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ABSTRACT

Strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long term. It mainly achieves advantages for the organization through its configuration of its resources within a challenging environment. It is the direction and scope of an organization over the long term: which achieves advantage of the organization through its configuration of resources within a changing environment, to meet the needs of markets and to fulfill the expectations of the stakeholders. It is geared towards meeting the needs of the markets as it fulfills stakeholders’ expectations. As a young discipline, strategic planning has no clear body of accepted knowledge. The objective of the study was to examine the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The case study design of research was used for this research. The study used both primary data. Primary data was collected through use of individual interviews and research questionnaire. Qualitative data was largely analyzed using content analysis. Descriptive statistics was also used to analyze data collected by use of questionnaire. Factor analysis and regression model were performed on the data for the possible factors influencing implementation of strategic plans and relationship between the independent and dependent variables of strategy implementation. The study concludes that government policies such as Medium term expenditure framework policies; Performance contracting policy, Performance contracting, internal resources such as policies and procedures for efficient and effective business operations and independence for the commission, adoption of Information Technology and stakeholders involvement significantly influence the implementation of strategic plans. The study recommends that for strategic planning and implementation to be modified to serve IEBC better, the commission must stick to timelines and ensure deadlines are met, if not a stern action is taken against the officer in charge also. All requisite requirements have to be put in place to realize the full implementation. The study also recommends that IEBC need to be treated by government as an independent entity at the same time. IEBC needs to demonstrate this to all stakeholders which we have unfortunately not done. The study further recommends that the government should release funds to the commission on time.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long term. It mainly achieves advantages for the organization through its configuration of its resources within a challenging environment. It is the direction and scope of an organization over the long term: which achieves advantage of the organization through its configuration of resources within a changing environment, to meet the needs of markets and to fulfill the expectations of the stakeholders. It is geared towards meeting the needs of the markets as it fulfills stakeholders’ expectations according to Johnson and Scoles (2002). Porter (1996) argues that organizations must embark on making their strategies competitive. He further explains that competitive strategy is about being different which means deliberately choosing a different set of activities to deliver a unique mix of value. An organization’s strategy must be appropriate to its resources, circumstances and objectives. Rimbere (2008) explains that the process involves matching the company’s strategic advantage to the business environment the organization faces. He highlights that one objective of an overall corporate strategy is to put the organization into a position to carry out its mission effectively and efficiently.

As a young discipline, strategic planning has no clear body of accepted knowledge. The root of strategic planning lays partly in economic theories especially those about the firms and human resource theories particularly those on motivation and leadership (Lynch, 2012). Lynch holds that even though different arguments arise in terms of the development of strategy, two approaches are predominant; the prescriptive and the
emergent approaches. The prescriptive strategy is one whose objectives have been defined in advance and whose elements have been developed before strategy implementation and three core areas follows sequentially. The Emergent approach is one whose final objectives are unclear and whose elements are developed during the course of its life. The process of strategy development and strategic implementation overlap. Strategic analysis is followed by trial and error experimentation and the strategy development and implementation processes are altered accordingly. The researcher will therefore rely heavily on prescriptive strategy theories for this study such as synoptic theory of strategic planning, industrial organization theory, resource-based theory, systems theory and the co-operation and network theory.

There are a variety of perspectives, models and approaches used in strategic planning. The way a strategic plan is developed and implemented depends on the nature of the organization's leadership, culture of the organization, complexity of the organization's environment, size of the organization and expertise of planners. The essence of any organization according to Gumbus and Lyron (2002) is being able to satisfy its clients thus gaining competitive advantage. However, many organizations tend to relax and settle at strategy formulation. Lynch (2012) indicated the nature and implication of the implementation process. It involved objectives, task setting and communication, resource allocation, monitoring and controlling the plan. With the growth of strategic management theory, there has been considerable interest in focusing not only on the strategic plan development but more so on the implementation and the factors that affect it heralded by the myriad of challenges affecting successful implementation of the well laid out strategic plans (Jooste & Fourie, 2009).
Planning is crucial to undertaking any major electoral process and is a key responsibility (Lekasi, 2014). The strategic plan is drawn on experience, recommendations from national (district to center) and international stakeholders, and reports from election observation groups. However, Gumbus and Lyron (2002) observe that formulating a strategic plan alone is not enough; its implementation among the electoral bodies is more challenging and demanding given their unique position. Thus, the electoral commissions require the support and cooperation from all sectors for the successful implementation of this strategic plan. It is a statutory requirement that public organizations in Kenya implement strategic planning as a means of enhancing result-based management and efficiency in their operations. This study therefore focuses on the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

1.1.1 Concept of Strategic Planning

Argenti (1968) defines strategic planning as an organization's process of defining its strategy or direction and making decisions on allocation of resources to pursue this strategy. It may also extend to control mechanisms for guiding the implementation of the strategy. Argenti (1968) highlights that strategic planning became prominent in corporations during the 1960s and remains an important aspect of strategic management. According to the author, it is executed by strategic planners or strategists, who involve many parties and research sources in their analysis of the organization and its relationship to the environment in which it competes. Strategic planning includes processes of formulation and implementation the strategic plan (Argenti, 1968).
According to Roach and Allen (2003), the strategic plans are the product of the best minds inside and outside the corporation. The process considers future implications of current decisions, adjusts plans to the emerging business environment, manages the business analytically, and links, directs, and controls complex enterprises through a practical, working management system. This process plays a vital role in the firm performance (Roach & Allen, 2003). The concept and practice of implementing strategic plans have been embraced worldwide and across various sectors because of its perceived contribution to organizational effectiveness (Thompson & Strickland, 2007). Today, organizations both public and private have taken seriously to the practice of implementing strategic plans to guide the performance of those organizations. Steiner (1979) noted that the framework for formulating and implementing strategies requires a strong backbone in the formulation process.

1.1.2 Implementation of Strategic Plans

The aim of strategy implementation is to turn plans into actions in order to accomplish strategic objectives and goals of the organization. Lynch (2012) identifies four elements of implementation: Identifying strategic objectives, Formulating specific plans, Allocating resources and budgets, and Monitoring and controlling the procedures. Implementation requires carefully planned activities for the organization to achieve its objectives. Within the implementation process, there are three major approaches: comprehensive (pushed through regardless of changes in the environment), incremental (in conditions of great uncertainty) and selective (compromises are made).
According to Pettigrew and Whipp (2012), implementation is a continuous and iterative process, not one that simply occurs after the formulation of the strategy. Hrebiniak and Joyce (2012) highlight two significant limitations in implementation: Bounded rationality (managers are bound by their own limitations in terms of options and will attempt to reduce implementation to bite size chunks; they may also make decisions that favour their own personal goals which are not necessarily the same as the organisation) and Minimum intervention (the philosophy of "if it aren’t broke, don't fix it"; managers only change what they perceive to be necessary and sufficient).

1.1.3 Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission

The Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC), was established under Article 88 of the Constitution of Kenya, 2010 as the successor body to the Interim Independent Electoral Commission (IIEC) and the Interim Independent Boundaries Review Committee (IIBRC). The IIEC was established by Parliament in 2008 through an amendment of Section 41 of the then Kenyan Constitution. The IEBC is responsible for conducting and supervising referenda and elections to any elective body or office established under the Constitution or as prescribed by an Act of Parliament. The Commission comprises of a Chairperson and eight members. The Commissioners provide oversight and policy direction through established Committees. For its functioning, it is supported by a Secretariat headed by a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) who is also the Commission’s Secretary. The Commission Secretary is assisted by two Deputy Commission Secretaries; one in charge of Operations and the other Support Services.
The functions of the Secretariat are arranged under Nine directorates: Legal and Public Affairs; Voter Education and Partnerships; Voter Registration and Electoral Operations; Finance; Information Communication Technology; Research and Development; Human Resource and Administration; and Risk and Compliance. The IEBC’s operations are decentralized with field offices in 17 regions managed by Regional Elections Coordinators. The Commission has also established offices in each of the 290 constituencies being managed by a Constituency Elections Coordinator.

1.2 Research Problem
Good strategies alone will not work without appropriate implementation processes in place. Strategy implementation is a critical component of strategic management (Barasa & Ombui, 2014). Roach and Allen (2003) are of the view that implementing strategy is tougher, more time consuming, and challenging than crafting strategy. According to Rimbere (2008), without understanding and commitment, strategy implementation efforts face major problems. Managers are prone to overlook implementation realities. Rimbere further indicated that only 10% of formulated strategies are successfully implemented. Aosa (1992) noted that many firms created strategic plans which are rarely implemented according to the planned schedules. Even though the study looked into the implementation issue, it restricted itself on large manufacturing private firms whose set up is very different from the public institutions like the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. According to Barasa and Ombui (2014), lack of funds impedes strategic implementation; lack of competency in the organisation is barriers which hinder strategy implementation, co-ordination and reward system affect strategic implementation.
It is evident from the various studies done that there is lack of research on the topic of factors influencing implementation of strategic plans, case of Constitutional Commissions in Kenya and with specific interest of IEBC. This is despite there being several challenges facing IEBC in the process of strategy implementation such as limited resources, management of diversity among staff, political interests and interference, voter registration and education, people’s perception that IEBC was incompetent, suspicion in management of electoral results, wide mandate covering the entire aspects of electoral process and delimitation of boundaries across the country and negative publicity. The researcher aimed to narrow this research gap focusing on the case of IEBC and to study the factors from the perspective of prescriptive theories of strategic management. The choice of the IEBC as study location and variable scope is embedded on the ideals of fair inclusion and geographical representativeness which are key ingredients towards universal theory formation.

Locally, Kimani (2012) conducted a study on the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans: the case of Caritas, Nyeri Archdiocese, Mutuvi (2013) did a study on the factors affecting the implementation of strategic plans by non-governmental organizations in Nairobi County, Kirui (2013) studied the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in local authorities in Migori County, Nyakeriga (2015) examined factors that influenced implementation of strategic plans in newly established public universities in Kenya while Wanjiku and Ombui (2013) conducted a study on the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in public secondary schools in Lari District, Kiambu County. These local scholars have dealt with the situation being studies either holistically or partially rather than specifically.
Analyzing factors affecting the implementation of strategic plans by the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission is therefore underscored. This study basically sought to answer the question: What are the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission?

1.3 Research Objective
The objective of the study was to examine the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

1.4 Value of the Study
This study will contribute value in a number of ways. First, it will be useful in forming a theoretical foundation on the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans. The study will form a platform upon which further research on issues of implementation of strategic plans in commissions and other public institutions shall be undertaken by academicians and researchers. This study calls for continuous research to ascertain the actual situations rather than living on assumptions. Based on proposed design and methodology on the target population, it is highly anticipated that this study will induce a renewed debate and further researches on relationship between an organization’s institutional factors and optimality in strategic plan execution.

The study will also be important for practice in other constitutional commissions and public institutions in Kenya since it entirely examines the possible factors affecting the implementation of strategic plans in public institutions. The findings will enable the commission to implement its Strategic plans effectively and efficiently.
The study will also be useful to policy makers in specific to the government and various stakeholders concerned with management of elections as they will use the findings and recommendations of the study to improve on implementation of strategic plans of the commission and other constitutional commissions. This study therefore will contribute to policy development and management practice in the entire electoral board as they define ways of dealing with the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans.

1.5 Chapter Summary

Chapter one presents the background information to the problem, identifies the problem statement, states the purpose of the study and lists the research objectives that the research project investigated. It also presents the value of the study to the various stakeholders. The next chapter will review literature on factors influencing implementation of strategic plans giving a background on what other researchers’ have done in the field of study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the literature review of the study; the chapter explores the existing theoretical and empirical literature on implementation of strategic plans. The chapter summarizes the information from other researchers who have carried out their research in the same field of study with regards to theoretical and empirical literature. The specific areas covered here are concept of strategic plans, strategic plan implementation, and factors affecting implementation of strategic plans and finally the empirical review on implementation of strategic plans in an attempt to bridge the gap on factors affecting implementation of strategic plans in IEBC.

2.2 Theoretical Foundation of the Study

A collection of theories makes up the complexity and chaos theory (Boisot, 1999). The underlying idea “is that all things tend to self organize into systems” (Kelly, 1999). These systems develop patterns that are created when a number of simple rules are applied over much iteration. Small differences at the start of the process can eventually result in large differences in the system’s performance. Many interactions in a system can produce unexpected patterns or behaviours (Goldberg & Markoczy, 1998) because stimulating one part of the system can have unexpected effects in other, unanticipated, parts of the system. Such unexpectedness is because of the nature of non-linear feedback networks (Stacey, 1996) and the interconnected and interdependent nature of complex adaptive systems (CASs) (Bar-Yam, 2000).
Complex behaviour is orderly, yet full of surprise. This section critically reviews literature relevant to factors influencing strategic plans implementation with special focus on Prescriptive Theories of Strategic Management. Lynch (2012) differentiates between different theories of strategic management for example Synoptic Theory, Resource-Based Theory (RBV), Systems Theory, and Cooperation and Network theory.

2.2.1 Synoptic Theory of Strategic Planning

The synoptic theory of strategic planning was developed by Hudson, (1979) which is pretty much identical to the rational model, includes four classical elements, namely goal setting, identification of alternatives, evaluation of means against ends, and implementation of decisions. Over the years, a conventional strategic planning process has evolved, based on approaches developed by Bryson (1995), Nutt & Backoff (1992).

The theory emphasizes interaction and interpersonal dialogue and the process of mutual learning in planning, which typically involved clarifying missions and values, developing a vision of the future, analyzing external challenges and opportunities, assessing internal strengths and weaknesses, developing strategic goals and objectives, identifying strategic issues, developing and evaluating alternative strategies, and developing action plans. Currently, the synoptic theory support strategic planning in learning institutions and concerns content, involvement, participation and approach (Toft 1989). The more important issue, however, concerns putting plans into action.
Mintzberg (1994) is one of the most vocal critics of strategic planning, precisely because organizations’ planning activities are too often completely divorced from performance measurement and resource allocation. The synoptic theory view strategic planning as substance concentrated on the consideration of current decision options based on available data and taken in the light of their possible effects and consequences over time. In other words, it views strategic planning as concerned with identifying foreseeable thrusts and weaknesses to avoid and strengths and opportunities to pursue.

2.2.2 Industrial Organization Theory
Organizational learning theory is the process of finding a balance between developing, transferring and accessing information within a company, which facilitates each department to apply appropriate knowledge to its existing knowledge base and to create new additions (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000). Organizational learning is also viewed as a managerial action involving controlling and planning within a company aimed at achieving strategic objectives by creating, capturing and internalizing knowledge. New knowledge must be learned from the external environment or developed within the organization.

Scientific management theory by Frederick Winslow Taylor was introduced to promote productivity and efficiency in production. He proposes that efficiency could be controlled via scientifically managing production. Taylor views scientific management as “knowing exactly what you want men to do and then see that they do it in the best and cheapest way.” The scientific management theory affects both employers and employees and emphasizes the control of labor force by management.
Taylor identified four core principles: creation of a scientific method of measurement hence replacing the “rule of thumb” method, training of workers by management, cooperation between managers and workers to ensure the principles are being met, and he also emphasized on division of labor in the organization.

### 2.2.3 Resource-Based Theory

The resource-based theory literature explains firm performance in terms of firm level resource differences (Barney & Grant, 1991). While the generic business strategy framework drawn from the theory of industry and Competitive analysis (Porter, 1985) argues that the failure to choose between one of the generic strategies in the strategy space of potential competitive strategies can result in inferior performance (Campbell-Hunt, 2000). The focus of resource-based theory is on the relationship between firm resources and firm performance. Indeed, the traditional definition of strategy (Andrews, 1971; Ansoff, 1965; Hofer & Schendel, 1978), proposing that a firm should select that strategy which makes the most effective use of its core resources and capabilities to achieve above-normal rates of return, is consistent with this viewpoint.

Recent developments in the resource based view (RBV) suggest that capabilities are important contributor to strategy implementation (Tippins & Sohi, 2003). According to resource-based views, firms perform well and create value when they implement strategies that exploit their internal resources and capabilities. With the growth of strategic management theory, there has been considerable interest in focusing on intangible resources or Intellectual Capital (IC) and their deployment in the firm (Wernerfelt, 1995).
Competitive advantage comes from the organization’s resources and capabilities rather than the environment within which the company operates. This approach does not mean that all the resources of an organization will deliver competitive advantage but the core will (Lynch, 2012). The long term competitiveness of a company depends on its endowment of resources that differentiate it from its competitors, that are durable and, that are difficult to imitate and substitute. A resource is an economic or productive factor required to accomplish an activity, or a means to undertake in order for an enterprise to achieve desired outcome. Organizations classify resources into internal and external resources (Awino, 2015). Internal resources of an organization include physical resources, people resources and organizational knowledge. Resource-based theory, therefore, identifies how firm performance and its sustainability depend on the uniqueness, rareness, and non-imitability of its resources.

2.2.4 Systems Theory

From a systems theory point of view, strategic planning should be a bastion of long-term thinking, but instead is often short-term and reactive in scope, for instance maximizing near-term profits at the expense of long-term shareholder value (Senge, 1990). Systems thinkers view the organization as an organism, with each part dependent on the others to function, and the organism as a part of the larger system which includes its external environment. Organizational activity is understandable in terms of its relation to the external environment which provides the resources and conditions on which the organization depends for its survival or the realization of its purposes (Ansoff et al, 1998). There is emphasis of the necessity of achieving visions which are shared by all in the organization, not created by top management alone.
According to Senge (1990), strategic leaders need to learn to set goals that are worthy of commitment to create a shared vision for the organization. Without involvement of people throughout the organization, the strategic vision cannot come alive, or reflect personal ownership by all whom it affects. An example of the strategic planning style endorsed by systems thinkers is Interactive Planning. In this system, planning is defined as the design of a desired future, and the invention of ways to bring it about. This counters the notion of other strategic planning models that require managers to predict the future and prepare for it. The notion here is that the future is subject to creation (Hill & Jones, 1992). The premise of interactive planning is that your organization was destroyed last night and your job is to design the ideal system you would put into place today to replace it.

Unique attributes of interactive planning include a system where by every employee as the opportunity to be involved in making decisions which affect him or her. Involvement is accomplished by a network of interlocking boards composed of the manager, the manager's manager, and the people reporting to the manager. These boards are used for creating the vision of all management levels in the organization, developing policy which guides the manager in making management decisions, integrating activities and policy decisions with boards above and below, coordinating activities and decisions horizontally with other units, and evaluating the effectiveness of the manager (Hrebinjak, 2005).
2.2.5 Co-operation and Network Theory

Co-operation and Network theory strategy include those that focus on formal and informal relationships that can be built to develop strategic management such as strategic alliances and joint ventures. Co-operative strategy theory focuses on situations where at least two companies work together to achieve an agreed objective. Network theories focus on sharing networks of personal contacts, knowledge and influence both inside and outside the organization (Lynch, 2012). A franchise is a form of co-operative strategy in which an organisation (the franchisor) develops a business model and then offers it to others (the franchisees) in return for royalties (contractual arrangement).

2.3 Empirical Studies

Several other considerations other than the strategic plan itself have to be acknowledged. This fact guarantees organizations that regardless of how articulate they may be on their strategic planning; some factors will have influences on the implementation process. It is thus essential for strategic managers to proactively implement strategic plans. The factors result from both the management skills and the context of the organization. Implementation requires a manager to have skills in: working through others, organizing, culture building, and creating fits between strategies and how the organization works. The context of the organization will have an influence to the implementation of strategic plans. Organization’s resources, skills and capabilities influence implementation.
The organizational structure will ultimately influence implementation since every organization is partly idiosyncratic, the result of many organizational decisions bringing historic circumstances (Thompson & Strickland, 1989). Reward systems will affect the implementation since Vroom (1964) points that individuals’ levels of performance will depend on the expected outcome. The policies an organization lays down will either accelerate or slow down the implementation process depending on how they effectively guide people to performance. Information systems and controls will determine how efficient and effective communication is.

Budgets and resources allocated within the functional areas of an organization will affect whether plans will be achieved or not and the time it will take to achieve these targets. According to Jooste and Fourie (2009), the organizational workplace will also affect how smooth the implementation process moves. Organizations’ cultures include a political component making all organizations to be political in nature. Managerial behavior cannot be purely rational and this affects how implementation process progresses (Ohja, 2012).

Gebhardt and Eagles (2014) evaluated those factors leading to implementation of strategy plans for parks and recreation in the province of Ontario, Canada. The study revealed the factors required for successful implementation and those that were obstacles to implementation. The planning process and the human implementation factors that were important to successful implementation of the strategy included, staff understanding the rationale behind the plan and having a commitment to the plan, consulting both public and general interest groups. Having key policy leaders lobbying on behalf of the plan and the staff agreeing with recommendations were also
identified as being key to successful implementation. The researchers listed the main obstacles to implementation as; lack of resources and staff having negative feelings towards the plan. Other obstacles listed included lack of staff involvement and high staff turnover.

Lack of leadership, and specifically strategic leadership, at the top of the organization has been identified as one of the major barriers to effective strategy implementation. In turn, strategic leadership is also viewed as a key driver to effective strategy implementation (Jooste and Fourie, 2009). The study investigated the perceived role of strategic leadership in strategy implementation in south Africa organization and concluded that strategic leadership positively contributed to effective strategy implementation in South African organizations. In terms of the barriers to effective strategy implementation, Jooste and Fourie (2009) found out that poor understanding of the strategy by the work force and ineffective communication of the strategy to the work force were the most important barriers to effective strategy implementation.

Yambwa (2014) investigated the reasons for failing to implement strategic plans in the Ministry of Regional and Local Government, Housing and Rural Development, Namibia. The study revealed that lack of commitment and teamwork, organizational structure and culture that were not aligned to strategy, inadequate budgetary provision, inadequate leadership to direct strategy implementation, lack of appropriate technology to support the implementation were the major factors affecting the strategic plan implementation in the Namibia’s Ministry.
Nyakeriga (2014) examined the factors that influenced implementation of strategic plans in newly established public universities in Kenya. The researcher concluded that the existing human resources management practices, organizational culture and organizational leadership, organizational structure and administrative systems, and effective communication and consensus influenced strategic plan implementation newly established public universities in Kenya.

Kirui (2013) investigated the significant institutional factors that influenced the overall push of the former local authorities in Kenya to their pre-determined strategic goals. The thematic focus was on organizational culture, structure, leadership and financial resources. The study found out that all the four affected implementation of strategic plans in Kenya’s former local authorities. In addition, culturally, poor internationalization of mission and strategic content, lack of participation in making of rules and regulations, lack of operational manuals, insensitive employee development policies, and highly structured downward communication effected employees mobilization to executing strategic plans. Organizational structures of the local authorities influenced implementation of strategic plans in the forms of task allocation, decentralization of authority, span of control, hierarchical length, employee co-ordination and integration, and structural flexibility.

Kimani (2012) examined the influence of leadership, communication and control on implementation of strategic plans at Caritas, Nyeri Archdiocese. The study established that the strategic plan was, to a large extent, implemented successfully. The leaders of Caritas Nyeri Archdiocese were committed to the implementation and had the necessary skills and experience. While most of the employees were aware of the
existence of the strategic plan, very few knew of its contents basically because sessions for communication of the content and staff roles in the plan implementation were non-existent or were far and in between. However, there was no feedback on implementation of the plan. Policies and performance targets to guide the implementation of the Strategic plan exist. However, performance was not measured against targets and many staff members did not know whether or not plan adjustments have been done based on feedback.

Mutuvi (2013) conducted a study on critical factors affecting NGOs while implementing their strategic plans and revealed that most of the factors were internal to the organization, thus easy to identify but psychologically challenging to solve. This was because they were largely emanating from management practices which did not favour smooth implementation of strategic plans. The practices were in turn influenced by social and behavioural aspects of individuals within the organizations. Almost all the organizations contacted had strategic plans but they were hardly implementing them rightfully. The organizations however shared the measures they were employing to deal with this common situation. Strategic plans were not being implemented, not because managers are deviant but rather because of the lack of the know-how and know-why. It was concluded that implementation of strategic plans was being approached as a onetime activity rather than a process demanding: effective communication; excellent remuneration packages; staff training and continuous motivation; stakeholders’ involvement; budgeting, planning and resource mobilization; continuous monitoring and evaluation; effective recruitment; and engaging employees in decision making.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study focus/main objective</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Knowledge gap</th>
<th>Focus of current study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gebhardt and Eagles (2014)</td>
<td>Factors leading to implementation of strategy plans for parks and recreation in the province of Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Descriptive survey through primary data collection collected from managers using a questionnaire which is analyzed using descriptive statistics</td>
<td>The researchers listed the main obstacles to implementation as; lack of resources and staff having negative feelings towards the plan. Other obstacles listed included lack of staff involvement and high staff turnover</td>
<td>The focus of this study was on parks and recreation centers whose operations are different from that of an electoral commission</td>
<td>The current study looks at the factors that apply in the IEBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yambwa (2014)</td>
<td>Reasons for failing to implement strategic plans in the Ministry of Regional Government, Housing and Rural Development, Namibia</td>
<td>Case study through primary data collection using an interview guide which is analyzed using content analysis</td>
<td>lack of commitment and teamwork, organizational structure and culture that were not aligned to strategy, inadequate budgetary provision, inadequate leadership to direct strategy implementation, lack of appropriate technology to support the implementation were the major factors affecting the strategic plan implementation</td>
<td>Although the focus is in the public sector, the ministry operations are different from that of the electoral commission</td>
<td>The current study looks at the factors that apply in the IEBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakeriga (2014)</td>
<td>Factors that influence implementation of strategic plans in newly established public</td>
<td>Descriptive survey through primary data collection collected from</td>
<td>The existing human resources management practices, organizational culture and organizational</td>
<td>The strategic approach of universities is different from that of an electoral commission</td>
<td>The current study seeks to fill this literature gap by focusing on the factors that apply in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources (Year)</td>
<td>Factors Influencing Implementation Of Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Implementation of strategic plans</td>
<td>The focus of this study</td>
<td>Literature Gap Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirui (2013)</td>
<td>Descriptive survey through primary data collection</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Organizational culture, structure, leadership and financial resources affected implementation of strategic plans in Kenya’s former local authorities.</td>
<td>The thematic focus was on Local Authorities and not on electoral body leaving a gap.</td>
<td>The current study seeks to fill this literature gap by focusing on IEBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuvi (2013)</td>
<td>Descriptive survey through primary data collection</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Implementation of strategic plans was being approached as a onetime activity rather than a process demanding: effective communication; excellent remuneration packages; staff training and continuous motivation; effective recruitment; and engaging employees in decision making.</td>
<td>The focus of this study was on Non-governmental Organizations whose operations are different from that of an electoral commission.</td>
<td>The current study looks at the factors that apply in the IEBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimani (2012)</td>
<td>Descriptive survey through primary data collection</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>-leadership, communication and control influence implementation of the operation and strategic approach of</td>
<td>The current study seeks to fill this literature gap by focusing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managers are prone to overlook implementation realities. The literature focused on the various factors affecting implementation of strategic plans based mainly on data from developed countries whose strategic approach and financial footing may be different from Kenya. Most of them are also in private institutions whose operation is different from that of the public institutions. This leaves a literature gap on the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in the public sector which this study seeks to fill by focusing on the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

### Table: Comparison of Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Details</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jooste and Fourie (2009) Perceived role of strategic leadership in strategy implementation in South Africa organization</td>
<td>Descriptive survey through primary data collection using a questionnaire which is analyzed using descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Strategic leadership positively contributed to effective strategy implementation in South African organizations - poor understanding of the strategy by the workforce and ineffective communication were the most important barriers</td>
<td>The study is narrow since it focused on only one variable affecting the strategic plan implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The current study focuses on four variables enlarging the breadth of focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2015)
2.4 Conceptual Framework
A conceptual framework is a set of broad ideas and principles taken from relevant fields of enquiry and used to structure a subsequent presentation (Reichel & Ramey, 1987). When clearly articulated, a conceptual framework has potential usefulness as a tool to scaffold research and, therefore, to assist a study to make meaning of subsequent findings (Smyth, 2002). The conceptual framework of this study is based on four independent variables and one dependent variable as represented diagrammatically in Figure 2.1. The study used a conceptual framework in order to answer the research question. According to the study, effective implementation of strategic plans was conceptualized as being dependent on adequate internal resources, knowledge sharing, adoption of information technology, and stakeholders influence.

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government policies</td>
<td>Implementation of strategic Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Internal Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2015)
2.5 Chapter Summary
This chapter reviews the relevant literature in relation to the research objective presented in the study. The discussion tackles previous empirical studies on various factors influencing implementation of strategic plans and provides a firm theoretical background for the study. The next chapter; Research Methodology, presents the research design, data collection methods, and how results was analyzed in the study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This section outlines the approach to be adopted towards gathering data that was used to generate solutions to the study objective. It contains the outline on the profile and the scope of the study as well as the method that were used to collect the data and also how the data collected was analyzed so as to come up with findings, interpretations, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

3.2 Research Design
Orodho (2003) defines a research design as the scheme, outline or plan that is used to generate answers to research problems. According to Kombo & Tromp (2006), research design can be thought of as the structure of research. The case study design of research was used for this research. According to Lamnek (2005), the case study is a research approach, situated between concrete data taking techniques and methodological paradigms. It allows for an in-depth study of the subject of factors influencing strategic plan implementation at IEBC. Case studies place more emphasis on a full contextual analysis of fewer events or conditions. This provides for valuable insight for problem solving, evaluation and strategy. It also provides for the benefit of being able to observe and record non-verbal as well as verbal behaviour (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). Descriptive research design was also used to show the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The design was chosen since it is more precise and accurate since it involves description of events in a carefully planned way (Babbie, 2002). This research design also portrays the characteristics of a population fully (Chandran, 2004).
3.3 Data Collection
The study used both primary data and secondary data. Primary data was collected through use of individual interviews and research questionnaire. Individual interviews were facilitated by an interview guide with open ended questions. Unstructured interviews permit more direct comparability of responses and also the interviewer’s neutrality is maintained (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). The interview schedule was administered through face to face discussions. Secondary data was obtained from mainly the organization’s strategic plan. The target groups for the interviewees were three commissioners, the commission secretary, deputy commission secretary and two directors heading directorates. Apart from the face to face interviews the researcher is expected to use a questionnaire which the population was randomly chosen to participate in completing the questionnaire. The target respondents for the questionnaire were forty comprising of Regional Election Coordinators and Managers. The questionnaires was administered by emailing to the regional election coordinators and telephone calls follow ups, while drop and pick later method for the managers at the head office was adopted.

3.4 Data Analysis
According to Cooper and Schindler (2003), where research is concerned with finding out who, what, where, when or how much and considering the data collection approaches used in the study, there was a mixture of descriptive and qualitative results and therefore the data obtained is both quantitative and qualitative. Qualitative data was largely analyzed using content analysis. This allowed for meaning to be extracted from information collected and relate it to the different issues on factors influencing implementation of strategic plan therefore ensuring the required analytical understanding of the data.
Descriptive statistics was also used to analyze data collected by use of questionnaire that mostly was on likert scale of 1 – 5. Factor analysis and regression model were performed on the data for the possible factors influencing implementation of strategic plans and relationship between the independent and dependent variables of strategy implementation. The following model was used to show the relationship between independent and dependent variables:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \epsilon \]

**Where:** \( Y \) = Implementation of Strategic Plans,

\( \beta_0 \) = Constant Term,

\( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \) and \( \beta_4 \) = Beta coefficients

\( X_1 \) = Government Policies

\( X_2 \) = Adequate Internal Resources,

\( X_3 \) = Adoption of Information Technology

\( X_4 \) = Stakeholders Involvement

\( \epsilon \) = Error term

**3.5 Chapter Summary**

This chapter presents the research methodology that was used for this study. The chapter covers research design, data collection methods and data analysis methods. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents analysis of the data on the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The chapter also provides the major findings and results of the study. Finally, the chapter presents a discussion on the findings.

4.2 Response Rate
The target groups for the interviewees were three commissioners, the commission secretary, deputy commission secretary and two directors heading directorates. The study also targeted Regional Election Coordinators and Managers. The response rate of the study was 100%. This response rate was good and representative and conforms to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) stipulation that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good.

4.3 Demographic Information of the Respondents
The study sought to establish the position, working experience and educational qualification of the respondents as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4. 1: Position held at IEBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC &amp; Managers</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2015)
The findings reveal that majority of the respondents held the position of Regional Election Coordinators and Managers as represented by 81.8%, 9.1% of the respondents were commissioners while directors and CEO were represented by a 4.5% in each case.

Table 4.2: No of years worked in the IEBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2015)

Table 4.2 show that the majority of the respondents had worked with IEBC for a period of between 0 and 5 years as depicted by 81.8%, while only 27.3% of the respondents had worked for a period of 6 and 10 years.

Table 4.3: Educational level of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2015)

Table 4.3 show that the majority of the respondents had between 11 and 15 years of experience as depicted by 42%, 21% between 6 and 10 years, 11% both less than 5 years and between 16 and 20 years.5% of the respondents had 21 years and above of experience.
4.4 The Strategic Planning

The researcher sought to establish the level of implementation of strategic plans. The findings are analysed in the Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Extent to which the commission had implemented the strategic plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very great extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2015)

Table 4.4 show that majority of the respondents revealed that the commission had implemented the strategic plan to a moderate extent as shown by a mean of 50.0%, 27.3% indicated a great extent, 13.6% showed a little extent, 9.1% indicated a very great extent while 0.0% indicated no extent at all.
Table 4.5: Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government policies adversely affect the implementation of strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td>4.617</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal resources have contributed to slow implementation of the strategic plans.</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation.</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2015)

Table 4.5 reveals that government policies adversely affect the implementation of strategic plans at the commission to a very great extent as shown by a mean of 4.617. Internal resources were also found to have contributed to slow implementation of the strategic plans to a greater extent as represented by a mean of 4.437. The respondents also revealed that Adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation and stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission influence the implementation of strategic plans to a greater extent as shown by mean scores of 3.885 and 3.636 respectively.
The interviewees indicated that there is no total commitment and that not all management understand the importance of planning in an organization. The interviewees also stated that the top level management is committed to implementing new strategies.

4.5 Factors Affect Implementation of Strategic Plans

The researcher sought to establish the extent to which various factors affect implementation of strategic plans. The findings are analysed in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Factors Affect Implementation of Strategic Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation.</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management Commitment.</td>
<td>4.359</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication.</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>4.562</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2015)

Table 4.6 shows that leadership style in the commission influence the implementation of strategic plans to a very great extent as represented by a mean score of 4.562. The study also revealed that top management commitment influence the implementation of strategic plans to a great extent as represented by a mean score of 4.359, while resistance to change and resource allocation had a moderate influence on the implementation of strategic plans at IEBC as indicated by mean scores of 4.125 and 3.421 respectively.
The interviewees also said that culture and behavioral nature of IEBC positively affect the implementation of strategic plans because the plan is drawn for the activities of every officer of the commission does. Some also argued that the culture to a large extent affects the implementation since most employees of the commission formerly were civil servants and they have brought the laid back culture at the civil service to the commission. Therefore very little is achieved at the end of the day. Once one does not do their part, the next part is affected negatively.

The interviewees further indicated that the commission structure influence the implementation of strategic plans since each level in the organizational structure has a role to play. It was also established that organizational leadership influence strategic plan implementation in the commission. The chairman and CEO influence the rest of team positively toward the implementation of SP.

The interviewees also stated that government policies such as Medium term expenditure framework policies, Performance contracting policy, Performance contracting, a requirement to have a strategic plan for public, Policies requiring the development of strategic plan as pre-requisite for activity funding, Training of government workers in areas of study, Expansion of the ICT sector and new government policy on ICT deployment in the public sector; and Implementation of government programmes like vision 2030 Positively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.
In addition the interviewees said that implementation do not happen within the anticipated time-frame due to lack of team work and inter-directorate linkage which is a hurdle to implementation, lack of resources and delays in funds release from the treasury. The study also found that when resources are not availed on time, there is delay in the implementation of some activities. They further stated that competing needs which equally need funding from government, the rigid budgeting policies, the IFMIS policy, lack of cooperation from other institutions and agencies facilitating auxiliary aspects of electoral processes and closure of some NGO’s which finance execution of various policies advocacy negatively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.

The interviewees added that lack of funds to carry out some crucial activities Lack of ownership from the staff, suspicion from political leadership, political actors such as parties and candidates, inadequate policies and procedures for efficient and effective business operations, lack of independence for the commission, favourism of some employees, poor infrastructure in remote areas, nepotism in appointments, tribalism etc, employees motivation, lack of commitment towards strategic direction of the commission, poor monitoring framework, inflexibility towards adopting to change, lack of prioritization of commission activities and timeliness in the implementation to be the major challenges faced or observed in regard to strategic management plans.

The interviewees further intimated that adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation and stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission influence the implementation of strategic plans to a moderate extent as shown by mean scores of
3.885 and 3.636 respectively. Some of the information technology modes that are used between various levels of organization’s employees include; LAN which has enhanced communication with the commission; Biometric voter registration (BVR) which the commission uses to register voters; Electronic voter identification (EVID) used for identifying voters and Results transmission system (RTS) for transmitting electronic results challenge system and gadgets becoming obsolete in a very short time.

The interviews also intimated that for strategic planning and implementation to be modified to serve IEBC better, the commission must stick to timelines and ensure deadlines are met, if not a stern action is taken against the officer in charge also All requisite requirements have to be put in place to realize the full implementation. They further stated that IEBC need to be treated by government as an independent entity at the same time IEBC needs to demonstrate this to all stakeholders which we have unfortunately not done. Employees need to be more patriotic to have the country at heart and try their level best to cut, costs how much it takes to carry out their duties. Need for stakeholders to be brought on board early when the process starts in order to gain their goodwill. All the stakeholders in the commission should work as a team and encourage proper communication between levels lateral and vertical.

4.6 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a statistical method used to describe variability among observed, correlated variables in terms of a potentially lower number of unobserved variables called factors (Yount, 2006). Factor analysis is a systematic, statistical procedure used to uncover relationships amongst several variables. This procedure enabled numerous
correlated variables to be condensed into fewer dimensions known as factors. The purpose of factor analysis is to discover simple patterns in the pattern of relationships among variables (Anderson, 2004). In the context of this research, the variables are the degree of agreement with various specific perception statements while the factors are the general underlying constructs. In its procedure, rotation is applied to identify meaningful factor names or descriptions.

Table 4.7: Communalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government policies adversely affect the implementation of</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal resources have contributed to slow implementation of</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the strategic plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Information Technology at the commission has</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fastened strategy implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management Commitment.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Source: Research Data (2015)
Communality is the proportion of variance that each item has in common with other factors. From Table 4.7, Internal resources have contributed to slow implementation of the strategic plans (99.9%) have the greatest communality or shared relationship with other factors while Adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation and Communication (85.3%) have the lowest communality with others.

From the Table 4.7, the Kaiser Normalization Criterion was used, which allows for the extraction of components that have an Eigen value greater than 1. The principal component analysis was used and 1 factor was extracted. As the table above shows, this 1 factor explains 95.430% of the total variation. Factor 1 contributed the highest variation of 95.430%.

Figure 4. 1: Scree Plot

Source: Research Data (2015)
In a scree plot, the components are plotted on X axis whereas the Eigen values are on the Y axis. As one moves to the rights on the Scree plot, the Eigen values drop as shown below. From the scree plot obtained below, only 1 factor is significant because the curve becomes less steep from this point due to low Eigen values.

**Table 4.8: Component Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government policies adversely affect the implementation of strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal resources have contributed to slow implementation of the strategic plans.</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation.</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation.</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management Commitment.</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication.</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>-.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>-.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>-.489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Research Data (2015)**

The initial component matrix was rotated using Varimax (Variance Maximization) with Kaiser Normalization. The above results allowed the researcher to identify what variables fall under each of the 2 major extracted factors. Each of the 9 variables was looked at and placed to one of the six factors depending on the percentage of variability; it explained the total variability of each factor. A variable is said to belong to a factor to which it explains more variation than any other factor.
4.7 Regression Analysis

In this study, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the relationship among predictor variables. The research used statistical package for social sciences (SPSS V 21.0) to code, enter and compute the measurements of the multiple regressions.

### Table 4.9: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Research Data (2015)**

R-Squared is a commonly used statistic to evaluate model fit. R-square is 1 minus the ratio of residual variability. The adjusted $R^2$, also called the coefficient of multiple determinations, is the percent of the variance in the dependent explained uniquely or jointly by the independent variables. 65.8% of the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission could be attributed to the combined effect of the predictor variables.

### Table 4.10: Summary of One-Way ANOVA results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td></td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>9.559</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Research Data (2015)**
The probability value of 0.036 indicates that the regression relationship was highly significant in predicting the relationship between the factors and implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The F calculated at 5% level of significance was 9.559 since F calculated is greater than the F critical (value = 8.9406), this shows that the overall model was significant.

Table 4.11: Regression coefficients of the relationship between implementation of strategic and the four predictive variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>23.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policies</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>2.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate internal resources</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of information technology</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>2.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involvement</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>23.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2015)

The coefficient of regression in Table 4.11 above was used in coming up with the model below:

\[ SP = 0.902 +0.429GP+ 0.423IS+0.531IT+ 0.602SI \]

Where SP is implementation of strategic plans, GP is government policies, IS is Adequate internal resources, IT is adoption of information technology and SI is stakeholders involvement. From the model, taking all factors (government policies, adequate internal resources, adoption of information technology and stakeholders involvement) constant at zero, implementation of strategic plans was 0.902. The data findings analyzed also shows that taking all other independent variables at zero, a unit
increase in government policies will lead to a 0.429 increase in implementation of strategic plans; unit increase in adequate internal resources will lead to a 0.423 increase in implementation of strategic plans; a unit increase in adoption of information technology will lead to a 0.531 increase in implementation of strategic plans while a unit increase in stake holders involvement will lead to a 0.602 increase in implementation of strategic plans.

According to the model, all the variables were significant as their significance value was less than 0.05. Government policies, stakeholder’s involvement, adequate internal resources, adoption of information technology were positively correlated with implementation of strategic plans.

4.8 Discussion of Results

The objective of the study was to examine the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The study established that the coefficient for government policies was 0.429, meaning that government policies positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans such policies include; Medium term expenditure framework policies; Performance contracting policy; Performance contracting; a requirement to have a strategic plan for public; Policies requiring the development of strategic plan as pre-requisite for activity funding; Training of government workers in areas of study; A requirement for every organization to have a strategic plan; Expansion of the ICT sector and new government policy on ICT deployment in the public sector; and Implementation of government programmes like vision 2030 Positively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.
The study revealed that the coefficient for internal resources was 0.423, meaning that adequate internal resources positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. Some of the internal controls identified were lack of funds to carry out some crucial activities Lack of ownership from the staff, suspicion from political leadership, political factors such as parties and candidates, inadequate policies and procedures for efficient and effective business operations, lack of independence for the commission, favourism of some employees, poor infrastructure in remote areas, nepotism in appointments, tribalism etc, employees motivation, lack of commitment towards strategic direction of the commission, poor monitoring framework, inflexibility towards adopting to change, lack of prioritization of commission activities and timeliness in the implementation to be the major challenges faced or observed in regard to strategic management plans.

According to Yambwa (2014) who investigated the reasons for failing to implement strategic plans in the Ministry of Regional and Local Government, Housing and Rural Development, Namibia. The study revealed that lack of commitment and teamwork, organizational structure and culture that were not aligned to strategy, inadequate budgetary provision, inadequate leadership to direct strategy implementation, lack of appropriate technology to support the implementation were the major factors affecting the strategic plan implementation in the Namibia’s Ministry.

The study found that the implementation do not happen within the anticipated time-frame due to lack of team work and inter- directorate linkage which is a hurdle to implementation, lack of resources ( limited relatively new) and delays in funds release from the treasury. The study also found that when resources are not availed on
time, there is delay in the implementation of some activities. The study further established that, competing needs which equally need funding from government, rigid budgeting policies, the IFMIS policy, lack of cooperation from other institutions and agencies facilitating auxiliary aspects of electoral processes, and closure of some NGO’s which finance execution of various policies, advocacy negatively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans. This is in agreement with Barasa and Ombui (2014) who expressed that lack of funds impedes strategic implementation, lack of competency in the organization is a barrier which hinders strategy implementation, co-ordination and reward systems affect strategic implementation.

Budgets and resources allocated within the functional areas of an organization will affect whether plans will be achieved or not and the time it will take to achieve these targets. Jooste and Fourie (2009) found that the organizational work place will also affect how smooth the implementation process moves.

The study deduced that the coefficient for adoption of Information Technology was 0.423, meaning that adoption of Information Technology positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plan. In addition it was revealed that adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation and stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission influence the implementation of strategic plans to a moderate extent as shown by mean scores of 3.885 and 3.636 respectively. Some of the information technology modes that are used between various levels of organization’s employees include; LAN which has enhanced communication with the commission; Biometric voter registration (BVR) which the commission uses to register voters; Electronic voter identification (EVID) used for identifying voters and
results transmission system for transmitting electronic results (RTS) challenge system and gadgets becoming obsolete in a very short time.

The study further found that the commission structure influence the implementation of strategic plans since each level in the organizational structure has a role to play. The study also found that culture and behavioral nature of IEBC affect the implementation of strategic plans since most employees of the commission formerly were civil servants and they have brought the laid back culture at the civil service to the commission. Therefore very little is achieved at the end of the day. Once one does not do their part, the next part is affected negatively. It was also established that organizational leadership influence strategic plan implementation in the commission. The chairman and CEO influence the rest of team positively toward the implementation of SP.

This correlates with Thompson and Strickland (1989) who found that the organizational structure will ultimately influence implementation since every organization is partly idiosyncratic, the result of many organizational decisions bringing historic circumstances. Ohja (2012) also posited that organizations’ cultures include a political component making all organizations to be political in nature. Managerial behavior cannot be purely rational and this affects how implementation process progress. Kirui (2013) found that culturally, poor internationalization of mission and strategic content, lack of participation in making of rules and regulations, lack of operational manuals, insensitive employee development policies, and highly structured downward communication affected employees’ mobilization to executing strategic plans.
The study established that the coefficient for stakeholders involvement was 0.602, meaning that stakeholders involvement positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. It was further established that leadership style and top management commitment which are key aspects of stakeholders involvement positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. This correlates with Senge (1990) who posited that strategic leaders set goals that are worthy of commitment to create a shared vision for the organization. Without involvement of people throughout the organization, the strategic vision cannot come alive, or reflect personal ownership by all whom it affects. The policies an organization lays down will either accelerate or slow down the implementation process depending on how they effectively guide people to performance. Information systems and controls will determine how efficient and effective communication is. Gebhardt and Eagles (2014) also argued that having key policy leaders lobbying on behalf of the plan and the staff agreeing with recommendations were also identified as being key to successful implementation.

Kimani (2012) examined the influence of leadership, communication and control on implementation of strategic plans at Caritas, Nyeri Archdiocese and established that the strategic plan was, to a large extent, implemented successfully; Mutuvi (2013) also conducted a study on critical factors affecting NGOs while implementing their strategic plans and revealed that most of the factors were internal to the organization, thus easy to identify but psychologically challenging to solve.
However, Jooste and Fourie (2009) pointed out that lack of leadership, and specifically strategic leadership, at the top of the organization has been identified as one of the major barriers to effective strategy implementation. In turn, strategic leadership is also viewed as a key driver to effective strategy implementation.

4.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the findings of this study. The chapter covers demographic information of the respondents, findings on strategic planning at IEBC, factors affect implementation of strategic plans, factor analysis, regression analysis and finally a discussion of the findings. The next chapter presents the conclusion and recommendation of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the researcher presents the summary, conclusion and recommendations based on the findings and interpretations of the research. The researcher also presents the limitations that were identified when carrying out this research. Further, the researcher provides suggestions for further research on the area and closes the chapter with providing implications for policy and practice that can emanate from the findings of the research.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
The objective of the study was to examine the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The findings are analysed in the table below. The study established that government policies positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. Such policies include; Medium term expenditure framework policies; Performance contracting policy; Performance contracting; a requirement to have a strategic plan for public; Policies requiring the development of strategic plan as pre-requisite for activity funding; Training of government workers in areas of study; A requirement for every organization to have a strategic plan; Expansion of the ICT sector and new government policy on ICT deployment in the public sector; and Implementation of government programmes like vision 2030 Positively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.
The study established that adequate internal resources positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. Some of the internal controls identified were lack of funds to carry out some crucial activities Lack of ownership from the staff, suspicion from political leadership, political factors such as parties and candidates, inadequate policies and procedures for efficient and effective business operations, lack of independence for the commission, favourism of some employees, infrastructure lack in remote areas, nepotism in appointments, tribalism etc, employees motivation, lack of commitment towards strategic direction of the commission, poor monitoring framework, inflexibility towards adopting to change, lack of prioritization of commission activities and timeliness in the implementation to be the major challenges faced or observed in regard to strategic management plans. This agrees with Yambwa (2014) who revealed that lack of commitment and teamwork, organizational structure and culture that were not aligned to strategy, inadequate budgetary provision, inadequate leadership to direct strategy implementation, lack of appropriate technology to support the implementation were the major factors affecting the strategic plan implementation in Namibia.

The study further found that the implementation do not happen within the anticipated time-frame due to lack of team work and inter- directorate linkage which is a hurdle to implementation, lack of resources (limited relatively new) and delays in funds release from the treasury. The study also found that when resources are not availed on time, there is delay in the implementation of some activities. The study further established that competing needs which equally need funding from government, The rigid budgeting policies, the IFMIS policy, lack of cooperation from other institutions and agencies facilitating auxiliary aspects of electoral processes and closure of some
NGO’s which finance execution of various policies advocacy negatively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans. This is in agreement with Barasa and Ombui (2014) who expressed that lack of funds impedes strategic implementation; lack of competency in the organisation is barriers which hinder strategy implementation, co-ordination and reward systems affect strategic implementation.

The study also established that the coefficient for adoption of Information Technology was 0.423, meaning that adoption of Information Technology positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plan. In addition it was revealed that adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation and stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission influence the implementation of strategic plans.

The study further established that the commission structure influence the implementation of strategic plans since each level in the organizational structure has a role to play. The study also found that culture and behavioral nature of IEBC affect the implementation of strategic plans since most employees of the commission formerly were civil servants and they have brought the laid back culture at the civil service to the commission. Therefore very little is achieved at the end of the day. Once one does not do their part, the next part is affected negatively. It was also established that organizational leadership influence strategic plan implementation in the commission. The chairman and CEO influence the rest of team positively toward the implementation of SP. This correlates with Thompson and Strickland (1989) who found that the organizational structure will ultimately influence implementation since
every organization is partly idiosyncratic, the result of many organizational decisions bringing historic circumstances. Ohja (2012) also posited that organizations’ cultures include a political component making all organizations to be political in nature.

The study established that the coefficient for stakeholders involvement was 0.602, meaning that stakeholders involvement positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. It was further established that leadership style and top management commitment which are key aspects of stakeholders involvement positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. This correlates with Senge (1990) who posited that strategic leaders set goals that are worthy of commitment to create a shared vision for the organization. Without involvement of people throughout the organization, the strategic vision cannot come alive, or reflect personal ownership by all whom it affects.

5.3 Conclusion of the Study
The study concludes that government policies positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. Such policies include; Medium term expenditure framework policies; Performance contracting policy; Performance contracting; a requirement to have a strategic plan for public; Policies requiring the development of strategic plan as pre-requisite for activity funding; Training of government workers in areas of study; A requirement for every organization to have a strategic plan; Expansion of the ICT sector and new government policy on ICT deployment in the public sector; and Implementation of government programmes like vision 2030 Positively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.
The study also concludes that adequate internal resources positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. Some of the internal controls identified were lack of funds to carry out some crucial activities, lack of ownership from the staff, suspicion from political leadership, political factors such as parties and candidates, inadequate policies and procedures for efficient and effective business operations, lack of independence for the commission, favourism of some employees, tribalism etc, employees motivation, lack of commitment towards strategic direction of the commission, poor monitoring framework, inflexibility towards adopting to change, lack of prioritization of commission activities and timeliness in the implementation to be the major challenges faced or observed in regard to strategic management plans.

The study further concludes that when resources are not availed on time, there is delay in the implementation of some activities. The study further established that competing needs which equally need funding from government, The rigid budgeting policies, the IFMIS policy, lack of cooperation from other institutions and agencies facilitating auxiliary aspects of electoral processes and closure of some NGO’s which finance execution of various policies advocacy negatively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.

The study also established that the adoption of Information Technology positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plan. In addition it was revealed that adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation and stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission.
The study further deduced that the commission structure influence the implementation of strategic plans since each level in the organizational structure has a role to play. The study also found that culture and behavioral nature of IEBC affect the implementation of strategic plans since most employees of the commission formerly were civil servants and they have brought the laid back culture at the civil service to the commission.

The study concludes that stakeholder’s involvement positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. It was further established that leadership style and top management commitment which are key aspects of stakeholder’s involvement positively and significantly influenced the implementation of strategic plans. Without involvement of people throughout the organization, the strategic vision cannot come alive, or reflect personal ownership by all whom it affects.

5.4 Recommendations of the Study
The study recommends that for strategic planning and implementation to be modified to serve IEBC better, the commission must stick to timelines and ensure deadlines are met, if not a stern action is taken against the officer in charge also All requisite requirements have to be put in place to realize the full implementation.

The study also recommends that IEBC need to be treated by government as an independent entity at the same time IEBC needs to demonstrate this to all stakeholders which we have unfortunately not done. Employees need to be more patriotic to have the country at heart and try their level best to cut, costs how much it takes to carry out their duties. Need for stakeholders to be brought on board early
when the process starts in order to gain their goodwill. All the stakeholders in the commission should work as a team and encourage proper communication between levels lateral and vertical. The study further recommends that the government should release funds to the commission on time. The government should also adopt technology in the IEBC to enhance automation in the strategic plan.

The study recommends that government policies such as; medium term expenditure framework policies; performance contracting policy; performance contracting; a requirement to have a strategic plan for public; policies requiring the development of strategic plan as pre-requisite for activity funding; training of government workers in areas of study; a requirement for every organization to have a strategic plan; new government policy on ICT deployment in the public sector and Implementation of government programmes like vision 2030 which positively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans should be put in practice for proper implementation of strategic plans in IEBC.

The study also recommends that since planning horizon is found to affect the implementation in a negative way, the IEBC and other commissions should employ more resources to enhance positive contribution towards implementation of strategic plans. This would be in areas of employee training and development and government policy enhancement.
5.5 Implications of the Study

The study findings imply that the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans can be founded in the various prescriptive theories of strategic management such as synoptic theory, resource-based theory (RBV), systems theory and cooperation and network theory. This study calls for continuous research to ascertain the actual situations rather than living on assumptions. Based on proposed design and methodology on the target population, this study will induce a renewed debate and further researches on relationship between an organization’s institutional factors and optimality in strategic plan execution.

The study findings also imply that for the constitutional commissions and the public sector at large to implement its strategic plans effectively and efficiently, it has to take into consideration factors such as the government policies, adequate internal resources, information and communication technology and stakeholders involvement. The study findings also will inform policy development and management practice in the entire electoral board as they define ways of dealing with the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans to help them improve on implementation of strategic plans of the commission and other constitutional commissions.

5.6 Limitation of the Study

A limitation for the purpose of this research was regarded as a factor that was present and contributed to the researcher getting either inadequate information or responses or if otherwise the response given would have been totally different from what the researcher expected.
The main limitations of this study were; some respondents refused to be interviewed. This reduced the probability of reaching a more conclusive study. However, conclusions were made with this response rate.

The small size of the sample could have limited confidence in the results and this might limit generalizations to other situations.

Most of the respondents were busy throughout and had to continuously be reminded and even persuaded to provide the required information.

5.7 Areas Suggested for Further Research

The study examined the factors influencing implementation of strategic plans of the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission and established that leadership styles and top level management, lack of goodwill from some of our stakeholders, insufficient of funds to carry out some crucial activities lack of ownership from the staff, suspicion from political leadership, political factors such as parties and candidates, inadequate policies and procedures for efficient and effective business operations, lack of independence for the commission, favourism of some employees, poor infrastructure in remote areas, nepotism in appointments affect the implementation of strategic plans. Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission however is just one commission among many others. This warrants the need for another study which would ensure generalization of the study findings for all the commissions in Kenya and hence pave way for new policies. The study therefore recommends another study be done with an aim to investigate the effects of implementation of strategic plans in selected commissions in Kenya.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Interview Guide

I humbly request for your time to voluntarily participate in filling of this questionnaire. This interview guide seeks to investigate the factors influencing the implementation of strategic plans in IEBC in Kenya. This study is an academic study and the information obtained through this questionnaire will be treated confidentially and will not be used for any other purpose other than academic research.

PART A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Name of interviewee (optional)………………………………………………
2. Name of the department ………………………………………………………
3. What is your highest level of academic qualification? ………………………
4. How long have you worked for the commission? ……………………………

PART B: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

5. Comment on the general strategic plan implementation at IEBC?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. In your opinion, is the top level management committed to implementing new strategies?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
7. How does the culture and behavioral nature of IEBC affect the implementation of strategic plans?

8. Where do you think your organization lies in terms of implementing strategies within the Electoral management bodies?

9. Does the implementation happen within the anticipated time-frame? If NO, what factor(s) hinder the implementation process?

10. How do you implement your strategic plan and what role do the following stakeholders play?
   i) Employees
ii) Political parties

iii) Others (Specify)

11. Are there dissatisfied stakeholders who are resisting the strategic plans and if so how do you propose they should be handled?

12. How does availability of internal resources influence strategic plan implementation in the commission?
13. Do government policies influence strategic implementation in the commission? How?

14. Does top management support positively or negatively affect your effective strategic plan implementation? How?

15. What are some of the information technology modes that are used between various levels of organization’s employees? Do you have information technology challenges in organization?
16. Does the commission structure influence the implementation of strategic plans? How?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

17. In your view, how does organizational leadership influence strategic plan implementation in the commission?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

18. What are the challenges that you have faced or observed in regard to strategic management plans?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

19. Is there a process of handling non-conformities to strategy implementation and if so what is the process?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

20. How can strategic planning and implementation be modified to serve IEBC better?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
21. Are there any other comments/suggestions that are vital to the planning and implementation at the IEBC?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix 2: Research Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to collect data on Factors Influencing Implementation of strategic plans at IEBC. This is entirely meant for academic purposes. All the information will be treated with confidentiality it deserves.

Section 1: Profile

Q1. (a) Your Name (Optional)

................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................

(b) What position do you hold in the commission?

................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................

(c) How long have you worked with the commission? Tick (✓) as appropriate.

i. 0 to 5 Years [ ]

ii. 6 to 10 Years [ ]

iii. Above 11 Years [ ]

(d) Highest level of education.

i. Diploma [ ]

ii. Degree [ ]

iii. Masters Degree [ ]

iv. Doctoral Degree [ ]

v. Any Other [ ] Specify ………………………………………

Section 2: Strategic Planning

Q2. (a) Has the commission embraced strategic planning and implementation?

i. Yes [ ]

ii. No [ ]

vii
(b) What is your role in strategy implementation?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

(c) To what extent had the commission implemented the strategic plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very great extent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little extent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. (a) Using the five point rating scale where 5 = Very large extent, 4 = Large extent, 3 = Moderate extent, 2 = Small extent and 1 = Not at all, indicate by ticking (✓) in the appropriate box the extent to which you agree with the listed statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government policies adversely affect the implementation of strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Internal resources have contributed to slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adoption of Information Technology at the commission has fastened strategy implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stakeholders’ involvement leads to effective implementation of strategic plans at the commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) List some of the government policies that:

i. Negatively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

ii. Positively affect smooth implementation of strategic plans.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
Q4. (a) Using the five point rating scale where 5 = Very large extent, 4 = Large extent, 3 = Moderate extent, 2 = Small extent and 1 = Not at all, indicate by ticking (√) in the appropriate box the extent to which the listed factors affect implementation of strategic plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resource Allocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Top Management Commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) What are other factors that influence implementation of strategic plans at the commission?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix 3: Organizational Chart