

**CHALLENGES OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AT  
THE PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMISSION OF  
KENYA**

**BY**


**LAWRENCE OCHIENG' AMOLLO**

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF  
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (MBA), SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, UNIVERSITY  
OF NAIROBI**

**OCTOBER, 2012**

**DECLARATION**

I declare that this project is my original work and has never been submitted for a degree in any other university or college for examination/academic purposes.

Signature:.....

Date:.....6<sup>th</sup> NOV. 2012

**LAWRENCE OCHIENG' AMOLLO**

**D61/61052/2011**

**SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION**

This research project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor.

Signature.....

Date.....8/11/2012

**DR. JUSTUS MUNYOKI**

**SENIOR LECTURER**

**CHAIRMAN,**

**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to all those who strive in service to humanity.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Firstly, my sincere gratitude to the Almighty by whose grace I was able to undertake and complete this study.

Secondly, I feel a deep sense of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Munyoki, for his guidance and contributions that made the development and production of this work a reality.

Lastly, appreciation also goes to all my friends and colleagues for their support and encouragement throughout the demanding journey. I also thank the interviewees at PARLSCOM for making time to give feedback on the interview which went a long way in ensuring that the project was insightful on completion.

## ABSTRACT

The concept of strategy originated from the military. However due to the rapid changes in the operating environment, private organizations have adopted it in developing their game plans to drive their organizations on where they would like to be. For the public sector, particularly the Parliamentary Service Commission (PSC), the concept is new. This study sought to establish the challenges of adopting strategic management and, more specifically, on the strategic implementation. The objective of this study was to determine the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission.

The study adopted a case study research design and used primary data that was collected using an interview guide. The researcher interviewed members of the PSC strategic plan implementing committee who were the target respondents. Content analysis was used to analyze the data collected from the respondents since it was qualitative in nature.

The study found that the organization encountered the following problems: slow procurement procedures due to bureaucracy in administration hence delays in decision making for some of the key projects, inadequate office space, lack of a clear communication framework due to poor inter and intra-communication and coordination among/within Directorates/Departments and slow implementation of some projects due to lack of adequate technical staff. The study recommends that the management should assess the organizational capabilities and behavior needed to move from what the organization is to what it needs to become and determine what work processes would be required to implement the strategy and design current work processes to fit those requirements.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>DEDICATION</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.1.1 Concept of Strategy.....	2
1.1.2 Strategy Implementation.....	3
1.1.3 Challenges of Strategy Implementation.....	4
1.1.4 The Parliamentary Service Commission (PARLSCOM) .....	5
1.2 Research Problem .....	7
1.3 Research Objective .....	9
1.4 Value of the Study .....	9
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>10</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	10
2.2 Strategy Implementation.....	10
2.3 Challenges of Strategy Implementation.....	12
2.3.1 Availability of Resources.....	13
2.3.2 Leadership Style.....	14
2.3.3 Organizational Culture.....	16
2.3.4 Corporate Structure.....	18
2.3.5 Lack of Focus.....	19
2.3.6 Failure of Buy in by Implementing Team.....	19

<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	20
3.2 Research Design.....	20
3.3 Data Collection .....	20
3.4 Data Analysis.....	21
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION.....</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	22
4.2 Demographic Information.....	22
4.3 Strategy Implementation Practices .....	22
4.4 Challenges of Strategy Implementation.....	26
4.5 Measures Being Put In Place by PSC to Reduce the Effects of the Challenges.....	31
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1 Introduction.....	32
5.2 Summary of the Findings.....	32
5.3 Conclusion .....	34
5.4 Limitations of the Study.....	35
5.5 Recommendations.....	35
5.6 Implications on Policy, Theory and Practice .....	37
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>45</b>
Interview Guide .....	45

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>PARLSCOM</b>	Parliamentary Service Commission
<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom
<b>KCB</b>	Kenya Commercial Bank
<b>SACCO</b>	Savings and Credit Cooperative Society
<b>HOD</b>	Head of Department
<b>BOM</b>	Board of Management
<b>ICT</b>	Information Communication and Technology
<b>SPIC</b>	Strategic Plan Implementation Committee
<b>MoU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>NBK</b>	National Bank of Kenya
<b>KNA</b>	Kenya National Assembly
<b>CNA</b>	Clerk of the National Assembly
<b>SNA</b>	Speaker of the National Assembly
<b>CEO</b>	Chief Executive Officer
<b>SWOT</b>	Strengths Weaknesses Opportunity and Threats
<b>HR</b>	Human Resource
<b>PESTEL</b>	Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Environmental and Legal



# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Organizations all over the world seem to have difficulties in implementing their strategies. Beer & Eisenstat (2000) revealed a number of problems in strategy implementation: weak management roles in implementation, a lack of communication, lacking a commitment to the strategy, unawareness or misunderstanding of the strategy, unaligned organizational systems and resources, poor coordination and sharing of responsibilities, inadequate capabilities, competing activities and uncontrollable environmental factors (Beer & Eisenstat, 2000). Strategy is a multi-dimensional concept that various authors have defined in different ways. It is the match between an organization's resources and skills and the environmental opportunities as well as the risks it faces and the purposes it wishes to accomplish (Thompson, 1993). It is meant to provide guidance and direction for the activities of the organization. Since strategic decisions influence the way organizations respond to their environment, it is important for a firm to make strategic decisions and define strategy in terms of its function to the environment. The purpose of strategy is to provide directional cues to the organization that permit it to achieve its objectives while responding to the opportunities and threats in the environment (Pearce & Robinson, 2007).

Ansoff (1999) views strategy in terms of market and product choices. According to his view, strategy is the "common thread" among an organization's activities and the market. Johnson & Scholes (1998) define strategy as the direction and scope of an organization that ideally matches the results of its changing environment and, in particular, its markets and customers so as to meet stakeholder expectations. According to Jauch & Glueck (1984), strategy is a unified and integrated plan that relates the strategic advantages of the firm to the challenges of the

environment and that is designed to ensure that the basic objectives of the enterprise are achieved through proper execution by the organization.

The Parliamentary Service Commission (PARLSCOM) is charged with the responsibility of implementing parliament's strategic plan that was first drafted in 2008 and revised in 2012. The strategic plan which covers the duration 2008-2018 involves the implementation of several activities that must be carried out by PARLSCOM. PARLSCOM has made several achievements on all the 12 objectives of the strategic plan, the most notable being the successful refurbishment of the National Assembly chamber (PSC strategic plan, 2012).

### **1.1.1 Concept of Strategy**

Mintzberg (1994) defines a strategy as a plan, a direction or a guide. Porter (1996) defines strategy as being different by deliberately choosing to do a different set of activities in order to deliver a unique mix of value. It involves doing activities differently than the competitors in order to gain competitive advantage. The concept of strategy originated from the military. It is only after the Second World War in 1945 that the concept of strategy became more relevant as business firms moved from relatively stable to more turbulent and competitive environments. These rapid changes in the environment were attributed to application of science and technology in management of firms and accelerated change emanating from within business firms. Many authors including Porter (1980) have written about the concept of strategy since its inception (Backer, 1980).

A strategy is designed to effectively relate the organization to its internal and external environment. Backer (1980) argues that the major significance of strategy is that it gives organizations a framework for developing abilities for anticipating and coping with changes in

the environment. Backer (1980) further indicates that a strategy helps an organization to deal with future uncertainty by defining goal accomplishing procedures.

### **1.1.2 Strategy Implementation**

In the world of management, increasing numbers of senior people are recognizing that one of the key routes to improved business performance is better implementation (Renaissance Solutions Ltd., 1996). However, at the same time, it is also understood that implementation is one of the more difficult business challenges facing today's managers (Pfeffer, 1996). Within this, management ability or competence is seen as an important contributor to achieving this aim (Boyatzis, 1982).

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 Raps (2005), the implementation process covers the entire managerial activities, including such matters as motivation, compensation, management appraisal, and control processes which entail cascading strategy to all functional areas in such a way as to achieve both vertical and horizontal logic and enhance implementation of policies.

Simons & Thompson (1998) pointed out that almost all the management functions to some degree, applied in the implementation process. Hendry & Kiel (2004) also posit 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. There should be specific interim or ultimate time-based measurements to be achieved by implementing strategies

in pursuit of the company's objectives. The implementation activities are in fact related closely to one another and decisions about each are usually made simultaneously.

What tends to be absent from these programmes is attention to any higher order competencies which enable managers to use these educational or technical abilities to make a difference to the organisation (Harris, 1989). As an example, better financial management may require senior managers not only to have a good grasp of financial principles but also to “remain open minded” or to “lead by example” under the difficult circumstances of trying to get other managers to keep a closer eye on expenditure. Similarly, improved chairmanship may demand qualities of “self confidence” and the ability to “read interpersonal or political situations” which often crop up in management meetings, as well as learning about techniques for running meetings. Exactly the same is argued to be true for organisational strategy and other areas of business improvement (Ulrich, 1998).

### **1.1.3 Challenges of Strategy Implementation**

Reed & Buckley (1988) discuss problems associated with strategy implementation identifying four key areas for discussion. They acknowledge the challenge and the need for a clear fit between strategy and structure and claim the debate about which comes first is irrelevant provided there is congruence in the context of the operating environment. They warn that, although budgeting systems are a powerful tool for communication, they have limited use in the implementation of strategies as they are dominated by monetary - based measures and, due to their size and the game playing associated budget setting, “it is possible for the planning intent of any resource redistribution to be ignored” (Reed & Buckley, 1988, p. 68). Another problem arises when management style is not appropriate for the strategy being implemented. They cite

an example that the “entrepreneurial risk taker may be an ideal candidate for a strategy involving growth, but may be wholly inappropriate for retrenchment” (Reed & Buckley, 1988, p. 68). Goal setting and controls are also recognized as problematic: identifying coordinated targets at various levels in the organization is difficult and the need for control is heightened as uncertainty and change provides a volatile environment (Tavakoli and Perks, 2001).

Al Ghamdi (1998) replicated the work of Alexander (1985) in the UK and found that 92 percent of strategy implementation by firms took more time than originally expected, that major problems surfaced in 88 percent of companies, again showing planning weaknesses. He found the effectiveness of coordination of activities as a problem in 75 percent and distractions from competing activities in 83 percent cases. In addition, key tasks were not defined in enough detail and information systems were inadequate in 71 percent of the respondents. What is interesting is that there is congruence between these findings, which implies that lessons have still not been learned; as Al Ghamdi states, “the drama still continues” (Al Ghamdi, 1998, p. 322).

#### **1.1.4 The Parliamentary Service Commission (PARLSCOM)**

PARLSCOM as presently constituted was established under sections 45A and 45B of the former Constitution of Kenya. It consists of the Speaker of the National Assembly (SNA) as the chairman, a vice-chairman elected by the Commission from amongst its members, the leader of Government business in the Kenya National Assembly (KNA), the leader of the opposition party with the highest number of seats in the National Assembly or a Member of the Assembly deputed by him and seven members appointed by the National Assembly from amongst its members (S. 45B (1)). The Clerk of the National Assembly (CNA) is the Secretary to the Commission.

In 2010 a new Constitution was promulgated which, aside from introducing far reaching changes in the structure of Parliament, added more roles to the institution. Key among the changes introduced is: Parliament will now consist of the Senate and the National Assembly, complete separation of the legislature and the Executive (Members of Parliament will no longer sit in the cabinet) and enhanced role of parliament in the vetting of Executive appointments.

In the (new) Constitution PARLSCOM is established under Article 127 of the Constitution. The membership of PARLSCOM will now consist of the Speaker of the National Assembly, as the chairperson, seven Members appointed by Parliament among its Members (of whom one is elected by the Commission as the vice-chairperson), and two Members, one man and one woman appointed by Parliament from among persons who are experienced in public affairs but are not Members of Parliament. The Clerk of the Senate is the Secretary to the Commission. The responsibility and membership of PARLSCOM still remains the same under the new constitution (PSC Strategic Plan, 2012).

PARLSCOM is charged with the primary responsibility of facilitating Members of Parliament to effectively and efficiently execute their responsibilities. The key stakeholders of PARLSCOM are Members of Parliament. PARLSCOM has strong linkages with all Ministries and Government Departments as it facilitates Parliament to play its two major roles of making laws and oversight. It also has other links with the public, as the MPs are representatives of the people. The responsibilities of PARLSCOM include the following: to provide services and facilities to ensure the efficient and effective functioning of Parliament, constitute offices in the

Parliamentary Service, and appointing and supervising office holders, preparing annual estimates of expenditure of the Parliamentary Service and submitting them to the National Assembly for approval, and exercising budgetary control over the Service, undertake, singly or jointly with other relevant organizations or programmes to promote the ideals of Parliamentary democracy and perform other functions necessary for the wellbeing of the Members and staff of Parliament, as prescribed by national legislation (PSC Strategic Plan, 2008-2012).

The strategic plan was reviewed in view of the changes introduced by the new constitutional dispensation and it will now cover the duration 2008-2018. It involves the implementation of several activities that must be carried out by PARLSCOM, including facilitation of the passage of Bills which will give effect to the new Constitution. The content of the strategic plan by and large remains the same. PARLSCOM has made several achievements on all the 12 objectives of the strategic plan, the most notable being the successful refurbishment of the National Assembly chamber (PSC Strategic Plan, 2012).

## **1.2 Research Problem**

Implementing strategies successfully is vital for any organization, whether public or private. Without implementation, even the most superior strategy is useless. The Parliamentary Service Commission of Kenya is currently implementing the 2008-2018 strategic plan and has already made a number of achievements in the first phase of implementation. A number of bills need to be prepared if the strategic plan has to be successfully implemented. The hurdles the implementation committee faces need to be reviewed. It will also be important to find out how the committee has managed to overcome the challenges. Strategy implementation has attracted much less attention in strategic and organizational research than strategy formulation or strategic

planning. Alexander (1991) suggests several reasons for this: strategy implementation is less glamorous than strategy formulation, people overlook it because of a belief that anyone can do it, people are not exactly sure what it includes and where it begins and ends. Furthermore, there are only a limited number of conceptual models of strategy implementation.

Kiptugen (2003) did a study to determine the strategic responses of Kenya Commercial Bank to a changing competitive environment. Since he focused mainly on strategies that can be adopted in a competitive environment, the study failed to cover the processes involved in strategy implementation and challenges in the implementation phase. On the other hand Muturi (2005) did a study to determine the strategic responses of Christian churches in Kenya to changes in the external environment. He based his survey on evangelical churches in Nairobi. This study focused on a different context and concept from what the current study seeks to cover. Kamanda (2006) also did a study on Kenya Commercial Bank (KCB) with the objective of determining the factors that influence its regional growth strategy. His study, however, does not cover the issues of strategy implementation. Situma (2006) also covered KCB but focused on its turnaround strategy. Muguni (2007) studied the role of executive development in strategy implementation. His was a comparative study of KCB and National Bank of Kenya. Orora (2011) studied the challenges of strategy implementation at Gusii Mwalimu Savings and Credit Cooperative Society Limited. He established that resistance and resource insufficiency were major challenges that the SACCO faced while implementing its strategic plan.

From the studies discussed above, it is clear that no study has been done focusing on strategy implementation by PARLSCOM. This study therefore seeks to establish the challenges of strategy implementation especially in the dawn of the new constitutional dispensation. The study



sought to answer the following question: What are the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission?

### **1.3 Research Objective**

The objective of this study was to determine the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission of Kenya.

### **1.4 Value of the Study**

The study would be important not only to Parliamentary Service Commission staff but also other managers in other government institutions. It would help them to understand the challenges of strategy implementation and how to overcome them. It would also help different firms to achieve success better than others.

The study would be a source of reference material for future researchers on other related topics; it would also help other academicians who undertake the same topic in their studies. The study would also highlight other important relationships that required further research; this might be in the areas of relationships between intelligence and firm's performance.

On policy, the findings of this study would be important to policy makers in establishing the challenges of strategy implementation. Many a time, good and well developed strategies failed simply because of implementation challenges. This study would help shade light on the roles of different stakeholders in strategy implementation and how synergy could be built to ensure successful strategy implementation.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents a review of the related literature on the challenges of strategy implementation. It also reviews literature with respect to the research objective on the challenges of strategy implementation at PARLSCOM, particularly in the implementation of the new constitution. The specific areas covered here are concept of strategy implementation, effective strategy implementation process and finally the challenges of strategy implementation.

#### **2.2 Strategy Implementation**

A strategy implementation framework encompasses: clear and quantifiable strategic goals, enabling strategic initiatives, enabling strategic assets, and enabling change management competencies and tools with frequent progress milestones (Otley, 2001). Strategic change is difficult, complex, and expensive to implement. There are barriers and resistance to change in every organization. Creating a dynamic strategic vision, supported from the top to the bottom, requires a holistic perspective and integrated participation at all levels. Although formulating a consistent strategy is a difficult task for any management team, making that strategy work which is affecting the process by which strategic plans are turned into organizational action (Okumus and Roper, 1998).

Strategic decisions determine the organizational relations to its external environment, encompass the entire organization, depend on input from all of functional areas in the organization, have a direct influence on the administrative and operational activities, and are vitally important to long-term health of an organization (Grant, 2000). Strategies must be well formulated and

implemented in order to attain organizational objectives. Thompson (1993) determined that the strategy implementation process included the many components of management and had to be successfully acted upon to achieve the desired results. Here, the critical point is that effective and successful strategy implementation depends on the achievement of good “fits” between the strategies and their means of implementation.

Chakravarthy & White (2001) have taken into consideration that no matter how effectively a company has planned its strategies, it could not succeed if the strategies were not implemented properly. Hendry & Kiel (2004) also clarified that the more ineffective the top management decisions, the more ineffective are the choices made at lower levels of management. Similarly, if top management's strategic choices tend to be successful, it reflects favorably on choices made in other parts of the organization. Simons (1994) refer to three categories of factors that affected strategic decision-making process: environmental factors; organizational factors; and decision-specific factors. Here, environmental factors mean external agents such as national culture, national economic conditions, and industry conditions. Organizational factors refer to organizational structure, organizational culture, structure of decision making bodies, impact of upward influence, and employee involvement.

Decision-specific factors can be explained as time, risk, complexity, and politics. According to Porter (1980) strategists must assess the forces affecting competition in their industry and identify their company's strengths and weaknesses, then strategists can devise a plan of action that may include first, positioning the company so that its capabilities provide the best defense against the competitive force; and/or second, influencing the balance of the forces through strategic moves, thereby improving the company's position; and/or third, anticipating shifts in the

factors underlying the forces and responding to them, with the hope of exploiting change by choosing a strategy appropriate for the new competitive balance before opponents recognize it.

Petersen & Welch (2000) noted two dimensions of strategy implementation: structural arrangements, and the selection and development of key roles (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). The quality of people as skills, attitudes, capabilities, experiences and other characteristics required by a specific task or position. Structure refers to the way in which tasks and people are specialized and divided, and authority is distributed; how activities and reporting relationships are grouped; the mechanisms by which activities in the organization are coordinated Systems refer to the formal and informal procedures used to manage the organization, including management control systems, performance measurement and reward systems, planning, budgeting and resource allocation systems, and management information systems. Staff refers to the people, their backgrounds and competencies; how the organization recruits, selects, trains, socializes, manages the careers, and promotes employees. Skills refer to the distinctive competencies of the organization; what it does best along dimensions such as people, management practices, processes, systems, technology, and customer relationships.

### **2.3 Challenges of Strategy Implementation**

There are a number of challenges that organizations encounter while implementing strategies. They emanate both from the internal and external environment of the organization. Some of these challenges include: availability of resources; leadership style; organization culture; corporate structure; lack of focus and failure of buy in by implementing team (Johnson & Scholes, 2003).

### 2.3.1 Availability of Resources

All organizations have at least four types of resources, namely: financial, physical, human resources and technological resources (Thompson, 1990). These resources are available to an organization as simple tangible resources (money, human resources and infrastructure) or intangible resources such as public power for example in law enforcement and tax collection or knowledge base. Resource based view to strategy management view knowledge, skills and experience of human resource as a key contributor to firm's bundle of resource and capabilities (Musyoka, 2008). Johnson et al. (2005) argues that putting strategy into action is concerned with ensuring that strategies are working in practice. It involves structuring an organization to support successful performance. This includes organizational structures, processes and relationships. It also involves enabling success through the way organization resources such as people, information, finances and technology support strategies.

As companies change and as skills expertise become recognized as a major asset of the firm, the heightened efforts in cultivating and enhancing them becomes significant part of development strategy (Saunders, 1994). During the process of strategy implementation, how relationships and beyond the organization are fostered and maintained will influence performance further while organizations and groups may be assumed as taking strategic actions, it is individuals who ultimately, in practical terms take action and are responsible for driving an organization or a group towards objective. Perhaps the most important resource of an organization is its people (Johnson & Scholes, 2003). Furthermore, organization is a social system relationship (formal and informal) among the people who individually and jointly subscribe to same goal(s) and to which they direct their actions. Where the needs of the individual and the demands of an organization

are incompatible, transactions and conflict are bound to occur and strategy implementation cannot be achieved (Dubrin, 2001).

Recruitment and staff development strategies need to support the other factors. In addition aspects of job design, reward package and conditions of the labor market and the hopes and expectations of people (Saunders, 1994). Audits to assess human resources requirements to support strategies identify goal setting and performance appraisals, reward systems, competence based recruitment, training and development as key human resources activities known to help liable successful strategy implementation. Performance management is not only essential but its processes should also be adjusted to support changing strategies. Hendry and Majluf (2004) found out that systems process and routines for organizing, allocating and developing new programs during implementation directly depend on human resources. A number of factors commonly prohibit effective resource allocation. These include an overprotection of resources too great an emphasis on short run financial criteria, organizational politics, vague strategy targets, a reluctance to take risks and a lack of sufficient knowledge (Galpin, 1998). Identifying the appropriate resources and competencies to support strategy implementation unless the organization is also able to allocate resources and control performance in line with strategy (Musyoka, 2008).

### **2.3.2 Leadership Style**

Leadership is the process of persuasion, where an individual induces a group to pursue certain objectives. Effective leadership involves restructuring organizational architecture in a manner that motivates employees with the relevant knowledge to initiate value-enhancing proposals (Dubrin, 2001). Drucker (1994) captures an environmental scanning analysis that depicts leadership as that which should manage the fundamentals like people, inflation among others.

Strategic leadership should ensure that values and culture within an organization are appropriate for satisfying key success factors. This should lead to environmental-value-resources (E-V-R) congruence. Bartlett & Goshal (1996) recognize the role of middle managers, arguing they are the key actors who have a pivotal role in strategic communication. They talk about middle managers as threatened silent resistors whose role needs to change more towards that of a "coach", building capabilities, providing support and guidance through the encouragement of entrepreneurial attributes. So, if they are not committed to performing their roles the lower ranks employees will not be provided with support and guidance through encouragement of entrepreneurial attributes. In addition to the above, another inhibitor to successful strategy implementation that has been receiving a considerable amount of attention is the impact of an organization's existing management controls (Marginson, 2002) and particularly its budgeting systems (Marginson, 2002).

Successful strategic plan implementation requires a large commitment from executives and senior managers. Therefore, planning requirement which may be done even at departmental levels requires executive support. Executives must lead, support, follow-up and live the results of strategic planning implementation process. According to Healthfield (2009), without commitment of senior executives, participants feel fooled and misled. This complements what (2005) claims that the commitment to the strategic direction is a prerequisite for strategy implementation. Therefore, top managers have to show their dedication to the effort. To implement strategy successfully, senior executives must not assume that lower level managers have the same perceptions of the strategic plan and its implementation, its underlying rationale, and its urgency. Instead, they must assume they do not, so executives must persuade employees of the validity of their ideas. This notwithstanding what Kaplan and Norton (2004) argues that

upfront commitment by leaders include an adherence to the full and thorough process of strategic planning which must culminate in implementing programs and services and commit allocations to meet the objectives of the strategic plan at a level that is doable for the organization and the level of activity.

### **2.3.3 Organizational Culture**

Organizational culture refers to the leadership style of managers – how they spend their time, what they focus attention on, what questions they ask of employees, how they make decisions as well as the organizational culture (the dominant values and beliefs, the norms, the conscious and unconscious symbolic acts taken by leaders (job titles, dress codes, executive dining rooms, corporate jets, informal meetings with employees)). Organizational culture is among the major issues, because the cultural dimension is central to all aspects of organizational behavior (Hendry & Kiel, 2002). If strategy implementation is going to realize its full potential of dramatically improving the way companies do business, changing of the organizational culture must be considered an integral part of the process. Systems cannot be developed irrespective of the people that will be managing and operating those systems. One of the biggest reasons why some process strategy implementation projects do not achieve the level of success the organization expects is because the organization or functional manager did not deal with the issue of organization culture change. Greengard (1993) says that an organization should strive to involve the staff at all stages of the implementation process.

Woolridge & Floyd (1990) note that it can be much easier to think of a good strategy than it is to implement it. Much of the shortcomings in the strategy area are attributable to failures in the implementation process rather than in the formulation of strategy itself (Beer & Eisenstat 2000; Woolridge & Floyd, 1990). The available literature in the 1990s on strategy implementation was



examined in order to identify potential strategy implementation challenges. Of the 22 identified earlier by Alexander (1985) only 15 implementation problems have been cited.

Eisenstat (1993) indicates that most companies attempting to develop new organization capacities stumble over these common organizational hurdles: competence, coordination, and commitment. These hurdles can be translated into the following implementation problems: coordination of implementation activities was not effective enough, capabilities of employees were insufficient, training and instruction given to lower level employees were inadequate, and leadership and direction provided by departmental manager were inadequate.

Schmidt (1994) posits that a strategic change can be successfully implemented through a four-stage process: assess the organizational capabilities and behavior needed to move from what the company is to what it needs to become, determine what work processes would be required to implement the strategy and design current work processes to fit those requirements, identify what information needs the work processes generate, and determine what information systems and databases would be required to meet those needs and determine which organizational structure would best support those work processes.

This strategic change model can be translated into the following implementation problems: key implementation tasks and activities were not sufficiently defined, information systems used to monitor implementation were inadequate, and overall goals were not sufficiently well understood by employees. Schmidt (1994) found that there are six areas of vital importance to long term successful strategy implementation. These areas are: market, people, finance, operation, adaptability, and environment.

### 2.3.4 Corporate Structure

According to Kaplan and Norton (2004), organization structure influences the type of strategy used by an organization. Mintzberg (1996) identified that strong ideology will lead to strong resistance to change and freedom of action is severely constrained. Structural designs typically begin with organizational chart. It pertains managers responsibilities, their degree of authority and the consideration of facilities, departments and decisions, tasks design and production technology. Whereas Hall et al. (2003) identifies three organizational structure variables (formality, complexity and centralization), Mintzberg (1979) comes up with five variables which have varying degree of formality, complexity and centralization. They include: simple structure, machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, divisionalized form and autocracy. The structural design of the organization helps people to pull together activities that promote effective implementation (Musyoka, 2008).

The structure of the organization should be consistent with the strategy to be implemented. Moreover the nature of the organizations structure to be used in implementing strategy is influenced by environmental stability and the interdependence of the different units (Daft, 2000). Failure to address issues of the broad structural design of roles, responsibilities and lines of reporting can, at a minimum, constrain the development of strategies and performance (Johnson & Scholes, 2002; Koske, 2003). Disorder, friction, malfunctions or reduced performance results when managers use the wrong structure for the environment (Hax and Majluf, 1991).The structure of the organization should therefore be compatible with the chosen strategy and if there is incongruence adjustment will be necessary either for the structure or the strategy itself (Koske, 2003). Hax & Majluf (1991) stated that strategy and structure interact, strategy does influence structure but structure also constraints strategy alternatives. Learned et al. (1969) states that

structure of organizations in certain circumstances are unimportant e.g. small companies where an individual direct planning and execution of activities structure therefore applies I large organization where they have many people (Koske, 2003). Symptoms of an ineffective organizational structure include: too many levels of management, too many meetings attended by too many people, too much attention being directed toward solving interdepartmental conflicts, too large span of control and too many unachieved objectives (Galpin, 1998).

### **2.3.5 Lack of Focus**

A corollary to the need for timeliness and distinctiveness is the need for strategic focus. Some companies try to be all things to all people. As a result, they lack distinctiveness, but importantly, they also lack focus. As a result, resources are dissipated and priorities are never clearly articulated. With little sense of prioritization, employees are a bit like carnival plate spinners – always frantically working to keep things from collapsing, but never really making progress (Sterling, 2003).

### **2.3.6 Failure of Buy in by Implementing Team**

Some strategies fail because there is insufficient buy-in to or understanding of the strategy among those who need to implement it. A great deal of academic research has been devoted to studying the impact of employee buy-in and understanding of strategy. Giles (1991) demonstrated that strategy implementation fails when “implementers do not own the strategy”. Guffey & Nienhaus (2002) found a strong link between organizational commitment and employees’ support of the organization’s strategic plan. Several CEOs interviewed believe that the surest way to ensure someone understands a strategy is to involve him or her in its creation.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

In this section the research identified the procedures and techniques that were used in the collection, processing and analysis of data. Specifically the following subsections were included; research design, data collection and data analysis.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

The study adopted a case study research design. This was a case study aimed at getting detailed information regarding the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission. The researcher settled for a case study of PARLSCOM.

According to Yin (2004), a case study allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events. Kothari (2004) noted that a case study involves a careful and complete observation of social units. It is a method of in-depth study rather than breadth and places more emphasis on the full analysis of a limited number of events or conditions and other interrelations. Data collected from such a study was more reliable and up to date.

#### **3.3 Data Collection**

The study used primary data that was collected using an interview guide. The researcher interviewed members of the strategic plan implementing committee. The committee had 6 members and all of them formed the target population. The interview guide enabled the researcher to collect qualitative data. This was used in order to gain a better understanding and a more insightful interpretation of the results from the study.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

Content analysis was used to analyze the data collected from the respondents since it was qualitative in nature. Nachmias & Nachmias (1996) define content analysis as any technique used to make inferences through systematic and objective identification of specified characteristics of messages. Kothari (2004) also explains content analysis as the analysis of the contents of documentary and verbal material, and describes it as a qualitative analysis concerning the general import of message of the existing documents and measure pervasiveness.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents analysis and findings of the study as set out in the research methodology. The results are presented on the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission. The study targeted all the 6 committee members out of which 5 committee members responded by scheduling an interview with the researcher. This gave a response rate of 83%. The interviewees comprised of clerk assistant, principal finance officer, director of legal services, director of information and human resource officers at the PSC.

#### **4.2 Demographic Information**

The study sought to establish the respondents' demographic statistics including: position in PSC, period worked at PSC and their educational background. On the period the interviewees had worked in the PSC, the study found that majority of the interviewees had worked in the PSC for more than 5 years implying that they had enough experience in the PSC to be able to provide relevant information since they understood the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission.

The study also sought to determine the interviewees' highest academic qualification. From the findings, most of the interviewees had masters' and bachelors' degrees hence understood what the study required and aimed to achieve.

#### **4.3 Strategy Implementation Practices**

The interviewees were required to give their view on the importance of strategy implementation to the success of PSC. The interviewees indicated that the strategy implementation defined goals

to be achieved by the Commission; guided the activity planning and prioritization; it gave direction and clarified the goals to be achieved; aided in the execution of PSCs vision and mission; assisted in the budgeting process; enhanced staff, morale through clear distinction of duties; served as a tool for performance management; and created sustainability of plans and programmes.

On how the PSC was able to position and relate itself to the environment to ensure its continued success and also secure itself from surprises brought about by the changing environment during strategy implementation, the interviewees indicated that the PSC involved all staff members in drawing work plans which were based on the strategic objectives. They also involved all stakeholders (staff, the management etc) in the development and formulation of the plan hence creating ownership by all organs of the Commission. In addition, the PSC positioned itself by constantly reviewing its plans against what was happening in other parliaments and government departments and by carrying out an environmental scan of the stakeholders through SWOT and PESTLE analysis and as such the PSC was able to prepare adequately for any eventualities.

The study also required the interviewees to indicate the importance of management ability, or competence, in achieving successful strategy implementation. From the responses, the interviewees noted that a competent management was able to think strategically by giving leadership in understanding of the mission of the institution, focus on key goals, and knowledge on what to measure and prepare adequately for the future. Since management was responsible for execution of strategy, they needed to be competent in order to understand the strategic direction of the institution and guide implementation of programmes and strategies for realization of the strategic plan.

In addition, the study sought to establish the stages of strategy implementation at PSC as well as the persons involved in strategy implementation process. The interviewees indicated that the first stage of strategy implementation at PSC was strategy formulation that entailed establishment of the strategic objective derived from the emerging issues. The second stage was the sensitization of the strategic objectives across all the departments in the PSC. The third stage involved work plan development both by individuals as well as at the departmental level followed by execution/implementation of the work plans after which monitoring and evaluation was undertaken. The final stage entailed reporting of progress in the strategy implementation and review of strategies. The interviewees stated that all members of staff, including heads of department, directors, members of PSC and all other stakeholders were involved in the strategy implementation process at PSC.

On the role of communication in the process of strategy implementation at PSC, the study established that communication was vital in ensuring that all stakeholders were aware of what was expected of them and how each one of them contributed to the overall performance. It was used to sensitize the staff members at departmental level regarding the implementation of the plan and development of work plans. Communication was a key ingredient since all strategies and plans had to be communicated clearly, concisely and precisely to all staff and to the Commission. It also provided a feedback mechanism which enhanced satisfaction.

The study aimed at establishing the impact of human resource development on effective strategy implementation at PSC. The findings revealed that HRD ensured that all knowledge and skills gaps were filled and led to a more motivated work force. The employees were implementers of the PSC strategy hence they were heavily involved at various stages. Buy-in by staff led to great achievement in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.



The study sought to determine the effect of involvement of organizational members in the strategy process on successful strategy implementation. The interviewees indicated that through involvement there was ownership of the strategy by the organizational members as they were the implementers hence more cooperation towards achievement of stated goals. Involvement also enhanced team work among organizational members leading to successful strategy implementation.

The study also required the interview to indicate the initiatives taken by management in creating and sustaining a climate within the organization that motivated employees in their implementation role. The interviewees cited that the organization improved work environment and employee welfare by providing appropriate employee assistance, benefits and health schemes, allowances for preparatory meetings and proper remuneration. There were also training and development initiatives where implementers attended workshops for capacity building.

The study further sought to identify the requirements for a successful strategy implementation at PSC. The interviewees outlined such requirements as organizational structure through defined jobs, roles and responsibilities, HR planning by ensuring sufficient and appropriately skilled staff, training and development interventions, policies and procedures to guide in implementation of objectives, committed team of implementers, support from senior management and availability of resources to implement strategy.

On the style or model of strategy implementation employed at PSC, the study established that PSC used bottom-up/ top-down implementation where work plans were developed and implemented by departments while monitoring and evaluation flowed down from the top. The findings also revealed that, as a strategy implementation practice, PSC employed continuous

review and monitoring and organized sensitization of staff. It was also revealed that all staff were encouraged to participate in the strategy implementation.

The interviewees were also required to indicate other factors that led to strategy implementation success at PSC. Some of the factors mentioned by the interviewees included: reliable budgetary provision; ability to attract and retain competent and professional staff; political goodwill; link of all activities being implemented to the strategic plan; availability of adequate resources voted to various projects; and a permanent interdepartmental committee overseeing the strategy implementation.

#### **4.4 Challenges of Strategy Implementation**

The study sought to establish the strategic implementation problems related to organizational hurdles. From the findings, the interviewees cited the following problems: slow procurement procedures due to bureaucracy in administration hence delays in decision making for some of the key projects, inadequate office space, lack of a clear communication framework due to poor inter and intra-communication and coordination among/within Directorates/Departments, slow implementation of some projects due to lack of adequate technical staff, delays in release of funds from treasury, some departments have ambitious, unachievable targets and set unrealistic work plans with targets they could not achieve, inertia from some of the staff to embrace the strategic plan. limited awareness of the strategic plan among some staff in some departments; inadequate internal capacity to undertake specialized capital projects leading to implementation delays and over dependence on consultants.

The interviewees also indicated that they faced the challenge of strategy implementation time being underestimated since some departments had ambitious activities which they did not

achieve. Similarly, the interviewees cited inadequate funding, political interference and changes in projects that were priority, for example, the plan of acquiring and refurbishing buildings for use by incoming parliament which had been delayed by decisions at cabinet and selling agencies as some of the challenges that surfaced during strategy implementation that had not been anticipated.

The study required the interviewees to indicate other factors in the external environment that had an adverse impact in strategy implementation at PSC. The interviewees indicated political interference, bad publicity, slow response from external stakeholders such as government/ ministries, treasury in releasing funds, cabinet decisions especially acquisition of parliamentary square and the new constitution which had brought about organizational changes which had led to the revision of the strategic plan as other factors in the external environment that had an adverse impact in strategy implementation at PSC.

The interviewees were also required to indicate some of competing activities that caused distractions inhibiting strategy implementation at PSC. Some of the competing activities mentioned included: resistance to change, lack of cohesive inter departmental linkages, lack of effective communication and feedback channels; staff demands, political interests, and lack of a defined organization structure.

On the challenges posed by the inadequacy of information systems used to monitor strategy implementation at PSC, the findings revealed that operationalization of the strategic plan was hampered and the information therein was not cascaded down to all the members of staff; and elaborate computer-based system had not been put in place hence reliance on paper reports by

departments which were analyzed and filed; and duplication of activities at departmental level due to lack of proper structure.

On the impact of poor communication and diminished feelings of ownership and commitment by employees to strategy implementation at PSC, the interviewees indicated resistance where staff members were reluctant to implement the plan; general hostility to the whole process of strategic planning hence its 'business as usual' and the strategic objectives risk not being achieved; Occasionally, they had faced a challenge of poor feedback from some of the departments. Some interviewees had repeated what they reported in the past year; others under reported while others did not give the correct picture of their level of strategy implementation.

The study further sought to establish the challenges caused by ineffective coordination and poor sharing of responsibilities of strategy implementation activities at PSC. According to the findings, ineffective coordination and poor sharing of responsibilities led to role conflict and ad hoc assignments outside the agreed work plans hence achievement of the strategies was hampered. Ineffective coordination of activities at departmental level also delayed implementation of some of the projects like the implementation of the HR strategy of recruiting key staff for both the Senate and National Assembly due to lack of adequate coordination between the concerned parties and the Commission.

In addition, the study sought to find out other challenges faced in strategy implementation at PSC. The challenges encountered included: lack of specialized training opportunities due to low provision of resources for training, shortage of technical staff, lack of clarity in HR systems and policies, subjective treatment of situations and persons, inadequate appreciation of strategic planning by most staff including heads of department who are meant to be strategy

implementers, inadequate prioritization of projects, lack of operational scheme of service, lack of integrated framework to guide the role of various department, and lack of an operational MOU for facilitation of meaningful engagement of think-tanks and other professional associations.

The study also sought to establish the possible solutions to the challenges of strategy implementation at PSC. The interviewees cited the following possible solutions to the challenges of strategy implementation at PSC: development of a clear organizational structure and schemes of service, recruitment of additional staff especially in technical area, leveraging of ICT to support operations through automation of services, involve staff in change management initiatives and team building activities, improvement of internal processes such as human resource policies and procurement processes, put in place an effective communication framework, sensitization of all members of staff on the strategic plan, training of all staff especially directors and HODs on elements of effective strategy formulation and implementation, prioritization of projects, institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation through having a department responsible for planning and development and proper budgeting.

On ways the PSC had dealt with the challenges to ensure successful strategy implementation, the study established that PSC dealt with the challenges by filling vacant positions, sensitization of staff, enhancing human resource development and training interventions, ad hoc approach but plans were underway to have a department responsible for strategy, office of director general to coordinate the activities of the PSC strategic planning and implementation.

On whether the resources had affected strategy implementation at PSC, some of the interviewees said yes since some projects had been underfunded due to inadequate resources allocation which had affected the implementation of the plan for example acquisition of equipments among others.

Other interviewees said no since resources had been adequate only that there had been delay in releasing them to various projects.

The interviewees were asked to indicate how culture at PSC had affected strategy implementation process. According to the interviewees, culture at PSC had to some extent affected strategy implementation negatively. This was due to the prevalence of parliamentary traditions which made it very difficult for change to be embraced. Interdepartmental linkages had also been weakened by the perceived competition between the officers of the House and other support services. People had been generally slow to embrace change and sometimes they intentionally delay implementation due to fear of political consequences like delays in staff reorganization.

On whether there was a system to monitor the progress of strategy implementation at PSC and the effects it had on the implementation process, the interviewees indicated that there was system to monitor the progress of strategy implementation. The strategic plan implementation committee developed a monitoring and evaluation framework which was engaged in monitoring and evaluating programmes and strategies on a regular basis. This has led to regular evaluation and reporting on progress made hence aids decision making on way forward; Identification of objectives, strategies and output; identification of performance indicators, time frames, roles and responsibilities, communication of outcomes of assessment and way forward to BoM and commission, updated work plans and adjustments on indicators, annual assessment/audit through collection of data on indicators and appraisal carried out, annual work plan based on the strategies and finances allocated accordingly and the system had enhanced implementation of the plan.

#### **4.5 Measures Being Put In Place by PSC to Reduce the Effects of the Challenges**

The study sought to determine what PSC had done to ensure proper management of strategy implementation. The interviewees indicated that PSC had established the Strategic Plan Implementation Committee to spearhead and oversee the implementation of the Plan. In addition, further proposal had been put in place to have a specific department to deal with planning and development. On what the PSC had done to ensure inclusiveness and reduce resistance from staff and other stakeholders in the strategy implementation process, the study established that PSC involved all staff and other stakeholders in the drawing up of work plans and regular feedback on progress made and envisaged changes. Made strategy implementation in institution wide matter and once a year, all directors and HODs met to review progress made in the year and plan for the next year.

On whether the middle level managers were involved in strategy implementation at PSC, the interviewees indicated that middle level managers were involved in the formulation of strategies and development of work plans and budgets. HODs were the implementing agents of the strategy. They were very crucial to the successful implementation of the strategies as they form the link between management and the actors. On what PSC had done to improve the success rate of strategy implementation, the interviewees indicated that there was regular communication with all stakeholders, review reports, feedback through performance management, provision of ICT facilities, wider participation of all staff; monitoring and evaluation through SPIC and reports to the PSC quarterly.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter discusses summary of the findings on the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission. The chapter provides the summary of the findings, conclusion and gives recommendations based on the result discussed in the previous chapter.

#### **5.2 Summary of the Findings**

On strategy implementation practices, the study found that strategy implementation defined goals to be achieved by the Commission, guided the activity planning and prioritization, gave direction and clarified the goals to be achieved, aided in the execution of PSCs vision and mission, assisted in the budgeting process, enhanced staff morale through clear distinction of duties, served as a tool for performance management and created sustainability of plans and programmes. The study established that communication was a key ingredient since all strategies and plans had to be communicated clearly, concisely and precisely to all staff and to the Commission and it also provided a feedback mechanism which enhanced satisfaction. The requirements for a successful strategy implementation at PSC included organizational structure through defined jobs, roles and responsibilities, HR planning by ensuring sufficient and appropriately skilled staff, training and development interventions; policies and procedures to guide in implementation of objectives, committed team of implementers, support from senior management and availability of resources to implement strategy. The study established that PSC used bottom-up/ top-down implementation where work plans developed and implemented by departments while monitoring and evaluation down from the top.



On challenges of strategy implementation, the study found that strategic implementation problems related to organizational hurdles included slow procurement procedures due to bureaucracy in administration hence delays in decision making for some of the key projects, inadequate office space, lack of a clear communication framework due to poor inter and intra-communication and coordination among/within Directorates/Departments, slow implementation of some projects due to lack of adequate technical staff, delays in release of funds from treasury, some departments have ambitious, unachievable targets and set unrealistic work plans with targets they could not achieve, inertia from some of the staff to embrace the strategic plan; limited awareness of the strategic plan among some staff in some departments, inadequate internal capacity to undertake specialized capital projects leading to implementation delays and over dependence on consultants. The study also found that the organization faced the challenge of strategy implementation with respect to underestimation of required time since some departments had ambitious targets which they did not achieve.

On measures taken by PSC to reduce the effects of the challenges, the study established that PSC had established the Strategic Plan Implementation Committee to spearhead and oversee the implementation of the Plan, involved all staff and other stakeholders in the drawing up of work plans and regular feedback on progress made and envisaged changes, made the strategy implementation in the institution a wide matter and, once a year, all directors and HODs met to review progress made in the year and plan for the next year. Middle level managers were also involved in the formulation of strategies and development of work plans and budgets. Whereas HODs were the implementing agents of the strategy, there was regular communication with all stakeholders as well as review reports, feedback through performance management, provision of

ICT facilities, wider participation of all staff and monitoring and evaluation through SPIC and quarterly reports to PSC in order to improve the success rate of strategy implementation.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

From the findings, the study concludes that political interference, bad publicity, slow response from external stakeholders such as government/ ministries, treasury in releasing funds, cabinet decisions, especially acquisition of parliamentary square, and the new constitution, which has brought about organizational changes, are factors in the external environment that has an adverse impact in strategy implementation at PSC. The challenges of strategy implementation at PSC include lack of specialized training opportunities due to low provision of resources for training, shortage of technical staff, lack of clarity in HR systems and policies, subjective treatment of situations and persons, inadequate appreciation of strategic planning by most staff, including heads of department who are meant to be strategy implementers, inadequate prioritization of projects, lack of operational scheme of service, lack of integrated framework to guide the role of various department and lack of an operational MOU for facilitation of meaningful engagement of think-tanks and other professional associations.

The study also concludes that the requirements for a successful strategy implementation at PSC includes organizational structure through defined jobs, roles and responsibilities, HR planning by ensuring sufficient and appropriately skilled staff, training and development interventions, policies and procedures to guide in implementation of objectives, committed team of implementers, support from senior management and availability of resources to implement strategy.

## **5.4 Limitations of the Study**

The respondents were reluctant to provide information for fear that the sought would be used to victimize them or paint a negative image about them or the Commission. The researcher handled this problem by carrying an introduction letter from the University and assured the respondents that the information they gave would be treated with confidentiality and was used purely for academic purposes.

The study faced both time and financial limitations. The period over which the study was to be conducted was limited, hence exhaustive and extremely comprehensive research could not be undertaken on the challenges of strategy implementation at the PARLSCOM. The researcher, however, minimized these by conducting the survey only at the office where decisions are made.

## **5.5 Recommendations**

This study makes several recommendations based on those with policy implications as well as suggestions for further research.

### **5.5.1 Recommendations with Policy Implications**

The study found that there was lack of definite organization culture at PARLSCOM hence posing a challenge to strategy implementation. It is therefore recommended that organizations should consider organization culture an integral part of the process changing if strategy implementation is going to realize its full potential of improving the way organization do its business. The management should assess the organizational capabilities and behavior needed to move from what the organization is to what it needs to become, determine what work processes would be required to implement the strategy and design current work processes to fit those requirements, identify what information needs the work processes generate, and determine what

information systems and databases would be required to meet those needs and determine which organizational structure would best support those work processes.

The study also found that the organization structure at PARLSCOM was not fully aligned with the strategic plan that had been adopted and, therefore, recommends that the structure of the organization should be consistent with the strategy to be implemented since the nature of the organizations structure to be used in implementing strategy is influenced by the environment stability and the interdependence of the various units. The structure of the organization should be compatible with the chosen strategy and if there is incongruence, adjustment should be necessary either for the structure or the strategy itself to avoid disorder, friction, malfunctions or reduced performance results.

The study also established that the majority of the employees at PARLSCOM were not taken on board in the conceptualization of the plan which in turn led to lack of understanding of the strategic plan. It is therefore recommended that employees should be involved in formulation and implementation in order for them to understand strategy and support organization's strategic plan. This will reduce employee resistance and reluctance in implementing the strategy. Audits to assess human resources requirements to support strategies should identify goal setting and performance appraisals, reward systems, competence based recruitment, training and development as key human resources activities known to help liable successful strategy implementation. The organization should identify the appropriate resources and competencies to support strategy implementation.

### **5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Research**

This study focused on the challenges of strategy implementation at the Parliamentary Service Commission of Kenya. Therefore this study recommends that a similar study should be carried out on challenges of strategy implementation in all public institutions. This would allow for generalization of the study findings on the challenges of strategy implementation.

### **5.6 Implications on Policy, Theory and Practice**

The study should be important not only to Parliamentary Service Commission staff but also other managers in other Government institutions. It should help them to understand the challenges of strategy implementation and how to overcome them. It should also help different firms to achieve success better than others.

The study should be a source of reference material for future researchers on other related topics; it should also help other academicians who undertake the same topic in their studies. The study should also highlight other important relationships that required further research; this might be in the areas of relationships between intelligence and firm's performance.

On policy, the findings of this study should be important to policy makers in establishing the challenges of strategy implementation. Many a time, good and well developed strategies failed simply because of implementation challenges hence the study should help shade light on the roles of different stakeholders in strategy implementation and how synergy could be built to ensure successful strategy implementation.

## REFERENCES

- Al Ghamdi, S. M. (1998), Obstacles to successful implementation of strategic decisions: the British experience, *European Business Review*, Vol. 98 No.6, pp.322-7.
- Alexander, L. D. (1991), Strategy implementation: nature of the problem, *International Review of Strategic Management*, Vol. 2 No.1, pp.73-91.
- Alexander, L. D. (1985). Successfully implementing strategic decisions, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 18 No.3, pp.91-7.
- Andresen, G. L. (1995), Business Process Automation Transforming the Enterprise by Automating Access to Information, Customers, and Communications, *White Paper*, Dataquest, Inc., June.
- Ansoff, H.I. (1999), *Implanting Strategic Management*, Prentice Hall, Cambridge, United Kingdom
- Anyango, R. (2008), Challenges of Strategy Implementation. A Survey of Multinational Manufacturing Companies in Kenya. Unpublished MBA thesis, university of Nairobi
- Ateng F. O. (2007), Challenges of Strategy Implementation at the Ministry Of Finance in Kenya. Unpublished MBA thesis, university of Nairobi
- Bakar et al., (2011), Implementation of Strategic Management Practices in the Malaysian Construction Industry, *Pak. J. Commer. Soc. Sci. Vol. 5 (1), 140-154*
- Bartlett, C.A and Goshal, S. (1996), Release the entrepreneurial hostages from your corporate hierarchy, *Strategy & Leadership*, Vol. 24 No.4, pp.36-42.
- Beer, M and Eisenstat, R (2000), The silent killers of strategy implementation and learning, *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 41 No.4, pp.29-40.
- Boyatzis, R. (1982). *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Bracker, J. (1980), The historical development of the strategic management concept, *Academy Of Management Review* 1980, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 219-224
- Chakravarthy, B.S., and White, R. E. (2001), *Strategy process: forming, implementing and changing strategies*, Sage Publications: London.
- Daft, R. L. (2000), *Management*, Fifth edition, The Dryden Press
- Davenport, T. H. (1993), *Process innovation; reengineering work through information technology*. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Drucker, P (1994). Theory of the Business, *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, pp 95-106, Boston, Mass, USA.
- Dubrin, A. J. (2001), *Leadership: Research findings, Practice, and Skills* (Third ed.). New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dwallow M. (2007), *Strategy Implementation Challenges of Firms in the Packaging Industry in Nairobi*. Unpublished
- Eisenstat, R. A. (1993), Implementing strategy: developing a partnership for change, *Planning Review*, Vol. 21 No.5, pp.33-6.
- Galpin, T. J. (1998), When leaders really walk the talk: making strategy work through people, *Human Resource Planning*, Vol. 21 No.3, pp.38-45.
- Giles, W. D. (1991), Making strategy work. *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 24 No.5, pp.75-91.
- Govindarajan, V. (1999), Strategic Cost Analysis: The Crown Cork and Seal Case, *Journal of Cost Management*, Winter. 1989, 2, 4, pp. 5-16
- Grant, R. M. (2000), *Contemporary Strategy Analysis: Concepts, Techniques, Applications*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Greengard, S. (1993), Reengineering: out of the rubble", *Personnel Journal*, Vol. 72 No.12, pp.48.

- Guffey, M and Nienhaus, J. (2002), Highlighting what works, *Strategy and Leadership* Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 27-34.
- Hall, M., Andrukow, A., Barr, C., Brock, K., de Wit, M., & Embuldeniya, F (2003), *The capacity to serve: A qualitative study of the challenges facing Canada's nonprofit and voluntary organizations*. Toronto: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy
- Hammer, M. and Champy, J. (1993), *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*, Harper Business, 1993.
- Harris, T. B. (1989), Some comments on family boards. *Family Business Review*, 2(2), 150-152.
- Hax A C. & Majluf N S. (1991), *The Strategic Concept and Process*, Prentice Hall.
- Hendry, K. and Kiel, G.C. (2004), The role of the board in firm strategy: integrating agency and organizational control perspectives, *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, Vol. 12 pp.500-20.
- Jauch, L. and Glueck, W., (1984), *Business Policy and Strategic Management*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., Fourth Edition
- Johnson G., and Scholes, K. (1998), *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, Prentice Hall
- Johnson G., Scholes K. (2003), *Exploring Corporate Strategy; Texts and Cases*, Prentice Hall, New Delhi, 6th edition.
- Johnson, G. and Scholes, K (2002), *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, Prentice Hall, 6th Edition.
- Johnson, G., Scholes, K. and Whittington, R. (2005), *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, 7th Edition, Prentice Hall
- Kamanda, C. (2006), *Factors Influencing the Regional Growth Strategy at KCB*. Unpublished MBA Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi
- Kaplan, R.S., and Norton, D.P. (2004), *Strategy Maps Converting Intangible Assets into Tangible Outcomes*, Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA



- Kiptugen E.J. (2003), *Strategic Responses to a Changing Competitive Environment. The Case Study of KCB*. Unpublished MBA Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi
- Koske, F. K. (2003), *Challenges of strategy implementation and its challenges in public corporations: The case study of Telkom Kenya Ltd*. Unpublished MBA research Project, UON
- Kothari, C. R. (2004), *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: Wiley.
- Lampel, J. and Mintzberg, H. (1996), Customizing Customization”, *Sloan Management Review*, Vol.38, No. 1, pp. 21–30. Mullins, 2005
- Lares-Mankki, L. (1994), *Strategy Implementation Bottlenecks: Identification, Analysis and Removal*, Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta.
- Lucey, T., (2005), *Management information system* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Bedfore Row, London: Pearson Press limited.
- Marginson, D.E.W. (2002), Management control systems and their effects on strategy formation at middle management levels: evidence from a UK organization, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 23 pp.1019-31
- Mintzberg, H. (1979), *The structuring of organizations a synthesis of the research*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall
- Mintzberg, H. (1993), *Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994), *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. New York: The Free Press
- Mugenda, O. M and Mugenda, A.G (2003), *Research Methods, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Muguni I.N. (2007), *The Role of Executive Development in Corporate Strategy Implementation. A Comparative Study of KCB and National Bank of Kenya*, Unpublished MBA Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Muturi J.G. (2005), *Strategic Responses by Christian Churches in Kenya to Changes in the External Environment, A Case of Evangelical Churches in Nairobi*, Unpublished MBA Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Nachmias, C. F and Nachmias, D. (1996), *Research Methods in the Social Science, 5th ed.* London: Arnold Publishing

Okumus. F., and Roper, A. (1998), *Great strategy, shame about the implementation*, Proceeding of the 7th Annual Hospitality Research Conference (CHME), Glasgow, 14-16 April, pp.218-36.

Orora, M. (2011), *The challenges of strategy implementation at Gusii Mwalimu Savings and Credit Cooperative Society Limited*. Unpublished MBA Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Otley, D. (2001), Extending the boundaries of management accounting research: developing systems for performance management. *British Accounting Review*, Vol. 33 pp.243-61.

Parliamentary Service Commission Strategic plan, 2012

Pearce, J.A. and Robinson, R.B. (2007), *Strategic Management: Strategy Formulation and Implementation*. Third Edition, Richard D. Irwin Inc

Petersen. B., and Welch, D. E. (2000), Creating meaningful switching options in international operations. *Long Range Planning*, 33, 688-705.

Pfeffer. J. (1996), When it comes to best practices- why do smart organisations occasionally do dumb things? *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer.

Piercy, N.F. (1992), *Market-Led Strategic Change: Making Marketing Happen in Your Organization*, Thorsons, London

Porter, M (1980), *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*, Free Press, New York, NY.

Porter, ME (1996), What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review* 96(6)61-78

- Raps. A. (2005), *Strategy Implementation, an insurmountable obstacle? Handbook of Business Strategy*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 141-146.
- Reed, R. and Buckley, R.M. (1988), Strategy in action: techniques for implementing strategy, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 21 No.3, pp.67-74.
- Renaissance Solutions (1996), *Translating Strategy into Action*, Renaissance Solutions Ltd, London, research report in Tavakoli, I and Perks, K.J. (2001), The development of a strategic control system for the management of strategic change, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 10 pp.297-305.
- Sandelands, E. (1994), All talk and no action? Perish the thought, *Management Decision*, Vol. 32 No.5, pp.10-11.
- Schmidt. J. (1994), The case of the sales-driven company, *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 15 No.5, pp.17-20.
- Simons, R. (1994), How top management use control systems as levers of strategic renewal, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No.3, pp.169-89
- Situma S. (2006), *A Study of the Turnaround Strategy Adopted at KCB*, Unpublished MBA Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi
- Sterling. N. (2003), *Translating strategy into effective implementation: dispelling the myths and*
- Tavakoli, I and Perks, K. J. (2001), The development of a strategic control system for the management of strategic change, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 10 pp.297-305.
- Thompson. P. (1990), 'Crawling From the Wreckage', in D. Knights and H. Willmott, (eds.) *Labour Process Theory*. London: MacMillan.
- Thompson, S., (1993), *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*, New York: Prentice Hall
- Ulrich, D. (Ed.) (1998), Delivering Results. A New Mandate for Human Resource Professionals, *Harvard Business Review*. Vol. 18 No.3, pp.91-7.

Woolridge, B and Floyd, S.W. (1990), *Bridging the gap between strategy and operations: the implications of middle management involvement in strategy*, The Annual International Conference of the Strategic Management Society Proceedings, Stockholm.

Yin, R. K. (2004), *Case study research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

**APPENDIX**

**Interview Guide**

**CHALLENGES OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AT THE PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMISSION OF KENYA**

**SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 1. Your Position in PSC .....
- 2. Number of Years worked at PSC .....
- 3. What is your highest academic qualification? .....

**SECTION B: STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES**

- 4. In your view, what is the importance of strategy implementation to the PSC's success?

---

---

---

- 5. How is the PSC able to position and relate itself to the environment to ensure its continued success and also secure itself from surprises brought about by the changing environment during strategy implementation?

---

---

---

- 6. In your opinion what is the importance of management ability, or competence, in achieving successful strategy implementation

---

---

---

7. What are the stages of strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

8. Who are involved in strategy implementation process at PSC?

---

---

---

9. What role does communication play in the process of strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

10. What is the impact of human resource development on effective strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

11. What is the effect of involvement of organizational members in the strategy process on successful strategy implementation?

---

---

---

12. What initiatives are taken by management in creating and sustaining a climate within the organization that motivates employees in their implementation role?

---

---

---

13. What are the requirements for a successful strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

14. What is the style /model of strategy implementation employed at PSC?

---

---

---

15. What are the strategy implementation practices employed by PSC?

---

---

---

16. What are the other factors leading to strategy implementation success at PSC?

---

---

---

**SECTION C: CHALLENGES OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION**

17. What strategic implementation problems are related to organizational hurdles?

---

---

---

18. Do you face the challenge of strategy implementation time being underestimated?

---

---

---

19. What are some of the challenges that surface during strategy implementation that had not been anticipated?

---

---

---

20. What other factors in the external environment had an adverse impact in strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

21. What are some of competing activities that cause distractions inhibiting strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

22. What are the challenges posed by the inadequacy of information systems used to monitor strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

23. What is the impact of poor communication and diminished feelings of ownership and commitment by employees to strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

24. What are the challenges caused by ineffective coordination and poor sharing of responsibilities of strategy implementation activities at PSC?

---

---

---

25. What are the other challenges you face in strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---



26. What are the possible solutions to the challenges of strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

27. How has PSC dealt with these challenges to ensure successful strategy implementation?

---

---

---

28. Has the resources affected strategy implementation at PSC? Please explain

---

---

---

29. How has the culture at PSC affected strategy implementation process? Please explain

---

---

---

30. Is there a system to monitor the progress of strategy implementation at PSC? What effects has this had on the implementation process?

---

---

---

31. What are the possible solutions to the challenges of strategy implementation at PSC?

---

---

---

**SECTION D: MEASURES BEING PUT IN PLACE BY PSC TO ENSURE REDUCE THE EFFECTS OF THE CHALLENGES**

32. What has PSC done to ensure proper management of strategy implementation?

---

---

---

33. What has PSC done to ensure inclusiveness and reduce resistance from staff and other stakeholders in the strategy implementation process?

---

---

---

34. Are the middle level managers involved in strategy implementation at PSC? Please indicate their level of involvement and its effects on strategy implementation.

---

---

---

35. What has PSC done to improve the success rate of strategy implementation?

---

---

---