the data that was collected and segmenting the information on basis of similarities to establish the factors influencing the implementation of strategies at the USAID-Kenya. The method was chosen because it helps in understanding and making inferences on the strategies that have been proposed for implementation for the last ten years. After which similar responses were grouped together and assigned codes from where the rate of response was determined.

Thereafter the method was used in summarizing and quantitatively analyzing the data based on the objectives of the study (Krippendorff, 2004). This method was considered because it enabled the inclusion of large amounts of textual information and systematic identification of its properties, such as the frequencies of most used keywords by locating the more important structures of its communication content (Babbie, 2010)

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings on the factors affecting the implementation of strategies at the USAID.

In 2011, USAID put out a number of new policy statements to provide strategies for each of its core areas of focus which are formulated by various parties including partners and beneficiaries in order to promote ownership of its programs in Kenya. These are

4.2 Global Health Strategic Framework

(April 2012)The Global Health Strategic Framework sets the direction of USAID's global health sector for fiscal years 2012-2016. The strategy also incorporates the principles of the Global Health Initiative, emphasizing a "whole-of-government approach" that encourages cooperation and coordination between US agencies involved in global health. In the context of a rapidly changing global health environment, the report outlines five health priorities to address the major challenges of the day. Importantly, the Agency's goals go beyond direct provision and treatment to include strengthening recipient country health systems so they can better manage their own health needs. The framework also identifies key approaches for achieving each goal, partners for interagency collaboration, and concrete targets for measuring success.

4.2.1 Kenya's Feed the Future (FTF) 2011-2015

Kenya's Feed the Future (FTF) 2011-2015 strategy builds upon the experience and results of previous programs, most notably the Initiative to *End Hunger in Africa* and the *Global Food Security Response*. The strategy incorporates best practices and lessons learned over several years. The Kenya FTFS program interventions will continue the USG focus on enhancement of markets and smallholder access and reinforce efforts to build sustainability through creation of strong links between market participants, capacity building of viable producer groups, and measures to improve the enabling environment.

4.2.2 USAID's Global Climate Change and Development Strategy

USAID's Global Climate Change and Development Strategy sets out principles, objectives and priorities for USAID climate change assistance from 2012 through 2016. The overarching mission is to help developing country partners speed their transition to climate-resilient, low-emission, sustainable economic growth. This mission governs all underlying objectives and activities, together aiming to help countries slow the pace of greenhouse gas emissions while investing in resilient, sustainable growth and development.

4.2.3 The USAID first Global Water and Development Strategy

This is the US Agency for International Development's (USAID) first global Water and Development Strategy. It is intended to provide a clear understanding of USAID's approach to water programming. This Strategy emphasizes how

sustainable use of water is critical to save lives, promote sustainable development, and achieve humanitarian goals. Projections are that by 2025, two thirds of the world's population could be living in severe water stress conditions. This stress adversely affects individuals, communities, economies, and ecosystems around the world, especially in developing countries.

4.2.4 USAID's Strategy on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance

Agency for International Development recently released its new Strategy on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance. The strategy's overarching goal is to support the establishment and strengthening of inclusive and accountable democracies to advance freedom, dignity and development around the globe. The USAID is working to address the underlying causes of such poverty, the denial of rights, weak and corrupt institutions, political and economic exclusion, and the absence of participation and accountability in governance.

4.2.5 Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy (March 2012)

The Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy was designed to provide guidance on pursuing more effective and evidence-based investments in gender equality and female empowerment, and to incorporate these efforts into the Agency's core development programming. The goal of the policy is to advance equality between females and males, empowering women and girls to participate fully in and benefit from the development of their societies. To reach this goal, USAID investments are aimed at three overarching outcomes: reducing gender

disparities in access to, control over, and benefit from resources, opportunities, and services – economic, social, political, and cultural; reducing gender-based violence; and increasing women’s and girls’ capacity to realize their rights, determine their lives, and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies.

4.2.6 Counter Trafficking In Persons Policy (February 2012)

The 2012 Counter-Trafficking in Persons Policy seeks to enable the Agency to be a catalytic partner in the counter-trafficking community by outlining concrete, measurable principles and objectives.

These include integrating counter-trafficking activities across the development sectors, improving program design to capture lessons learned and best practices in counter-trafficking activities, and enhancing institutional accountability within USAID to address trafficking through training of staff and coordination with partners.

4.2.7 The Influence of Management on Strategy Implementation

The respondents were asked to show the influence of management on the implementation of strategies in the organization and ratings.

The respondents said that the management helps in translating strategies from just theories into action plans that enables the strategy to be successfully implemented and sustained. They offer real leadership to compete effectively and deliver growth.

They help in turning strategies into actions through performance factors, linking strategic thrusts to project, departmental and individual activity. The ultimate goal is to enable the organization to effectively translate strategic intent all the way through to results in a clear and powerful process. They help in creatively and systematically unfolding the strategies by bringing it to life by creating integrated action plans across the organization that ensures all functions and divisions are aligned behind it.

On democracy, the management strives to ensure that the medium-term development policy framework focuses on deepening the practice of democracy and institutional reforms; local governance and decentralization; public policy management and public sector reforms; enhancing development communication. They further aid in distilling the business strategies to achieve clarity of intent, developing the strategic thrusts and broad based action plans, and cascading out detailed work plans.

They also aid in performance management by communicating the strategic intent, thrusts and action plans, using rigorous project management principles to deliver the change agenda, setting individual targets and work plans aligned to the strategic priorities and consistently measuring progress, assessing and giving feedback about performance.

4.2.8 Organizational policies guiding implementation of strategies

The study sought to establish the organizational policies guiding the implementation of strategies at the USAID.

They said that the USAID has applied a set of operational principles across its entire portfolio to better measure and achieve results. They said that a proper strategy-structure alignment as a necessary precursor to the successful implementation of new business strategies. They pointed out that changes in the competitive environment require adjustments to the organizational structure. “If we lag in making this realignment, it may exhibit poor performance and be at a serious competitive disadvantage for us” said the CEO.

They said that they have adopted a decentralized system in the management of strategies and finds that structures that are more decentralized produce higher levels of effectiveness, regardless of the strategic context. The director indicated that they have adjusted organizational structures according to strategic needs to ensure successful implementation.

They have identified a taxonomy comprised of four different combinations of structure/behavior types, which they have labeled as, management dominant, customer-centric innovators, customer-centric cost controllers and middle ground. These alternative structure/behavior types are then matched with specific business strategies (prospectors, analyzers, low cost defenders, differentiated defenders) in order to identify which combination (s) of structures and behaviors best serve to facilitate the process of implementing a specific strategy.

The management has invested in design of organizational structure, design of control systems and selection of managers. Based on these distinctions, the organization has realized that high managerial internal locus of control and low emphasis on meeting a budget are associated with high performance in employing on strategy implementation.

4.2.9 The Influence of Organizational Policies on Implementation of Strategies

The study sought the respondents' opinions on the influence of organizational policies on implementation of strategies.

They said that at the USAID various organizational factors influence policy implementation, including the content of the policy, the nature of the policy process, the actors involved in the process, and the context in which the policy is designed and must be implemented. They observed that implementation is an ongoing process of decision making by key actors who working complex policy and institutional contexts and face pressures from interested as well as opposing parties.

Implementation is an ongoing process of decisionmaking by key actors who working complex policy and institutional contexts and face pressures from interested as well as opposing parties. As such, the motivation, flow of information, and balance of power and resources among stakeholders influences

policy implementation processes. Moreover, different stakeholders may have differing perspectives on what constitutes successful policy implementation.

“A top-down approach emphasizes the faithfulness with which implementation adheres to the policymakers’ intentions. Conversely, a bottom-up approach argues for local implementers to adapt policy strategies to meet local needs and concerns” said the CEO. He added that these two perspectives can result in very different strategies and outcomes. Increasingly, democratic policy systems support moving away from top-down or bottom-up dichotomies to a centrist approach emphasizing how actors from different institutional contexts influence what gets implemented.

“Definitions of implementation can also vary depending on where actors are along the continuum of policy implementation such as complying with policy directives, reaching intermediate performance indicators or benchmarks, or achieving long-term policy goals and objectives. Thus, while policies seek to codify a set of goals and actions, the manner in which a policy is implemented is not linear and may change over time for a variety of reasons only some of which are controlled by policymakers” observed the director.

They said that policies are often redefined and interpreted throughout the implementation process as they confront the realities of implementation on the

ground key elements along the policy to-action continuum, such as leadership, stakeholder engagement, the context and resources.

4.3 Leadership and Implementation of Strategies at the USAID

4.3.1 Leaders policies on Strategy Implementation

The respondents were asked, “What are the leadership policies on the implementation of the strategies”? They responded as follows.

They said that each person involved in change management has their responsibilities, and they understand the role of leadership in strategic implementation to make delegating responsibility more effective. This process involves participation from all of the departments that are affected. The Company leadership identifies what those departments are and create an implementation team that consists of representatives from each affected group. The management goes ahead to create structures that identifies various group leaders, the responsibilities of those group leaders and an accountability system that insures that the implementation team meets its timetable for getting the new program or policy in place.

The management creates the feeling of urgency among the parties involved in the implementation of the strategies. They do this by explaining to the staff why the implementation is necessary and makes the employees understand how the company benefits from the new implementation. They also have the responsibility of getting the organization to see the setbacks of not making a change.

The management has the responsibility as leaders to put a monitoring system in place, analyze the data that is being generated during the implementation and make any necessary changes to make the implementation more efficient. They are also supposed to identify when each phase of a strategic implementation is complete and be ready to transition the company to the next phase.

4.3.2 The Influence of Leadership on Strategy Implementation at the USAID

In your opinion how does leadership affect the implementation of strategies in this organization?

They said that a leader without power or who does not know how to use power will fail in strategy implementation for such a leader will not be in a position to influence individuals to perform. They added that power has a central role in strategy implementation guides an organization and its members throughout a strategy implementation process. They identified the forces of power as being “the ability to get someone to do something that he or she does not particularly want to do and that in order to use power it is necessary to understand what it involves before actual application on employees.

Respondents from the study showed that the top leadership in the organization was able to role model appropriate behavior to see through the strategy implementation process. They were of the opinion that top leadership relied more on transactional leadership style through reward structures while transformational leadership style was being used to a minimal extent.

4.4 Communication and Strategy Implementation

4.4.1 Effective communication structures for implementation of strategies

The respondents were asked to the communication structures based on the strategies that have been put in place.

The results show that meetings are the most frequently used communication tool in strategy implementation followed by memoranda, public address, notices and circulars. They observed that transmitting vision to employees and using every communication channel and tool possible are central elements in the success of any strategy and groundless rumours typical in strategy implementation can undermine chances of success, so it is important to choose appropriate media to avoid misunderstandings.

From the interviews held the respondents revealed that first line managers were more effective in communicating with employees as their closeness to people on the ground was often seen as sincere and telling the truth and that the employees preferred to receive their information through face to face discussions. It then follows that meetings are the most preferred and most effective way of transmitting information, and as such, it should be defined by those who implement or are the target recipients of the information. The explained meetings promote or permit real discussion, and front line managers can identify employee's reluctances, respond to questions and provide feedback to managers.

4.4.2 Influence of Communication on Strategy Implementation

The study sought to establish how communication affects strategy implementation at the. The response was presented as follows.

The respondents said that the content of communication on any given strategies is very important and includes clearly explaining what new responsibilities, tasks, and duties need to be performed by the affected employees. It also includes the why behind changed job activities, and more fundamentally the reasons why the new strategic decision was made firstly. The respondent showed that the organization has adopted a communication system where employees have easy access to management through open and supportive communication climate.

The indicated that the organizational communication system provides for adequate training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the process of strategy implementation. They have made communication pervasive in every aspect of strategy implementation to aid in organizing processes, organizational context and implementation objectives.

The have identified the major communication barriers as organizational structure barriers, learning barriers, personnel management barriers, or cultural barriers which constitute the key barrier to the implementation of planned strategic activities.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the summary, conclusions, recommendations, limitation and suggestion for further study

5.2 Summary

The study findings suggest that implementation of strategies at the USAID is mixer of other major factors related to strategy formulation. They are both an institutional and an interpersonal process that gathers data and viewpoints and ultimately results in strategic decisions. These strategic decisions and how they have been reached have a major impact on strategy implementation success. Institutional factors (management and organizational policies) and people-oriented factors (leadership and communication) influence implementation outcome dialectically. Consensus and commitment has been achieved with the help of proper implementation tactics and communication activities by stakeholders in the organization.

These factors in turn are influenced by four generic phases of strategy implementation, pre-implementation, organizing implementation, managing implementation, and sustaining performance. A leader is viewed in this study as a managerial employee who is tasked to oversee the successful execution of strategic initiatives. While issues of strategic planning have presented challenges to strategic leaders, it is in the area of strategy implementation where these leaders have encountered a number of challenges.

5.3 Conclusion

Strategic communication to the USAID means communicating a concept, a process, or data that satisfies a long term strategic goal by allowing facilitation of advanced planning, or communicating over long distances usually using international telecommunications or dedicated global network assets to coordinate actions and activities of operationally significant commercial, non-commercial and military business or combat and logistic subunits.

The content of communication on any given strategies is very important and includes clearly explaining what new responsibilities, tasks, and duties need to be performed by the affected employees. It also includes the why behind changed job activities, and more fundamentally the reasons why the new strategic decision was made firstly.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings above, the study recommends that the management at the USAID should emphasis a vertical management system to ensure all stakeholders are made part of any project/programmes proposed. The company should keep on improving of the organizational policies guiding the implementation of its projects to ensure that they are carried out as envisioned in the guidelines. The most important thing when implementing a strategy is the top management's

commitment to the strategic direction itself. Therefore, top managers must be willing to give energy and loyalty to the implementation process.

The ability to craft a clear cut strategic vision represent a valuable intangible asset which is key in strategy implementation. The study revealed that most strategies implemented were not backed by well crafted visions to guide them. Thus for the purpose of strategy implementation leaders should be able to craft a vision that create a fit between intended strategy and the specific personality profile of the implementation's key players in the different departments of the organization.

Further morethere is a high need for a set of leadership behaviors that can sustain long term strategy implementation activities. The appropriate leadership behavior is supposed to be focused on vision, missions, inspiration and intellectual capacity which translate to transformational leadership behavior.

The research established that most strategies failed due to the inability of leaders to make use of their various skills to create the awareness and show the strategy implementation roadmap as most of the strategy implementers were not aware of leadership expectations. Leadership should make use of their skills and abilities such as Human, technical and conceptual skills to create the need for change and enhance strategy implementation receptivity through imparting knowledge, motivation and guidance to strategy implementation individuals and teams.

Most of strategies implementation failed due to lack of two way communication. It is therefore recommended that they should adopt two way communication tools that permit and solicit questions from employees on issues related to the formulated strategy and its implementation.

5.5 Limitations of the study

Issue of confidentiality were of great concern to the respondents and therefore had to be adequately addressed. The researcher sought permission from the relevant authority beside assuring them that the study was meant for academic purpose only.

Fear of victimization

The respondents frightful of the predicament that would befall them if they give out critical information. However their fears were allayed upfront by articulating to them the UoN letter of introduction indicating the need to carry out the study.

5.6 Suggestion for further research

I commend further research on strategy formulation process at USAID for how this strategy are formulated and personnel involved in its formulation has a great impact on strategy implementation. I would suggest also a research on Balance scorecard implementation at USAID for this drives Performance on how those strategy are been implemented and the Speed at which they are implemented leading to organization achieving its goals and Objective.

REFERENCES

- Akan, O., Allen, R.S., Helms, M.M., and Spralls III, S.A. (2006). „Critical Tactics for Implementing Porter” s Generic Strategies”. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 27, 43-53
- Alexander, L.D. (2005), Successfully Implementing Strategic Decisions”. *Long Range Planning*, 18, 91-97.
- Babbie, Earl R. (2010) *The Practice of Social Research* (12th ed.). Wadsworth: Cengage Learning. p. 530. ISBN 9780495598411.
- Bantel, K.A. (1997). „Performance in Adolescent, Technology-Based Firms: Product Strategy, Implementation, and Synergy”. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 8, 243-262.
- Barney, J. (1991) Firm Resources and Sustainable Competitive Advantage, *Journal of Management*, Vol 17, no 1, 1991
- Chimhanzi, J. (2004), The impact of marketing/HR interactions on marketing strategy implementation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38, 73-98.
- Chimhanzi, J., and Morgan, R.E. (2005).„Explanations from the marketing/human resources dyad for marketing strategy implementation effectiveness in service firms”. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 787– 796.
- Dinney Miller (1998) Relating Porter’s business Strategies to Environment and Structures: Analysis and Performance Implication. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol, 31, No 2, 280.
- Dul, J. and Hak, T. (2008) *Case Study Methodology in Business Research*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. ISBN 978-0-7506-8196-4

- Gerry Johnson, K. S. (2005) *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Gregory G and Dess, G. T. (2008) *Strategic Management Text & Cases*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gupta, A.K. (2008), SBU Strategies, Corporate-SBU Relations, and SBU Effectiveness in Strategy Implementation". *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 477-500
- Higgins Daniel (2004) *How managers think*, Harvard Business Review, November–December. Foundation Center, Retrieved 2012-01-09
- Horton, Richard (2004). "UNICEF leadership 2005–2015: a call for strategic change". *The Lancet* 364 (9451): 2071–2074. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17560-0. PMID 15589292
- Hrebiniak, L.G. (2006), Obstacles to Effective Strategy Implementation". *Organizational Dynamics*, 35, 12-31
- <http://kenya.usaid.gov>.
- http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode31/usc_sec_31_00006305----000-.html
- IBM, Capitalizing on Complexity: Insights from the Global Chief Executive Office Study, July 2010
- J. Scott Armstrong and Kesten C. Greene (2007), Competitor-oriented Objectives: The Myth of Market Share". *International Journal of Business* 12 (1): 116–134
- Johnson, G and Scholes. K. (1999) *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, 5th Edition, FT Prentice Hall, London
- Jonathan Weisman (2006) *Proposals Call For Disclosure of Ties to Lobbyists*. Washington Post. Retrieved 2010-05-02

- Kim W.C., and Mauborgne, R.A. (1991), Implementing Global Strategies: The Role of Procedural Justice". *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 125-143.
- Kim, W.C., and Mauborgne, R.A. (1993), Making Global Strategies Work". *Sloan Management Review*, 34, 11-27.
- Kioko, Irene W (2012), Factors Affecting Effective Use of Donor Aid by International Non-Governmental Organizations in Kenya: a case of USAID, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Krippendorff, Klaus (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology* (2nded.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. ISBN 9780761915454
- Lamb Robert Boyden (2007) *Competitive strategic management*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Lindblom, Anna-Karin (2005), *Non-governmental organizations in international law*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Kenya Joint Assistance Strategy 2007 – 2012,
- Michelle Chino, (2008) Strategies for Preparing a Successful Grant Application, American Indian Development Associates, 2401 12th St., NW, Suite 212, Albuquerque, NM 87104, (505) 842-1122
- Mintzberg, H. (2000) *The Rise & Fall of Strategic Planning*. Essex, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Moore, Mark H., *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Mulcaster, W.R. "Three Strategic Frameworks," Business Strategy Series, Vol 10, No 1, pp 68 – 75, 2009

- Noble, C.H. (1999a), Building the Strategy Implementation Network". *Business Horizons*, 19-27.
- Orodho, A. J. (2005) *Elements of Education and Social Science research methods*, Mosola publisher, Nairobi Kenya
- Pearce, J.A. & Robinson, R.B. (2007) *Formulation, Implementation and Control of Competitive Strategy*, 9th edition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Pine, J. and Gilmore, J. (1999) *The Experience Economy*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- Porter, J. A. (1998) *Strategic Management*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Richard W. Scholl, (1998), Organizational Strategy and Strategic Diagnosis, Labor Research Center, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881
- Schuck, Gloria (2002) *Intelligent Workers, a New Pedagogy for the High Tech Workplace*, Organizational Dynamics, Autumn.
- Singh, D.T. (1998), Incorporating cognitive aids into decision support systems: the case of the strategy execution process. *Decision Support Systems*, 24, 145–163.
- Slater, S.F., and Olson, E.M. (2001), Marketing's Contribution to the Implementation of Business Strategy: An Empirical Analysis". *Strategic Management Journal*.22, 1055-1067.
- Steiner Peter (1994) *the Practice of Management*, Harper and Row, New York.
- Stephen Schlesinger (2003) *Act of Creation: the Founding of the United Nations*, Westview Press, softcover, 374 pages, ISBN 978-0-8133-3324-3.
- Sterling R. (2003) *Translating strategy into effective implementation: dispelling the myths and highlighting what works*. Prentice Hall, New York

- Thompson, A.A. & Strickland, A.J. (2007) *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*, 13th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- United States Environmental Agency (USEA) (2010) *Grants Management Plan 2009-2013*, Nairobi Kenya.
- US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) *Strategic Plan, Fiscal Years 2010-2015*, <http://www.hhs.gov/ociio>
- USAID, (2012) Scholarships Give Kenyan Children Wings to Fly, US Embassy Kenya
- USAID, (2011), Capable Partners Program, Kenya (CAP Kenya, US embassy Kenya
- USAID, Community Health Services Bring AIDS Treatment Close to Home, July 17, 2013, Kenya.
- USAID, Young Fathers Turn Farming Into Successful Enterprises July 22, 2013.
- Walker, Jr, O.C., and Ruekert, R.W. (2007), Marketing's Role in The Implementation of Business Strategies: A Critical Review and Conceptual Framework". *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 15-33.

APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. State some of the latest strategies that have been formulated in this organization.
2. Who are the main participants in the formulation of these strategies?
3. How do the managers and stakeholders influence the implementation of these strategies?
4. How would you rate the management's participation in the implementation of these strategies?
5. What are the organizational policies that guide the implementation of the strategies?
6. Based on the response above, do you think the implementation of these strategies has been carried out in the context of the above guidelines?
7. Explain your response above.
8. In this context what would you say is the influence of organizational policies on the implementation of policies?
9. What are the leadership policies on the implementation of the strategies?
10. Who are the leaders charged with overseeing the implementation of these strategies?

(indicate their roles)
11. How would you rate their level of commitment in offering the necessary direction for the implementation of the strategies?

12. In your opinion how does leadership affect the implementation of strategies in this organization?
13. How would you describe the communication structures based on the strategies that have been put in place?
14. How do the above structures affect implementation of the strategies that have been put in place?
15. What is your view on strategy implementation in organizations from your experience?