

**CHALLENGES OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC
DECISIONS IN BUNGOMA COUNTY, KENYA**

BY

NAMUSONGE, FLORA NASIRUMBI

A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.

NOVEMBER, 2015.

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been submitted to any other university for award of a degree.

Signature.....Date.....

.....

Namusonge Flora Nasirumbi

D61/67939/2013

The Research project was submitted for examination with my authority as the University Supervisor.

Signature.....Date.....

.....

Professor Zachary B. Awino

School of Business,

University of Nairobi.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to God Almighty to whom I owe my existence and whose grace I found sufficient.

I dedicate this research project to my Loving husband Hon. Victor Wakumile, my children Leroy and Liana for their support and encouragement, patience and understanding throughout the duration of my MBA degree studies and my parents Namusonge Sakwa and Salome Ngami and family for their undying support and love and Their virtue of hard work, resilience, devotion and integrity has continued to drive and guide me through the long journey of my life. May the Almighty God bless you abundantly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Whilst accomplishing the degree of Master in Business Administration Management, I would like to express my sincere thanks for contributions to this project to a few people. Each of them has contributed in its own way to achieving this result.

First of all I owe many thanks to my supervisor Professor Zachary Bolo Awino for giving me the opportunity to work at this topic. I thank him for the trust and confidence, useful suggestions, and liberty he gave me to accomplish this dissertation. I appreciate his vast knowledge and skills in many areas, his belief that it was indeed possible to finish, kept me going. I also like to humbly extend my sincere gratitude to my moderator Dr.Kagwe for his guidance and support without which, the research would not have been a reality.

I also extend my appreciation to the staff of the Department of Business Administration, University of Nairobi for their immeasurable support during my period of study.

I wish to pay a special tribute to my dear husband Hon. Victor Wakumile and my children Leroy and Liana and the entire Namusonges' family for your love and support.

My extended thanks to my friends Joyce Gichuhi, Maurine Alosa, Vincent Osewe and Daniel nzioka for the support, encouragement and inspiration without which, I could not have been challenged to keep moving on when the going got rough. I salute you all and may God bless you in abundance.

My deep appreciation extends to the Nairobi County Government and the respondents who facilitated the research process in the county. I am greatly indebted to all those who in their own individual ways contributed either directly or indirectly to making this project a success.

Above all names, The Almighty God, I am over whelmed by the miracles. Thank you for your providence, wisdom and strength; through that glimmer of light at the end of the tunnel when I was hopeless, you were my only hope. Thank you Jesus.

ABSTRACT

Implementation of strategic decisions is critical to a company's success. Strategic decisions are the chosen alternative that affects key factors which determine the success of an organization's strategy. Strategic decisions in the Kenya Vision 2030 are the highest strategic choices geared towards guiding the country into the envisioned future and determine the success or failure in shaping the development course. The purpose of this study was to explore the reasons for delayed successes in Bungoma County projects and it identifies numerous bureaucratic obstacles to effective planning and implementation of strategic decision and suggests how these obstacles can most effectively be eliminated. This study reviewed literature on devolution of functions and governance systems in Bungoma county Government and provides a review of strategy implementation literature to identify the main inhibitors of successful strategy implementation and evaluate the contribution it can make to strategy implementation, in particular how it may be able to mitigate the problems associated with strategic decisions implementation. First it looked at the definition of data in relation to information and knowledge. Sources of data, both internal and external have been identified. The research design was a descriptive survey involving a target population of County executive committee members who were respondents. The research instrument was an interview schedule covering all the study parameters. The data collected was analyzed using content analysis. The study found that that successful strategy implementation can go a long way in helping an organization gain a competitive edge, help in defining the business of the organization and also help in achieving right direction. The study results have highlighted many areas that need to be addressed in order to make the implementation of strategic by the Bungoma County more successful. There is need for the county government to consider addressing these issues expansively to make the process successful. The study found that those involved in strategy implementation process in the organization were senior managers, middle level managers and top management and all the other employees. Communication was also found to be a key success factor within strategic Decision implementation. The study recommends that the management should ensure that they employ and deploy qualified and competent individuals. Also the study recommends that Bungoma County Government should employ monitoring/Evaluation mechanism, also allocate enough funds to allow projects completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgment	iv
Abstract	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 Strategic Decisions	3
1.1.2 The challenges of the implementation of Strategic Decisions.....	4
1.1.3 County Governments in Kenya.....	5
1.1.4 Bungoma County	6
1.2 Research Problem	7
1.3 Research Objective.....	9
1.4 Value of the study.....	10
1.5 Chapter Summary	11
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Theoretical Foundation	12
2.3 Overview of Strategic thinking	13
2.4 Strategic Decisions	15
2.5 Strategic Implementation and Challenges	16
2.6 Empirical Studies and Research Gaps.....	18
2.7 Chapter Summary	19

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 Introduction	20
3.2 Research Design	20
3.3 Data Collection	21
3.4 Data Analysis	22
3.5 Chapter Summary	22
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	23
4.1 Introductions	23
4.2 Perception of Strategic Implementation	23
4.3 Main stakeholders in the implementation of Strategic Decisions and their Responsibilities	24
4.4 Challenges of implementing Strategic Decision in Bungoma County Government	28
4.4.1 Resources as a Challenge of Implementation of Strategic Decisions.....	28
4.4.2 Resistance to Change as a Challenge of Implementation of Strategic Decisions	30
4.4.3 Environmental challenges of the Implementation of Strategic Decisions.....	31
4.4.4 The Electorate as a Challenge in the implementation of Strategic Decisions.....	32
4.4.5 National Government as a Challenge in the implementation of Strategic Decisions	33

4.5 Capacity to Implement the Strategic Decisions	34
4.6 Evaluation of Strategic Decisions.....	35
4.7 Possible Solutions to the Challenges	36
4.8 Discussions of the Findings	37
4.9 Chapter Summary	40
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND	
RECOMMENDATIONS	41
5.1 Introduction	41
5.2 Summary	41
5.3 Conclusion	44
5.4 Recommendations	45
5.5 Suggestion for further Research	46
5.6 Limitations of the Study	47
5.7 Implications to the Study	48
References	49
Appendices	60
Appendix I: Introduction Letter	60
Appendix II: Interview Guide.....	61

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Somewhere along the line of development we discover what we really are, and then we make our real decision for which we are responsible. Make that decision primarily for yourself because you can never really live anyone else's life, Eleanor Roosevelt. Decision Making could be defined as the study of identifying and choosing from alternatives, the best option that suits a purpose. Mintzberg , Raisinghami and Theoret (1976) defined strategic decisions as one which is important in terms of action taken, the resources committed or the precedent set. Strategy implementation is process or paths that an organization takes in order to be or reach where it sees itself in the future. It's the process or path that leads to where the organization sees itself in the future.

This study is based on the resource-based view (RBV) which emphasizes the firm's resources as the fundamental determinants of competitive advantage and performance. It adopts two assumptions in analyzing sources of competitive advantage (Barney, 1991 and Peteraf and Barney, 2003). First, this model assumes that firms within an industry or within a strategic group may be heterogeneous with respect to the bundle of resources that they control. Second, it assumes that resource heterogeneity may persist over time because the resources used to implement firms' strategies are not perfectly mobile across firms i.e. some of the resources cannot be traded in factor markets and are difficult to accumulate and imitate. Resource heterogeneity (or uniqueness) is considered a necessary condition for a resource bundle to contribute to a competitive advantage. The argument goes "If all firms in a market have the same stock of resources, no strategy is available to one firm that would not also be available to all other firms in the market" (Cool, Almeida Costa and Dierickx, 2002).

Analysis of implementing strategic decisions provides an opportunity to explore several questions thought to be crucial in developing a deeper understanding of decision implementation. First, how do top managers go about implementing strategic decisions? Second, do top and lower level managers use the different implementation approaches, and do they use them in similar proportions? Third, how successful are these implementation approaches? Answers to these questions depend, in part, on conditions given by contextual factors both positive and negative that are encountered during an implementation attempt. The research attempts to contribute to this area drawing upon an in-depth empirical investigation of challenges that are encountered in the process of implementing the strategic decisions. These are decisions leading to significant commitment of resources, with significant impact on the firm as a whole and on its long-term performance (Marsh et al. 1988).

The County Governments of Kenya know where they are at present, where they want to be in the future and what actions to take in order to get there. They have clear and elaborate plan of their vision and mission statement. In the year 2010, Kenya enacted a new constitution that introduced County governments. One of the main responsibilities of the County governments is to implement devolution strategies. Bungoma County Government has an integrated master plan is aligned to Kenya Vision 2030 that seeks to transform Kenya into a middle income economy by the year 2030 (www.nairobi.go.ke). The Bungoma County government has established structures that will enable it to implement its strategic Decisions. The Bungoma County government has established 10 departments and filled them with county executive committee members in line with the Constitution of Kenya and the County Government Act, 2012. The essence of these departments is to carry out their specific roles as enshrined in schedule four of the Constitution of Kenya (www.nairobi.go.ke).

1.1.1 Strategic Decisions

Strategic decision-making is the process of developing and putting into action choices that will influence the long-term welfare of the organization. These choices often involve major organizational change and large resource commitments that are difficult to reverse once they are implemented (Lampel 1998) Strategic decision-making reflects decision makers' experience, the positions they occupy and their organizational environment. Work on improving strategic decision-making has focused on the content of decision outcomes and the process that produces these outcomes. According to Mintzberg H & Waters J (1994) Strategic decision-making takes place within a context defined by the organization's strategy and varies according to the extent to which this strategy is a deliberate, as opposed to an emergent, process.

The fear of making serious decisions is a new kind of fear, called decidophobia, proclaimed by Walter Kaufmann (1973). Wherever you see a successful business, someone once made a courageous decision. The fear of wrong decision runs in heart of all good leaders and managers but the ability to make the right decision despite the fear make them successful. The nature of the decision itself, or the Strategic Decision, may be important. Research into decision-making cognition and labeling suggests that the same internal or external stimulus may be interpreted quite differently by managers in different organizations or even within the same organization (e.g. Dean and Sharfman, 1993a; Dutton, 1993; Haley and Stumph, 1989). It has been argued that the way managers categorize and label a decision in the early stages of the decision-making process, strongly influences the organization's subsequent responses (Dutton, 1993; Fredrickson, 1985; Mintzberg et al. 1976). For example, there is evidence that if a decision is perceived as a crisis different actions will be taken than if the decision is perceived as an opportunity (Jackson and Dutton 1988; Milburn et al. 1983).

Fredrickson (1985) found that when decisions were interpreted as threats as opposed to opportunities, the decision making followed was characterized by greater

comprehensiveness. Our understanding, however, of the impact of decision-specific characteristics on organizational decision-making processes is still quite limited (Papadakis and Lioukas, 1996; Rajagopalan et al. 1993).

The authors are not aware of any empirical work that empirically examines a range of decision specific characteristics in relationship to a range of process dimensions. With few exceptions(e.g. Dean and Sharfman, 1993a; Dutton,1986; Dutton et al. 1989; Dutton et al. 1983;Fredrickson, 1985), existing research has not yet shown in any detail how decision-specific characteristics shape the Decision Making Process as a whole.

1.1.2 Challenges of implementing Strategic Decisions

Brannen's (2005) survey based study concluded that in order to improve execution certain issues have to be tackled. These include inadequate or unavailable resources, poor communication of the strategy to the organization, ill-defined action plans, ill-defined accountabilities, and organizational/cultural barriers. Brannen's survey unearthed another significant obstacle to effective strategy implementation namely, "failing to Empower or give people more freedom and authority to execute." Nickols (2000) terms strategy as execution. He discussed four cases of strategy execution: flawed strategy & flawed execution, sound strategy & flawed execution, flawed strategy & sound execution, and sound strategy & sound execution. Only when the strategy and the execution are sound the organization has a pretty good chance for success, barring aside environmental and competitive influences. Further, he contends that executing the wrong strategy is one of the major problems leading to unsuccessful implementation of strategies.

Guffey and Nienhaus (2002) also established a strong link between organizational commitment such as strong belief in the organization's goals and values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and strong desire to maintain membership in the organization and employees support of the organization's strategic plan. Sterling (2003) further asserts that lack of timeliness and distinctiveness in implementation of strategy may be a major challenge. If any competitor beats the organization in marketing a certain idea, then the implementation of an intended strategy becomes a challenge. He

further argues that lack of strategic focus is also a challenge in the implementation process. Lack of focus exhibits itself in the form of dissipation of resources and lack of clear articulation of priorities.

1.1.3 County Governments in Kenya

The Counties Governments in Kenya are geographical units envisioned by the 2010 Constitution of Kenya as the units of devolved government. The powers are provided in Articles 191 and 192, and in the Fourth Schedule of the Constitution of Kenya and the County Governments Act of 2012. The counties are also single member constituencies for the election of members of parliament to the Senate of Kenya and special women members of parliament to the National Assembly of Kenya. As of the 2013, general elections, there are 47 counties whose size and boundaries are based on the 47 legally recognized Districts of Kenya.

According to Ghai (2006), most African countries with centralized systems of governance exhibit several symptoms that are associated with poor or failed governance. He further argues that one of the most serious symptoms include the inability to discern between public and private resources since most of the people in positions of leadership exploit public resources for private gain. Ndulo (2006) also asserts that lack of devolution in most African countries with centralized governments leads to limited participation by the citizenry. Most African countries Kenya included were very much affected by the kind of leadership perpetuated by the colonialists.

Most of the colonial masters were more interested in making economic gain than building economic institutions. The divide and rule approach of the colonialists developed ethnic hostility among various ethnic groups as they struggled to control resources that were available (Kimenyi, 2002). Since independence, there have been several efforts to bring reforms in various sectors of the Kenyan economy including land reforms.

This was necessitated by the inability of the centralized system of governance to strengthen institutions and instead made them mere instruments of support to the ruling

party (Cotrell & Ghai, 2007). The other reason why devolution was supported in Kenya is due to the marginalization of some regions and communities in terms of development. The old constitution of Kenya did not have a clear guideline on how to approach development issues in order to create equitable development.

It was believed that devolution would help in reducing the disparities among various communities and regions that developed as a result of marginalization (Barkan & Chege, 1989). The devolution efforts in Kenya have, therefore, been done in three major phases. The first phase involved the Majimbo system immediately after independence, the local authorities system, the Constituency development fund (Ndulo, 2006) and the current County government system.

1.1.4 Bungoma County Government

Bungoma County is one of the 47 County governments that were established through the promulgation of the new constitution in the year 2010. The County came into existence in March 2013 on the same boundaries of what was formerly known as Western province. Bungoma County borders the Republic of Uganda to the West, Teso and Busia districts to the South West, Mumias to the South, Trans-Nzoia, Lugari and Kakamega to the North East. The County has an area of 3,032.2 sq. Km and lies between 1,200 and 1,800 meters above sea level and experiences mean temperatures of 23 degrees centigrade. Its latitude stands at 0.57 with the longitude of 34.56.

The population of Bungoma is estimated at 1,630,934 (as projected in 2009) of which female constitute 52% while male are 48%. Age percentage distribution stands at; 0-14 years 45.9 %, 15-64 years 51.4 % and over 65 years 2.3%. The region has a population density of 453.5 people per sq. Km with a national percentage of 3.6%. Poverty level index stand at 53% while age dependency ration is at 93.8. Bungoma is divided into nine administrative and political divisions: Bumula, Kanduyi, Kimilili, Sirisia, Kabuchai, Webuye East, Webuye West, Tongaren, and Mt. Elgon which are further divided into 46 political wards and 88 administrative Locations. The County has three Agro-ecological zones: Lower Midland (LM 1), Lower Highland (LH), and Upper Highland (UH). The latter two comprises about 10-15% of the total area, but mainly covered by forests (Mt.

Elgon) approximately measuring 32,732 hectares. It lies between latitude 1.13333 and longitude 34.55 north east of the equator in Western Kenya.

1.2 Research Problem

The popular view of strategic decisions is that they typically involve a high degree of uncertainty, high stakes, major resource implications, and long-term consequences. This view is associated with the traditional conceptualization of strategic decisions as the product of intentional attempts at rational choice, and context-setters for subsequent strategic action. This conceptualization, however, has been criticized for assuming a rational and linear relationship between decisions and actions that has not been empirically proven. Over the years a large number of concepts and techniques have been proposed on how organizations should develop and implement a suitable strategy (Gilberto Montibeller and Alberto Franco. 2010). Some of these concepts and techniques concentrate on matching an organization's resources and skills with the opportunities and risks created by its external environment (Buzzell, and Bradley, 1987; Porter, 1985), while others focus on the organization's resources and capabilities as drivers of competitive advantage (Grant, 1991). Notwithstanding the above criticisms, we believe like others that the view and quest of intentional decision making is an undeniable aspect of organizational life. There is, therefore, a clear role for Decision implementation Analysis in these contexts, to support strategic decision making.

In the year 2010, Kenya promulgated a new constitutional dispensation that advocated for a devolved system of governance. The main purpose of this important action was to address failures linked to quality of governance such as corruption, economic stagnation, poverty, development inequalities and episodic instability. Key among the responsibilities of the County governments is the implementation of the devolution strategy. Bungoma County is one of the 47 County governments that were established through the promulgation of the new constitution in the year 2010. Various researchers have reviewed literature in the field of strategy implementation.

Alexander observes that literature is dominated by a focus on long range planning and strategy content rather than the actual implementation of strategies, on which “little is written or researched” (Alexander, 1985, p. 91). Despite the neglect by academicians and consultants more challenges are experienced in practice in the course of strategy implementation. In their research, Bartlett and Ghoshal (1987) found that in all the companies they studied “the issue was not a poor understanding of environmental forces or inappropriate strategic intent. Without exception, they knew what they had to do; their difficulties lay in how to achieve the necessary changes. The studies that have been done on strategy implementation have focused on other institutional firms while this study sought to find out the challenges of the implementation of strategic decisions in Bungoma County Government, Kenya.

Li, Sun & Eppler (2008) carried out a study on factors influencing strategy implementation. The findings indicate that the factors include institutional or people oriented factors. Another study conducted by Michaela and Adriana (2010) on effective strategic action established that most companies fail in effective strategic implementation. Yii Teang Tan (2004) carried a study on barriers to strategy implementation: a case of Air New Zealand the findings add two additional barriers to implementation, namely leadership and power. It was also discovered that the participants acknowledged that these two barriers will impede or enhance the success of Air New Zealand. This was backed by the level of commitment and loyalty shown by the participants, which brought Air New Zealand one step closer to unraveling the mysteries of the implementation process.

Oloo (2012) also carried out a study on the challenges of strategy implementation among public Corporations in Kenya. The findings reveal that untimely allocation of resources and inadequate funding are the main challenges. Wesonga et al. (2012) carried out a study on challenges of implementing performance contracting in the Public service. The study established that resistance to change was a major challenge. One of the reasons for this failure to implement strategies is the fact that managers try to implement them without a careful understanding of the factors which are important in helping to make implementation work (Okumus, 2003).

Accordingly, managers have to be aware of the importance of strategic decisions as well as of the successful implementation of these decisions and their effect on the success of their organization. In his research on the challenges of implementation of devolution strategy at the Nairobi city county government in Kenya Muli Ngu (2014) the constitution of Kenya 2010 and the Vision 2030 serve as the corporate strategy from which the County draws its content. The county is more of a business unit hence its devolution strategy is like a functional level strategy that focuses on the corporate strategy.

Relevant fields of literature refer to the aspect of challenges affecting the implementation on strategic decisions on different organizations and business units. Despite the asserted challenges, the existing conceptualizations generally remain partial, fragmented and unspecified in reference to the specific County Governments. The study seeks to fill this gap by establishing a thorough and integrative conceptualization of various aspects of Challenges that affect the implementation of the strategic decisions at County Government Level. In this regard, the study sought to answer the question what are the challenges faced by Bungoma County Government in the implementation of strategic decisions?

1.3 Research Objective

The objective of this study was to establish the challenges facing Bungoma County Government in the implementation of strategic Decisions.

1.4 Value of the Study

Successful strategy execution is a unique blend of nuts, bolts and really bright ideas. In implementing strategy, the executive's mission is to go beyond the creation of grand strategy and develop those innovative business solutions that aid and ensure successful execution – only then do they create the legacy of implementation excellence.

The findings of this study are beneficial to the policy makers of Bungoma County Government. The findings formed a basis upon which an informed policy development process can be structured.

Further, the study enables policy makers in the government to take necessary measures to strengthen devolution in Kenya. It's envisaged that if the strategies are implemented well, devolution can spur economic and social development in all counties in Kenya. Most of the Counties are more likely to face the same challenges in implementing this strategy. The findings from this study shall assist other County governments in the country to get a clear understanding of how implementing strategic Decisions has worked in other areas. It, therefore, serves as a benchmark.

This study increases the body of knowledge in the area of strategic decision implementation in County Governments in Kenya and more especially Bungoma County Government. This study also enriches the resource based theory of strategic planning by analyzing the resources available to Bungoma County Government, resources are both tangible and intangible assets that an organization has such as brand names, in-house knowledge of technology, employment of skilled personnel, trade contacts, machinery, efficient procedures and capital. The study evaluated whether the resources available to the Bungoma County are reliable and adequate to enable it govern and deliver services effectively as espoused by article 175 of the Constitution of Kenya 2010.

This study also aims to investigate the perceived effectiveness of strategy implementation in Bungoma County Government. With regard to the effectiveness of strategy

implementation, this study brings out the role of strategic leadership in effective strategy other counties can be able to learn from Bungoma County.

In addition, it is always perceived that there is a moderate to very large gap between strategy formulation and effective strategy implementation in which the study seeks to bring in light. The findings of this study are highlighted thus making Bungoma County be a benchmark to the other counties.

1.5 chapter summary

This Chapter presents the backbone of the Study, it highlights the Background of the study .The researcher discussed an overview Strategy and tries to explain the general perception on challenges of implementing Strategic Decisions. The researcher in this chapter has brought in play the theory of Resource based view to further discuss the problem.

The researcher explains the origin and formations of the county Governments in Kenya and also tries to narrow down to the Bungoma County which is the Case study.

Finally the researcher looks at the Research problem and tries to highlight other researches done in the end bring out the research Gap. The last sections discusses about the research objectives and the value of undertaking the study

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the information from other researchers who have carried out their research in the same field of study. The specific areas covered here are theoretical review/past studies, empirical review, critical review and summary of the chapter.

2.2 Theoretical Foundation

This study was based on the Resource Based Theory of strategic planning. The theory posits that organizations depend on resources as the primary point of the strategic planning process (Peteraf and Bergen, 2003) . Although early contributions to resource-based theory and dynamic capabilities came from the discipline of economics (e.g. Demsetz, 1973; Gort, 1962;Marris, 1964; Penrose, 1959; Richardson, 1960, 1972;Rubin, 1973; Slater, 1980), during the last 20 years the business field of strategic management has made significant contributions to resource-based theory and dynamic capabilities (e.g., Foss, 1997; Heene & Sanchez,1997; Volberda & Elfring, 2001). Logic dictates that (organizational) economic theory will continue to play an important role in the study of economic value creation and sustainable competitive advantage. After all, sustainable competitive advantage requires an understanding of market frictions. Foss (1998) states that the resource-based perspective does not escape the general problem of finding the appropriate unit of analysis. Most contributions within the RBV take the individual resource as the relevant unit of analysis to study competitive advantage.

However, Foss (1998) points out that this choice may only be legitimated if the relevant resources are sufficiently well-defined and free-standing. If, in contrast, there are strong relations of complementarily and co specialization among resources, it is the way resources are clustered and how they interplay and fit into the system that is important to

the understanding of competitive advantage. Foss (1998) recognizes that the concepts 'capabilities' and 'competences' aim perhaps at grabbing this clustering and interplay. The conceptual framework takes this problem into account by relating competitive advantage to strategy rather than to individual resources. Birger (1984) asserts that most products require the services of several resources and most resources can be used in several products. Caves (1980) defines organizational resources as both tangible and intangible assets that an organization has such as brand names, in-house knowledge of technology, employment of skilled personnel, trade contacts, machinery, efficient procedures and capital. The resource based theory therefore, suggests that the resources available to an organization can determine the level of returns the organization can be able to achieve.

The resource based theory indicates that an organization can identify attractive resources to enable it to identify classes of resources for which resource position barriers can be built up. These barriers are often self-reproducing; that is a firm which at a given time finds itself in some sense ahead of others may use these barriers to cement that lead (Birger, 1984). It is the properties of the resources and their mode of acquisition which allow this to be done. In this study, e-commerce is taken as a resource that can be utilized by an organization in gaining competitive advantage and profitability. This is done by maintaining technological leads such as e-commerce.

2.3 Overview of strategy thinking

Strategic thinking is a flexible means of solving strategic problems and conceptualizing the future of the firm within the strategic management framework combining a range of individual and group mental activities (Mintzberg H ,1994). Several writers have suggested definitions for strategic management. Gluck,Kaufmann and Walleck (1980) discuss:“(1) A planning framework that cuts across organizational boundaries and facilitates strategic decision making about customer groups and resources. (2)A planning process that stimulates entrepreneurial thinking. (3) A corporate values system that reinforces managers' commitment to the company strategy” (Gluck et al, 1980).

The concept of strategy has been borrowed from the military and adapted for use in business. A review of what noted writers about business strategy have to say suggests that adopting the concept was easy because the adaptation required has been modest. In business, as in the military, strategy bridges the gap between policy and tactics. Mintzberg (1994) defines strategy as “a plan, or something equivalent –a direction, a guide or course of action into the future, a path to get from here to there”, and as “a pattern, that is, consistency in behavior over time”. The term strategy seems to have a multitude of meanings. This is not surprising, as there is no commonly accepted and universal definition of strategy (O'Regan and Ghobadian, 2002a, b). The Greek origin of the term strategy, *strategia* means the art of war (Feurer and Chaharbaghi, 1995).

Andrews (1971) argues that strategy is a rational decision-making process by which the firm's resources are matched with opportunities arising from the competitive environment. Others, such as Schendel and Hofer (1979) regard strategy as the mediating force or match between the organisation and the environment, and Aldrich (1979) state that the environment has a strong deterministic influence on the strategy-making processes in organisations. On the other hand, proponents of the resource-based view also argue that it is not the environment, but the resources of the organisation that form the foundation of a firm's strategy (Grant, 1991). Mintzberg (1994) contends that strategies are intentional and their implementation is deliberate before they become realised. Intentional strategies that are not realised are thus discarded. It is rarely possible to realise intended strategies completely, and so the realised strategies normally diverge to a greater or lesser extent from the intended strategies. Additionally, in some cases companies do not have any specified intended strategy. The realised strategy is thus, the product of many different decisions taken individually.

Mintzberg (1987) contends that formulation and implementation merge into a fluid process of learning through which creative strategies evolve. He also identifies three types of strategy processes: planning, entrepreneurial and learning-by-experience (Mintzberg, 1994). While both content and process are separate elements of strategy, they are highly interdependent. The interrelationship is seen as so significant that a consideration of the content of strategy in the absence of the strategic process means that only a limited view is obtained (Mintzberg, 1990). Barnes (2001) argues that firms should determine the content and the process of their strategies in the light of their position in the industry and their objectives, opportunities and resources.

2.4 Strategic Decisions

The first step in the evolution of strategic management was taken in the late 1950's, when firms developed a systematic approach to deciding where and how the firm will do its future business (Ansoff, 1984). A strategy is a pattern in the organization's important decisions and actions, and consists of a few key areas or things by which the firm is distinguished from others (Digman, 1986). To Drucker, strategy is a purposeful action while to Mintzberg it is a plan, a ploy, a pattern, a position, and a perspective (five Ps).

Strategic management is defined as the set of decisions and actions resulting in the formulation and implementation of strategies designed to achieve the objectives of an organization (Pearce II & Robinson, 1985). According to Schwenk (1988) strategic decisions are ill structured, non-routine, and important to the firm, in which top management usually plays a central role (Hofer & Schendel, 1978). Strategic decision-making is incremental and interdependent, shaped by a variety of contextual influences arising from past events, present circumstances, and perspectives of the future (Quinn, 1980; March, 1981; Das, 1986; Neustadt & May, 1986).

One of the central features of strategic decisions is their lack of structure (Mintzberg et al., 1976) mainly due to the complexity of the strategic problems (Mason & Mitroff, 1981). Gamble and Thompson (2009) found that a company's strategy consists of competitive moves and approaches management has developed to attract and please customers, conduct operations, grow the business, and achieve performance objectives.

2.5 Challenges of Strategy implementation

The environmental conditions facing many firms have changed rapidly. Today's global competitive environment is complex, dynamic, and largely unpredictable. To deal with this unprecedented level of change, a lot of thinking has gone into the issue of how strategies are best formulated.

Strategic management is about managing the future, and effective strategy formulation is crucial, as it directs the attention and actions of an organization, even if in some cases actual implemented strategy can be very different from what was initially intended, planned or thought.

The assessment of strategy formulation processes becomes crucial for practitioners and researchers alike in order to conduct and evaluate different formulation processes (Olson et al., 2005). A strategy is only as good as its implementation. However the processes are not as simple as planned. The challenge is that the organizations have to face the barriers to stimulate employees throughout an organization to work with pride and enthusiasm towards achieving stated objectives.

The relevant literature (Noble, 1999; Noble and Mokwa, 1999) has advocated factors that influence the effective implementation of strategies, for example; organisational structure (Drazin and Howard, 1984); control mechanisms (Daft and Mackintosh, 1984; Jaworski et al., 1993); strategic consensus (Floyd and Wooldridge, 1992); leadership (Gupta and Govindarajan, 1984; Nutt, 1983); and communication (Workman, 1993). However, prior research has neglected to ascertain whether the “style” of strategy implementation undertaken has any impact on the effectiveness of the implementation effort. Mintzberg (1993) proposed that firms differ in terms of their structure and that theory should move away from the “one best way” approach towards a contingency approach, in that structure should reflect the firm's situation and strategies. The structure of a firm influences the flow of information and the context and nature of interpersonal interaction within it. Structure also channels collaboration, prescribes means of communication and co-ordination as well as allocating power and responsibility (Miller, 1987).

Reed and Buckley (1988) discuss problems associated with strategy implementation identifying four key areas for discussion. They acknowledge the challenge and the need for a clear fit between strategy and structure and claim the debate about which comes first is irrelevant providing there is congruence in the context of the operating environment. They warn that, although budgeting systems are a powerful tool for communication, they have limited use in the implementation of strategies as they are dominated by monetary based measures and due to their size and the game playing associated budget setting “it is possible for the planning intent of any resource redistribution to be ignored” (Reed and Buckley, 1988, p. 68).

Laibuta (2013) indicates that there are a number of challenges facing the implementation of devolution in Kenya. Lack of understanding of key issues around devolution is generating a great deal of mistrust between stakeholders with some, especially the minority coalition in both houses of parliament, believing that the national government is seeking to frustrate devolution. Some counties, for instance, contest the piecemeal transfer of functions that has taken place so far, arguing that all powers provided in Schedule Four of the Constitution be transferred at once. This demand is partly driven by belief on the part of county governments that officials of the national government and local government structures being phased out remain resentful of the invasion of their previous scope of authority. While this may be true, the reality on the ground is that many county governments, if not all, lack the capacity to absorb all such powers within such a short term. This argument is strengthened when one considers, for instance, that Kenya currently lacks trained and experienced legislative drafters, fiscal and economic planning experts to adequately cater for the 47 counties.

2.6 Empirical studies and Research Gaps

A critical evaluation of the strategy implementation literature reveals three core problem areas that need attention in terms of theoretical developments and encouragement of implementation-focused future research. These problems were partially identified by Hutzschenreuter and Kleindienst (2006) in their review of strategy process research, although they remain largely unresolved: a) inattention to the consequences of successful strategy implementation for competitive performance; b) relatively less attention to processual characteristics associated with implementation; c) inferior tactical image of strategy implementation as opposed to senior management image. These problem areas are now analyzed to establish the need to apply the RBV as a theoretical lens on the behavioural phenomenon of strategy implementation process.

There is a need to look at strategy as an integrated and dynamic process. Research concerning formulation and implementation is better if done together as strategy process research. Strategy process has been identified at various times as an important facet of strategic management research (Gopinath and Hoffman 1995, Pettigrew et al 2002, Hitt 2005). Study of the process is study of simultaneously occurring activities and their linkages. There is a need for achieving integration of the fragmented and dispersed pieces of research on strategy implementation. This requires a model which would look at the variables involved in implementation in an integrated way, duly looking at the interactive effects of the variables (Hrebiniak and Joyce 2001; Chakravarty and Roderick 2002; Pettigrew et al 2002)

In view of these factors, research into strategy implementation is also difficult for it entails the need to look at it over time (longitudinal studies); presents conceptual and methodological challenges as it involves multiple variables which interact with each other and show reciprocal causality(fajourn 2000).

Topic of implementation is a neglected and overlooked area in strategic management literature. Published research reveals emphasis on strategy formulation. Strategy formulation and implementation are complementary and logically distinguishable areas of strategic management and part of the overall process of planning executing and adapting. More Research on implementation has been done in organizational theory and development than in strategic management. Implementation research needs to be interdisciplinary. The importance of implementation can be gauged from the study of Joyce (2000) which showed that firms with unusually high performance and firms which turned around their performance relied upon key activities of strategic direction, building a fast and effective organization, establishing an adaptive culture and executing against focus of customer needs and cost (Hrebiniak and Joyce 2001 hand book of strategy).

2.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the literature review for the project. An overview of strategic management with a definition and introduction to strategy was presented. There was an introduction to strategy formulation and its relationship to strategy implementation.

The researcher then explains the relevant of all these frame work and approaches to the implementation which is relevant to the study. Implementation variables were also explained as potential challenges to the implementation. A section also presented on ways to overcome challenges to the implementation process.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology that was used to carry out the study. This will include the research design, data collection methods and data analysis techniques that will be employed in this study.

3.2 Research Design

This study adopted a case study design since the unit of analysis is the organization. This case study aimed at getting detailed information regarding the challenges encountered in the process of implementation of strategic decisions in Bungoma County Government.

According to Yin (1989) a case study allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events. It is also noted that a case study involves a careful and complete observation of social units. It is a method of study in depth rather than breadth and places more emphasis on the full analysis of a limited number of events or conditions and other interrelations. Primarily, data collected from such a study is more reliable and up to date.

Kothari (1990) describes a case study as a form of qualitative analysis that involves a careful and complete observation of a social unit. He further describes a social unit as a person, family or institution. The researcher adopted a case study because of its contribution to the knowledge of individual, group, organizational, social and political phenomena. Case study has been a common research strategy in business (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2002) and community planning. The distinct need for case studies arises out of the desire of the researcher to understand the complex social phenomena.

3.3 Data Collection

This study used both primary and secondary data. Primary data is data observed or collected directly from first-hand experience. In order to collect primary data, interview guides will be designed. It is information that is collected specifically for the purpose of a research project. An advantage of primary data is that it is specifically tailored to your research needs. A disadvantage is that it is expensive to obtain. Another advantage of using primary data is that researchers collect information for the specific purposes of their study. In essence, the questions the researchers ask are tailored to elicit the data that helps them with their study.

Secondary data used was obtained from published data and any other data collected in the past or from other parties. There are several advantages of secondary data, it tends to be readily available and inexpensive to obtain. In addition, secondary data can be examined over a longer period of time. Secondary data will be sourced from both internal and external sources.

Interview guides were used in the collection of data. Interviewing is a way to collect data as well as to gain knowledge from individuals. Kvale (1996) regarded interviews as an interchange of views between two or more people on a topic of mutual interest, sees the centrality of human interaction for knowledge production, and emphasizes the social impact of research data. The interview guide will be considered appropriate for this study since there is need to gain an in-depth understanding of the challenges facing Bungoma County government in implementing strategic Decisions and this can only be achieved by conducting interviews.

The researcher requested for an appointment with County Executive Committee of Bungoma County in order to ascertain when they were available for the interviews. This was made possible through an introduction letter from the University of Nairobi introducing the researcher to Bungoma County government for data collection purposes. The researcher then used the prior appointments to conduct the interviews with the respective respondents.

3.4 Data Analysis

The Qualitative data was collected, after which the response in the interview guides will be edited for completeness and consistence before processing the responses. The qualitative analysis was used to analyze the respondents' views about the challenges in the implementation of strategic Decisions in Bungoma County Government. Content analysis was used to analyze the data.

Nachmias and Nachmias (1996) define content analysis as any technique used to make inferences through systematic and objective identification of specified characteristics of messages.

Kothari (2004) also explains content analysis as the analysis of the contents of documentary and verbal material and describes it as a qualitative analysis concerning the general import of message of the existing documents and measure pervasiveness. Before embarking on content analysis, the researcher assessed the quality of the written material to ensure that the available material accurately represented what was written or said. The researcher then listed and summarized the major issues contained in the interview guide responses. This enabled him to structure the data in a way that could make it possible to analyze and interpret it.

3.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the research method options available for the researcher to conduct this research. This chapter started with explaining of the research question which was followed by a section with the information on research design chosen.

The chapter continues to explain the use of interview guides as the tool used for data collection. After that the sampling strategy for conducting interviews was presented along with the process used for analyzing data obtained for research.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish the challenges facing Bungoma County Government in the implementation of Strategic Decision. The respondents of the study included 10 County Executive Committee Members or their representatives engaged in implementation of strategic decisions at the Bungoma County government. The researcher managed to interview a total of 9 respondents thus achieving a response rate of 90%. This implies that the findings of the study can be used to reflect the true position on challenges facing the Bungoma County government in implementation of the strategic Decision.

4.2 Perceptions of Strategic Decisions implementation

The study sought to establish from the respondents how strategic Decision implementation process is perceived in the County Government of Bungoma. It was evident from the research findings that the strategic decision implementation of Bungoma County is embedded in the County' Integrated Urban Development Master Plan for the Bungoma County that runs from the year 2014 to 2030. The purpose of the Development Master Plan is to develop concepts for implementation of urban development projects for sustainable urban development and improvement of living conditions based on integrated urban development plan for the Bungoma County.

On the question of importance of strategy implementation to the County Government's success, the interviewees indicated that successful strategy implementation can go a long way in helping the organization gain a competitive edge, help in defining the business of the organization and also help in achieving right direction. The study also found that the company benefits by having its various strategies entrenched and broadly accepted by all the employees guaranteeing successful implementation in the future.

Bungoma County Government is able to position and relate itself to the environment to ensure its continued success and also secure itself from surprises brought about by the changing environment during strategy implementation. This is done by including qualified people with skills, attitudes, capabilities, experiences and other characteristics required by a specific task or position.

The County Government of Bungoma is an organization which is optimistic that their current operating performance will be sustained in the future. The importance of management ability, or competence, in achieving successful strategy implementation is top management's strategic choices. It reflects favorably on choices made in other parts of the organization. Strategic level manager's demographic characteristics should be examined for the formulation and implementation of strategic decisions. Those in the organization must understand each important detail in management's intended strategy. The organization is to take collective action; the strategy needs to make as much sense to each of the members in the organization as they view the world from their own context, as it does to top management. The collective intentions must be realized with little unanticipated influence from outside political, technological, or market forces.

4.3 Main Stakeholders in the implementation of Strategic Decisions

The study sought to establish the stakeholders in the implementation of the strategic Decisions in Bungoma County Government. A stakeholder is anybody who can affect or is affected by an organization, strategy or project. They are individuals, groups or organizations that are affected by the activity of another organization. They include owners who are interested in how much profit the business makes, managers who are concerned about their salary, workers who want to earn high wages and keep their jobs and customers who want the business to produce quality products at reasonable prices.

The respondents confirmed that the first stakeholder in the implementation of strategic Decision is the Government of Kenya. The government consists of the ministries, departments, agencies and other arms that form it. The study established that the National government is a major and leading stakeholder since it distributes the resources

to the County governments based on the provisions of the constitution. It also plays a significant role in the strategic decision development and implementation since all the subsidiary strategies must be in line with the country's Vision 2030. The government of Kenya also provides mechanisms for accountability of the county governments hence its central role in implementation of the strategies in the County of Bungoma.

The other groups of stakeholders who are key according to the research findings are the citizenry or the people of the Bungoma County. The County Government Act 2012 defines citizenry as the residents of a particular county, the rate payers of a particular city or municipality, any resident civic organization or non-governmental, private sector or labour organization with an interest in the governance of a particular county, city or municipality, non-resident persons who because of their temporary presence in a particular county, city or municipality make use of services or facilities provided by the county, city or municipality. It was revealed from the study that the people of the Bungoma County are very important stakeholders since all the plans developed by the County government are aimed at improving the living conditions of the people living in the County.

It was also clear from the study that Members of the Bungoma County Assembly are also very important stakeholders in the implementation of strategic Decisions. According to Article 177(i) of the Constitution of Kenya 2010, members of a county assembly are members elected by the registered voters of the wards, each ward constituting a single member constituency. On the same day as a general election of Members of parliament, being the second Tuesday in August, in every fifth year; or the number of special seat members necessary to ensure that principles of devolved government no more than two-thirds of the membership of the assembly are of the same gender or the number of members of marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities and the youth, prescribed by an Act of Parliament; and the Speaker, who is an ex officio member.

It was also clear from the study that international development and aid agencies are also very important stakeholders in the implementation of strategic Decisions. International development agencies are agencies whose goal is to help develop and support economic growth within a specified city, region or state by providing necessary resources and assistance. They are public, private or most often a public/private partnership, and their purpose is to promote economic growth and development in the areas they serve. The respondents revealed that Kenya is home to a number of high profile International organizations such as the United Nations Office in Nairobi, the World Bank, the International monetary Fund, the United States Aid, the United Kingdom Aid, Danish Aid and Japan International Cooperation Agency among many others. These international agencies are significant in the sense that they took an active role in funding several County strategic plans.

The research findings also established that there are other stakeholders who play a very significant role in the implementation of strategies in Bungoma County. One of these stakeholders is the business community in Bungoma. A business community is a private and secure environment for various organizations that want to share knowledge, promotions, offers, services, products or events, to network, establish new contacts or reinforce current ones. The Bungoma County as revealed from the study has a vast majority of business people who range from producers, landlords and small scale business people. These people hold a very significant position that cannot be ignored. The research findings indicated that the business community played a significant role in developing the strategic plan.

It was also clear from the study that there are other governmental regulatory agencies that oversee the implementation of the constitution of Kenya promulgated in the year 2010. These agencies are also important stakeholders in the implementation of the Strategic Decisions. Some of the key agencies include the Commission of implementation of the Constitution, Commission of Revenue Allocation, the Controller of Budget, the Salaries and Remuneration Commission and the Transition Authority among others.

Bungoma County Residents Associations and Community Groups are other key stakeholder in the implementation of strategic Decision. Community organizations (sometimes known as community-based organizations) are civil societies non-profit making organizations that operate within the community. Typical community organizations fall into the categories such as community-service and action, health, educational, personal growth and improvement, social welfare and self-help for the disadvantaged. Community based organizations which operate within the given locality insures the community with sustainable provision of community-service and action, health, educational, personal growth and improvement, social welfare and self-help for the disadvantaged, its sustainability becomes healthier and possible because the community is directly involved in the action or operation wherever and whenever monetary and non-monetary support or contribution is needed. The research findings also established that Residents Associations and Community Groups play a very significant role in the implementation of Strategic decisions in Bungoma County.

Another key stakeholder of Bungoma County is the employees. Employees are identified as stakeholders in the organization from almost all stakeholder perspectives. Employees are closely integrated with the Bungoma County and this gives them a peculiar role among stakeholders. They contribute to the County in fundamental ways. However, employees actually constitute the County: they are in many cases the most important factor or resource of the county, they represent the County towards other stakeholders and they act in the name of the county. Employees are greatly affected by the success or failure of the county; having an investment of experience and specialized skills, accrued resources, and personal relationships, and are dependent upon their employer's success through income or equity.

4.4 Challenges of Implementing Strategic Decisions in Bungoma County Government

The researcher further sought to establish the main challenges facing the implementation of the Strategic Decisions in Bungoma. Strategic challenges are those pressures that exert a decisive influence on an organization's likelihood of future success. These challenges frequently are driven by an organization's future competitive position relative to other providers of similar products. While not exclusively so, strategic challenges generally are externally driven.

However, in responding to externally driven strategic challenges, an organization may face internal strategic challenges. External strategic challenges may relate to customer or market needs or expectations; product or technological changes; or financial, societal, and other risks or needs. Internal strategic challenges may relate to an organization's capabilities or its human and other resources. It was revealed from the research findings that there are several challenges that affect the implementation of the devolution strategy in Bungoma County. The findings on these challenges are presented below

4.4.1 Resources as a Challenge of implementation of Strategic Decision

The study sought to establish whether resources are a challenge in the implementation of the devolution strategy at the Nairobi City County. A resource is an economic or productive factor required to accomplish an activity or as a means to undertake an enterprise and achieve desired outcome.

Three most basic resources are land, labour and capital. Other resources include energy, entrepreneurship, information, expertise, management, and time. Typically resources are materials, energy, services, staff, knowledge, technology or other assets that are transformed to produce benefit and in the process may be consumed or made unavailable. Benefits of resource utilization may include increased wealth, meeting needs or wants, proper functioning of a system, or enhanced wellbeing.

The concept of resources has been applied in diverse realms, including with respect to economics, biology and ecology, technology, management and human resources, and is linked to the concepts of competition, sustainability, conservation and stewardship.

In application within human society, commercial or non-commercial factors require adequate resource allocation through prudent resource management. Resources have three main characteristics: utility, limited availability, and potential for depletion or consumption. The findings from the study reveal that the respondents confirmed scarcity and insufficiency of resources as one of the biggest challenges to implementation of the strategic. It was evident from the study findings that the Bungoma County government does not have enough financial and human resources that are necessary in the implementation of the strategic.

It was clear that the financial resources provided by the national government are not adequate to cater for the implementation of the strategies effectively. It is due to the inadequate resources that the Council of Governors, a lobby group established under the Transition to Devolved Government Act 2012 has set up a working group of experts to spearhead devolution of more resources to all counties in Kenya through its 'pesa mashinani' initiative. It was further confirmed that the Bungoma County does not have enough financial resources to use in engaging permanently some of the experts who will assist in the implementation of the strategic decisions. The financial resources available to counties will determine to a considerable extent whether they can effectively fulfill their responsibilities.

Although counties can raise some money locally through taxes and fees, the bulk of the money is that which is transferred from the national exchequer, which counties allege is inadequate as against the functions that have been transferred from the central government to county governments. The framework for financial allocations and accountability is complex, requiring independent advice as well as tough negotiations. This shortage in manpower poses a big challenge in implementing the strategic decisions.

4.4.2 Resistance to Change as a Challenge of implementation of Strategic Decisions

Resistance is the action taken by individuals and groups when they perceive a change that is occurring as a threat to them. The threat need not be real or large for resistance to occur. Resistance is the equivalent of objections. Resistance may take many forms, including active or passive, overt or covert, individual or organized, aggressive or timid. However resistance to change happens, it threatens the success of the organization. Resistance affects the speed at which an innovation is adopted. It affects the feelings and opinions of employees and stakeholders at all stages of the adoption process. It affects productivity, quality and relationships.

The major form of resistance that has been witnessed according to the findings of the Study is largely from the workers of the Bungoma County Government especially those inherited from the defunct Bungoma Council. For the strategic Decisions to be effectively implemented there is need for the same to be supported fully by the workers of the Bungoma County government. However, as revealed from the research findings, most of the workers of the Bungoma County are against most of the desired changes since they make them feel insecure in their employment. This resistance has made it difficult for the County government to effectively implement its strategies.

Another most prevalent form of resistance emanates from the Members of the Bungoma County Assembly who at times frustrate motions dealing with devolution issues. The respondents confirm that in a number of occasions the Members of County Assembly have failed to support motions dealing with specific devolution issues on aspects of implementation as a way of resisting change and maintaining the status quo. This form of resistance makes it difficult since implementation of any activity requires the support of the Bungoma County Assembly. The study further confirmed that the other form of resistance is through legal battles in the courts. A lawsuit is a civil action brought in a court of law in which a plaintiff, a party who claims to have incurred loss as a result of a defendant's actions, demands a legal or equitable remedy or compensation. The defendant is required to respond to the plaintiff's complaint.

A lawsuit may involve dispute resolution of private law issues between individuals, business entities, non-profit entities or the government and government agencies. A lawsuit may also enable the government to be treated as if it were a private party in a civil case, as plaintiff, or defendant regarding an injury, or may provide the state with a civil cause of action to enforce certain laws. It was evident that for the strategic implementation process to be successful in Bungoma County there is a need to overcome several legal hurdles. The respondents confirmed that legal suits relating to implementation of Strategic decisions are a form of resistance that is based on legal excuses. The legal battles in most cases derail the implementation of strategies as expected by the Bungoma County government.

4.4.3 Environmental Challenges of implementation of Strategic Decisions

One of the challenges as revealed by the study relates to the environment. The respondents confirmed that there are two types of environments that affect the implementation of the strategic Decisions. The first type of environment is the physical environment. The physical environment includes land, air, water, plants and animals, buildings and other infrastructure, and all of the natural resources that provide our basic needs and opportunities for social and economic development.

A clean, healthy environment is important for people's physical and emotional Wellbeing. At a fundamental level, factors such as clean air and good quality drinking water are vital for people's physical health. Other environmental factors such as noise pollution can cause both physical harm and psychological stress. For many people, access to an attractive physical environment contributes greatly to their contentedness with life. The study confirmed that Bungoma town is currently congested, therefore strategic Decisions may not be very easy to implement since finding land in the town locality for some necessary facilities is a big challenge. Most of the land is fully occupied and this poses a very unique challenge to the Bungoma County government.

The second type of environment is the political environment. Political environment is the government actions which affects the operations of a company or business. These actions may be on local, regional, national or international level. Business owners and managers pay close attention to the political environment to gauge how government actions will affect their company. The political environment potentially affects the daily business activities of any business, company or organization. When a political institution passes a new law, businesses must consider the impact it will have on their operations. In some instances, companies may need to develop new strategies or processes in order to comply with initiatives imposed through legislative laws. The political system of the country also has an influence on political environments.

4.4.4 The Electorate as a Challenge of implementation of Strategic Decisions

The research findings reveal that the electorate is also a huge challenge in the implementation of the strategic in Bungoma County. An electorate is a body of people allowed to vote in an election. Being a part of the electorate is important because it gives them a chance to elect or choose whom they want to represent them in government. It was clear from the study that the electorate has high expectations from the County government. The high expectations have put pressure on the Bungoma County government since it may not be possible to instantly realize gains as far as implementation of strategy is concerned.

The respondents indicated that the electorate is also the tax payers from whom the County Government gets additional revenues to implement the strategies. The findings indicate that lack of support from the electorate has become a great Challenge in the implementation of the strategic. It was also evident from the study findings that the electorate also comprises of the residents of the Bungoma County who yearn to be provided for better services by the County Government.

4.4.5 National Government as a challenge of implementation of Strategic Decisions

The study sought to establish whether the Central government is a challenge to the implementation of the strategic decisions by the Bungoma County. A central government is the government of a nation state and is more typically a characteristic of a unitary state. This is the same as a federal government which may have distinct powers at various levels authorized or delegated to it by its member states. The structure of central governments varies. Many countries have created autonomous regions by delegating powers from the central government to governments at a sub national level, such as a regional, state or local level. Based on a broad definition of a basic political system, there are two or more levels of government that exist within an established territory and govern through common institutions with overlapping or shared powers as prescribed by a constitution or other law.

Usual responsibilities of this level of government which are not granted to lower levels are maintaining national security and exercising international diplomacy. The research results confirmed that the Central government has to some degree been a challenge to the implementation of strategic Decisions in the Bungoma County. One of such actions as established by the study is some political appointments that are against the devolution agenda. These appointments, for example are the County Commissioners, Deputy County Commissioners, Assistant County Commissioners, Chiefs and their Assistants which are parallel to the county established structures of a Governor, Deputy Governor, Sub-County Administrators, Ward administrators and the Village administrators as espoused in the County Government Act 2012.

It was also clear from the research findings that the central government also tries to control the activities of the County Government though not directly. The respondents confirmed that such actions have made it difficult for the Bungoma County to independently implement its strategic Decisions. It was further established that the central government has been slow in devolving some of the functions as required by the constitution.

This delay has also made the Bungoma County to face challenges in implementing its strategies. In addition, the respondents also confirmed that the central government is the custodian of financial resources that are distributed down to the County governments including the Bungoma County. The respondents revealed that the financial resources distributed to them are not adequate to allow effective implementation of the strategies.

The study further established that there are some conflicts between various arms of government such as judiciary and the legislature on matters concerning devolution. The study revealed that such conflicts have also become an impediment in the implementation of the strategies in the Bungoma County.

4.5 Capacity of the Implementation of Strategic Decisions

The study sought to establish from the respondents their opinion on the capacity of the Bungoma County to effectively implement the strategic Decisions. Organizational capacity is the long-term ability of an organization to fulfill its mission and vision by measurably achieving its objectives through a blend of sound management, strong governance, and a persistent dedication to assessing and achieving results. Increasing demands on nonprofit organizations require much more to be accomplished with fewer resources than in years past. One way for organizations to meet these needs is to have in place an infrastructure comprised of established best practices and documented processes. This enables the executive to move from a reactive to a proactive operating model.

It was confirmed that the Bungoma County has the capacity to successfully implement the strategic Decisions subject to a number of requirements being met. The study revealed that if the Bungoma County gets access to adequate resources, then the question of capacity to implement the strategic will not arise. Currently the capacity to implement the devolution strategy is affected by the scarcity of resources both financial and human. The respondents also confirmed that the Bungoma County's capacity to implement the strategic is affected by political wrangles due to ideological differences among political camps. These differences make it difficult for the Bungoma County government to gain support on the implementation of the various activities in their strategic plan.

4.6 Evaluation of Strategic Decisions

The researcher sought to establish how the Bungoma County evaluates the implementation of its strategic Decisions. Strategy evaluation is a process through which organizational and program strategies are developed, improved, and refined. Through clarity of strategic vision and purpose (and a culture of learning), evaluation of strategy can provide meaningful insights for both internal and external stakeholders. Strategy evaluation and control is the final stage in strategic management. All strategies are subject to future modification because internal and external factors are constantly changing. In strategy evaluation and control process, managers determine whether the chosen strategy is achieving the organization's objectives. The fundamental strategy evaluation and control activities are: reviewing internal and external factors that are the bases for current strategies, measuring performance, and taking corrective actions.

Strategy Evaluation is as significant as strategy formulation because it throws light on the efficiency and effectiveness of the comprehensive plans in achieving the desired results. The managers can also assess the appropriateness of the current strategy in today's dynamic world with socio-economic, political and technological innovations. The significance of strategy evaluation lies in its capacity to co-ordinate the task performed by managers, groups, departments etc. through control of performance. Strategic Evaluation is significant because of various factors such as developing inputs for new strategic planning, the urge for feedback, appraisal and reward, development of the strategic management process, judging the validity of strategic choice etc. The process of strategy evaluation consists of following steps; fixing benchmark of performance, measurement of performance, analyzing variance and taking corrective action. It was revealed from the study findings that there are regular reviews on the achievements made as far as implementation of strategic Decisions is concerned.

The Bungoma County conducts quarterly and annually evaluations of their achievements. It was also revealed that the implementation of the strategy has been broken down into smaller achievable targets that are cascaded down to the relevant departments for execution. The respondents also indicated that there will be midterm evaluation to be conducted at the end of two and half years to establish how far the strategy has been successful in its implementation. The employees are also evaluated based on their performance targets twice a year to establish the achievements they have made as far as implementation of the strategic is concerned. It was established that the Bungoma County plans to conduct a post implementation evaluation of their strategic plans in order to establish learning experiences for future implementation of other strategies.

4.7 Possible Solutions to the Challenges

The study further sought to find out from the respondents, what they thought could be Possible solutions to the challenges of implementing the strategy decisions in Bungoma County. It was established that one of the main solutions is to ensure that there are enough resources to assist in the implementation of the strategies. It was revealed that the national government needs to allocate more resources in addition to Bungoma County government exploring ways of increasing its revenue base in order to get the required financial resources. It was further revealed from the study that the Bungoma County government required highly competent experts in strategy implementation who will direct the process to completion.

The study also established that there is also need to hold frequent stakeholder meetings before implementing the strategic in the Bungoma County as per Section 91 of the County Government Act 2012. The County government of Bungoma should facilitate the establishment of structures for citizen participation including; information communication technology based platforms, town hall meetings, and budget preparation and validation forums, notice boards: announcing jobs, appointments, procurement awards. This will assist in alleviating the issue of resistance to implementation of the strategies. The respondents confirmed that informed stakeholders will not be party to resistance and this will hasten the implementation process.

It was further established that members of the Bungoma County Assembly should be enlightened on matters concerning strategic implementation and the need to separate them from partisan politics. This will assist in gaining the support of the Bungoma County Assembly in implementing the strategic Decisions.

4.8 Discussion of Findings

The study established that the content of the Bungoma strategic plan is the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and the Kenya Vision 2030. This implies that the Strategic Decisions of the Bungoma County draws its content from the Country's devolution strategy. In this case the constitution of Kenya 2010 and the Vision 2030 serve as the corporate strategy from which the County draws its content. These findings agree with those of Dix and Mathews (2010) who assert that a strategy is a tool that defines the routes that when taken will lead to the most likely probability of getting from where the business is to where the owners or stakeholders want it to go. And like a road rally, strategic plans meet detours and obstacles that call for adapting and adjusting as the plan is implemented.

The results also indicate that the Bungoma County is not working in isolation as far as implementation of the Strategic Decision is concerned. The Bungoma County government has identified a number of stakeholders who are very important in the Implementation of the strategic decisions, these stakeholders include the National government, the international development agencies, the business community in Nairobi, the electorate, the residents, the employees of the Bungoma County, trade unions, pressure groups and The County Assembly. This is an indication that the Bungoma County government recognizes the fact that the success of the exercise can only be made possible if there is involvement of all the stakeholders since they determine the direction the implementation process takes. This is also in line with the position held by Dix and Mathews (2010) who argue that stakeholders have a significant role determining where an organization progresses to.

The study further established that there are a number of resources that are very central to the implementation of the strategic Decisions. The main resources mentioned by the respondents include the financial resources that are provided by the National government, the physical facilities that are also provided by both the National and Bungoma County government. Human resources were also established as one of the most significant resources needed for successful implementation of the strategic Decisions. This is in line with the findings of Garatt (1999) who established that strategy implementation requires proper planning and resource mobilization in order to ensure that success is achieved according to the vision and mission of the organization.

The research findings also reveal that the National government plays a significant role as a major stakeholder. It was established that the national government is responsible for devolution of various functions to the County governments as stipulated in the Constitution of Kenya 2010. The National government also provides the financial resources that are required for the implementation of the strategies. Other than the financial resources and devolving the functions, the National government also plays an oversight role in the implementation of the strategic decisions.

The findings agree with the position held by Burgess et al., (2001) who also argues that the central government has the responsibility of adopting a national programme for compiling data for small area analysis and promote the use of new technologies for training and information exchange and democratic engagement. It also supports pilot schemes, promotes and disseminates good practice, and develops new approaches to the measurement of community engagement and quality of life outcomes. The central government should also realize that modernizing and fostering partnerships, community involvement and the risks attached to encouraging innovation need to be addressed if devolved governance has to succeed.

The study further established that there are a number of challenges the County of Bungoma faces in the implementation of the strategic decisions. One of the most prevalent challenges is the inadequacy of finances to facilitate the implementation of the Strategic Decisions. The other challenge established by the study is lack of support from the Bungoma County Assembly due to party differences from the Members of the County Assembly as well as resistance to change from the employees of the Bungoma County and other stakeholders such as the electorate and the business community. These findings seem to agree with the views of Laibuta (2013) who asserts that revenue allocation is proving to be a divisive issue since legally; counties are entitled to at least 15% of the total National Revenue collected. Despite many counties currently enjoying adequate funding, there is still a feeling that budgetary allocations need to be increased, and that the central government is reluctant to do this. Many county governors have since launched a spirited campaign to that effect and have interpreted the perceived national government reluctance as a ploy to frustrate the effectiveness of devolved units.

The study further revealed that the Bungoma County does not have adequate capacity to successfully implement their Strategic Decisions; this is attributed to shortage of the necessary facilities and resources that are critical for the implementation process. Ouedraogo (2003) had a similar view where he mentioned that most devolved units of government in some developing countries lack capacity to implement devolution strategies. He further argues that lack of capacity brings about the problem of coordination between the central and the local government authority. Lack of statistical databases to assist devolved units in the planning and monitoring of various activities is equally a major setback in implementation of devolved governance. The capacity problem often stems from the tendency to overrate the ability of the devolved unit of governance in prioritizing, planning and implementing development programs.

4.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the findings from the analysis of the data obtained from the case study. The findings from each objectives of the research were presented.

The five challenges to the implementation of strategic decision within The County of Bungoma were identified. Each of the challenges and reason for existence were provided. This is followed by the explanation for each and highlighting data that is relevant

The researcher intends to find out whether the perceptions of the strategy implementations process are different at different level .With the inclusion of the participants from all levels of the organization, the researcher found out that their perceptions are different due to the changing situation within the organization.

The researcher sought to find out whether the implementation variable identified by Okumu(2001) could potentially be challenges to implementation of Strategic decisions. The researcher showed that indeed these implementation variables could be the potential challenges to the implementation process.

Lastly the researcher undertakes to find ways to overcome the challenges identified. Responses from the participants provided good suggestion to ways in which The County Government of Bungoma could overcome the challenges during implementation process.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish the challenges of implementation of the strategic Decisions in the County government of Bungoma, Kenya. This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations made based on the research findings.

5.2 Summary

The study established that there are a number of challenges facing the implementation of the strategic Decisions in Bungoma County government. One of these challenges is the physical environment in which the County is located. The study found that the organization followed the steps of strategy implementation of SWOT that is it looks at the firm's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and analyzes the gap between the firm's internal (S&W's) and external (O&T's) environment. It uses the firm's values, to determine courses of actions, possibly via scenario planning, and select according to what the firm feel is likely or possible, or extremely attractive or threatening. Doing things like getting the resources, staff, incentive structures etc, the firm commenced implementation. The final step is strategic control, where implementation is checked to see if it is being executed as expected, checked to see if the outcomes are actually those that are sought, and the premises used during the SWOT analysis are checked to see if they have changed.

The results from the study further revealed that the electorate is also part of the challenges facing the Bungoma County government in implementing its strategic Decisions. The study confirmed that Bungoma County has a huge number of electorate who has high expectations and desperately waiting to see results.

These high expectations have put a lot of pressure on the County government since there are many people who are in need of its services. It was also clear that a greater percentage of the electorate are people living in informal settlements with unique problems that need to be urgently addressed. This makes it impossible for the Bungoma County government to implement its strategic Decisions with such unresolved problems.

It was evident from the research findings that the National government has also been a challenge in the implementation of the strategic Decisions in the County Government of Bungoma. It was established that some actions by the National government are against the devolution strategy. The study revealed that some political appointments contravene the provisions of the law and affect the efforts made by the County government in implementing the Strategic Decisions. It was further confirmed that the central government through its agencies also thwarts the implementation of the devolution strategy either directly or indirectly.

The study found that successful strategy implementation helped a company gain a competitive edge, define the business of the organization, achieve right direction and having its various strategies entrenched and broadly accepted by all the employees guaranteeing successful implementation in the future. Bungoma County Government is able to position and relate itself to the environment to ensure its continued success and also secure itself from surprises brought about by the changing environment during strategy implementation. The importance of management ability, or competence, in achieving successful strategy implementation is top management's strategic choices tends to be successful, it reflects favorably on choices made in other parts of the organization. The collective intentions must be realized with little unanticipated influence from outside political, technological and market forces.

The study also confirmed that implementation of the strategic Decisions as met its equal measure of resistance from various quarters thus making it challenging to implement it successfully. It was clear that resistance in the form of lack of support by the County Assembly of Bungoma of some motions geared towards implementation of the strategies is very detrimental to its implementation.

The study revealed that this resistance is also experienced from a number of other stakeholders such as the business community within the Bungoma County and the residents. It was revealed that this resistance curtails the County government's effort to successfully implement their strategic Decisions. The other challenge facing implementation of the strategic Decisions at Bungoma County is the lack of adequate resources such as finances and human resources. The county does not have enough resources to assist in implementing its strategic Decisions.

The study results confirm that for the Bungoma County government to successfully implement its devolution strategy there is need for the National government to allocate the County more resources or the County Government to come up with alternative ways of raising the required revenue, This will assist the Bungoma County to get the necessary resources for implementing the strategic Decisions. It was also established that there is need to involve all the concerned stakeholders at every stage of the strategic Decision implementation process. This will reduce the resistance that is currently experienced by the Bungoma County government.

It was evident from the results that Bungoma is currently the commercial and political capital of the Bungoma County and it is densely populated with little or limited land for expansion. It therefore becomes a challenge to get enough space to put necessary facilities that can enhance the implementation of the devolution strategy. The other type of environment was found to be the political environment. Being the political headquarters of the county, there are many political activities taking place and some of them impact negatively on the implementation of the devolution strategic Decisions by the County government.

5.3 Conclusion

The study concludes that successful strategy implementation helped a company gain a competitive edge, define the business of the organization, achieve right direction. The Bungoma County Government is able to position and relate itself to the environment to ensure its continued success and also secure itself from surprises brought about by the changing environment during strategy implementation. The collective intentions must be realized with little unanticipated influence from outside political, technological, or market forces.

The main stakeholders of the Bungoma County strategic Decision implementation process includes the National government, the electorate, the business community and the international development partners. These stakeholders have various levels of influence in the implementation of the strategic Decisions. The content of the strategic plan is mainly drawn from the country's Vision 2030. The main challenges that face the implementation of the strategic Decisions by the Bungoma County include the physical and political environment; the national government and its agencies whose actions at times contradict actions taken by the County government; inadequacy of resources both financial and human and resistance from both the Bungoma County Assembly, electorate and business community.

Initiatives are taken by management in creating and sustaining a climate within the firm that motivates employees in their implementation role with managers paying as much attention to planning the implementation of their strategies as they give to formulating them. A top-down/laissez-faire senior management style is used. The strategy implementation practices employed by the County of Bungoma are understanding customer expectation, marketing research and market segmentation. The other factors leading to strategy Decision implementation success at the Bungoma County Government are strong management roles in implementation, good communication, commitment to the strategy, awareness or understanding of the strategy, aligned organizational systems and resources, good coordination and sharing of responsibilities, adequate capabilities, and controllable environmental factors.

The study concludes that the organization followed the following steps in strategy implementation. SWOT analysis - analyze the gap between your internal (S&W's) and external (O&T's) forces/environment. Those involved in strategy implementation process in the organisation are senior managers, middle level managers and all the other employees. The impact of human resource development on effective strategy implementation at the organization is creating and sharing an organizational goal, acting as a role model, encouraging creativeness, providing support for employees.

The possible solutions to the challenges include more funding by the national government or seeking alternative means of raising revenue by the Bungoma County Government. Stakeholders involvement at all levels of implementation will also assist in reducing resistance. Another possible solution is to educate the Bungoma County Assembly on the need to separate politics and development issues in order to enable them understand the reason why their support for implementation of the devolution strategy is significant.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

During the period of the study several limitations were experienced. One of the limitations was unavailability of the respondents. Given that the respondents were senior officers at the Bungoma County, getting interview time with them was not an easy task since most of the times they were either in meetings, in the field or out of the county on official duties.

Another limitation was lack of data on the research topic on Strategic Decision implementation in Counties in Kenya. Given that the concept of devolution is new, very little has been written about it. This was evident when doing literature review on devolution strategy.

The other limitation of the study was time constraints. Juggling two issues is not easy and it was quite challenging doing research on Bungoma County while working and living in another county. Finally, the other limitation was in terms of financial resources. The study required a lot of financial resources to carry out and this one came out as one of the limitations of the study.

5.5. Implications of the Study

The study established that the central government plays a very significant role as the major stakeholder. It also plays an oversight role in the implementation of the strategic Decisions. However, the central government was also cited as an Impediment to successful implementation of the Strategic Decisions by not providing enough financial resources. This implies that development of policy concerning Devolution should carefully consider reviewing the roles of the central government so that conflict of interest can be eliminated. There should be clear policies governing the implementation of strategic Decisions in order to avoid confusion. Currently the existing policies need to be streamlined to provide the Bungoma County government with enough capacity to implement the strategic decisions successfully.

The study has also indicated that strategic Decisions are in their initial stages of implementation and that a lot still needs to be done to ensure successful Implementation. The study also established that there are several challenges in implementation of the strategic Decisions. This implies that most of the findings agree with those of other researchers on the challenges facing implementation of strategy. However, there is need for more research on implementation of the strategic Decisions in Kenya since the process is still in progress. This will assist in providing more knowledge on the challenges facing Bungoma County in implementing the strategic Decisions.

The study results have highlighted many areas that need to be addressed in order to make the implementation of strategic by the Bungoma County more successful. There is need for the county government to consider addressing these issues expansively to make the process successful.

However, some issues were found to be beyond the control of the Bungoma County government hence there is need for it to navigate around such issues with the aim of getting alternative solutions that can assist in implementation of the strategic Decisions.

5.6 Recommendations

It was also evident that the Bungoma County has resource limitations. The County government needs to explore more viable alternatives that can assist to raise the required revenue so that the implementation of the Strategic Decisions cannot stall. The national government needs to allocate more resources or the Bungoma County government should explore ways of increasing its revenue base in order to get the required financial resources.

The study has established that the National government is a challenge facing implementation of the strategic Decisions. There is need for comprehensive dialogue between the Bungoma County government and the National government to resolve any issues that could be causing obstruction to the successful implementation of the strategic Decisions.

It was evident from the respondents that Bungoma County government doesn't have the specialist skills needed to efficiently implement its strategic Decisions. It was revealed from the study that The Bungoma County government required highly competent experts in strategic Decision implementation who will direct the process to completion. The study established that there is also need to hold frequent stakeholder meetings before implementing anything concerning the strategic Decisions in the Bungoma County as per Section 91 of the County Government Act 2012.

The county government should facilitate the establishment of structures for citizen participation including; information communication technology based platforms, town hall meetings, budget preparation and validation forum, notice boards: announcing jobs, appointments, procurement awards and other important announcements of public interest, development project sites, avenues for the participation of peoples' representatives including but not limited to members of the National Assembly and Senate, or establishment of citizen forum at county and decentralized units. This will assist in alleviating the issue of resistance to implementation of the Strategic Decisions. The respondents confirmed that informed stakeholders will not be party to resistance and this will hasten the implementation process. It was further established that the Bungoma County Assembly should be enlightened on matters concerning devolution strategy implementation and the need to separate them from partisan politics. This will assist in gaining the support of the Bungoma County Assembly in implementation of the strategic Decisions.

5.7 Suggestions for Further Research

Devolution is a new conception in Kenya and it is at its initial stages of implementation. It will be important to replicate this study after a number of years in order to establish the position of implementation of the strategy as at then. This will assist in establishing how successful the process will be.

There are a total of forty seven counties in Kenya, there is need to conduct a survey on the challenges facing the implementation of the strategic among the 47 counties. This will assist in establishing whether all the Counties in the country face the same challenges or there are major differences in the challenges they face.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H.E. (1979). *Organisations and Environments*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs,NJ
- Alexander, L.D. (1985). *Successfully implementing strategic decisions, Long Range Planning*, Vol. 18 No.3, pp.91-7
- Andrews, K. (1987). *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*. Homewood, Illinois: Dow-Jones-Irwin.
- Ansoff, I.H. (1990). *Implanting Strategic Management*. Prentice Hall International Ltd:
- Artikson, I. (2010). Governance structures and the devolved delivery of employment outcomes. Department for Work and Pensions, Report No 678.
- Awino, Z. Imaita, I. K“ Obonyo, P. and Wandera, R. (2010, August). Challenges Facing the Implementation of Differentiation Strategy at the Mumias Sugar Company Limited. A paper Submitted at AIBUMA Conference. Kenyatta International Convention Center. Nairobi.
- Azfar, O.Kahkonen, S. and Meagher, P. (2001). *Conditions for Effective Decentralized Governance: A Synthesis of Research Findings*. University of Maryland:IRIS Center
- Bailey, A., Avery, C. (1998). "*Discovering and defining the process of strategy development*", in Ambrosini, V., Johnson, G., Scholes, K. (Eds),*Exploring Techniques of Analysis and Evaluations in Strategic Management*, Prentice-Hall, London, .
- Barkan, J.D and Chege, M., (1989). Decentralizing the State: District Focus and the Politics of Reallocation in Kenya. *Journal of Modern African Studies* , pp. 27(3), 431-453.

- Bartlett, C.A and Ghoshal, S. (1987). Managing across borders: new strategic requirements, Sloan Management Review, Vol. 28 No.2, pp.7-17.
- Berry, L. (1995). On Great Service, Free Press. New York, Borg, W., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. (5th ed.). NewYork: Longman.
- Besley, T. and Burgess, R. (2002). Land Reform, Poverty Reduction and Growth: Evidence from India. Quarterly Journal of Economics, pp. 389-430
- Birger, W. (1984). A Resource-based View of the Firm. Strategic Management Journal, pp. 171.
- Bourgeois, L.J., and Brodwin, D.R. (1984). Strategic implementation: five approaches to an elusive phenomenon, Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 5 pp.241-64.
- Brander Brown, J and Atkinson, H. (2001). Budgeting in the information age: a fresh approach, International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 13 No.3, pp.136-43.
- Burgess et al., (2001). Devolved approaches to local governance Policy and practice in neighbourhood management. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Buzzell, R.D., Gale, B.T. (1987). The PIMS Principles – Linking Strategy to Performance, The Free Press, New York, NY,
- Carpenter, M.A., & Sanders, Wm. G. (2007). Strategic Management: A Dynamic Perspective. Pearson Education
- Caves, D. W. and Christensen, L. R. (1980). The Relative Efficiency of Public and Private Firms in a Competitive Environment: The Case of Canadian Railroads. Journal of Political Economy Vol. 88, No. 5 (Oct., 1980), pp. 958-976, the University of Chicago Press.
- Chandler, A.D. Jr (1962). Strategy and Structure, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA,

- Dangayach, G.S., Deshmukh, S.G. (2001). "Manufacturing strategy: literature review and some issues", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 21 No.7, pp.884-932.
- Cottrell, J. and Ghai, Y. (2007). *Constitution Making and Democratization in Kenya (2000–2005) Democratization*, Vol.14, pp. 1-25
- David, F. (1989). *Strategic Management*, Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.
- David, F.R. (2005). *Strategic Management Concepts and Cases*.10th Ed. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Deloitte and Touche (1992). *Building Global Competitiveness: Imperatives for the 21st Century: A Research Report*, Deloitte and Touche, London.
- Development. Special Issue: Decentralization and Local Governance in Africa. Volume 23, Issue 1, pages 97–103, February 2003.
- Deweese, Lobao & Swanson (2003). Local Economic Development in an Age of Devolution. *Rural Sociology Journal*, 68 (2) pp.182-206
- Dix, F. and Mathews, H. (2010). *The Process of Strategic Planning*. Business Development Index, Ltd. and the Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio.
- Downes, L. (2001). *Challenges of Strategy Implementation*. The Industry Standard Vol 3.
- Drazin, R and Howard, P. (1984). Strategy implementation: a technique for organizational design, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 34 No.3, pp.465-85.
- Elcock, H. (1996). *Strategic Management*. In Farnham, D. & S. Horton (Eds). *Managing the New Public Services (2nd Edition)*. New York: Macmillan, p. 56.
- Feignbaum, A., (1990). *Total Quality Control (3rd edition)*. McGraw Hill, Maidenhead,

- Feurer, R., Chaharbaghi, K. (1995c). "Strategy formulation: a learning methodology", *Benchmarking for Quality Management & Technology*, Vol. 2 No.1, pp.38-55.
- Floyd, S.W and Wooldridge, B. (2000). *Building Strategy From the Middle: Reconceptualizing the Strategy Process*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, from <http://www.nairobi.go.ke>.
- Garatt, N. (1999). *Effective Directors and Building Dynamic Boards*. *Long Range Planning* 32 (1).
- Ghai, Y.P. (2006). *Law in the Establishment and Management of Decentralization*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong
- Ghuri, P.N., & Grønhaug, K., (2002). *Research Methods in Business Studies: A Practical Guide* (2nd edition), London: FT Prentice Hall Europe.
- Goold, M. and Quinn, J.J. (1990). *Strategic Control: Milestones for Long-Term Performance*, London: Hutchinson.
- Government of Kenya (2010). *Final Report of the Taskforce on Devolved Government: A Report on the Implementation of Devolved Government in Kenya*. Nairobi: Government Press.
- Government of Kenya (2010). *Constitution of Kenya*. Nairobi:Government Press.London
- Grant, R.M. (1991). "The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: implications for strategy formulation", *California Management Review* , Vol. 33 No.3, pp.114-35.
- Guffey, R. and Nienhaus B. (2002). *Determinants of employee support for the strategic plan of a business unit*. *Society for Advancement of Management (SAM) Advanced Management Journal*. Pp.23 – 30.

- Gupta, A.K and Govindarajan, V. (1984). Business unit strategy, managerial characteristics and business unit effectiveness at strategy implementation, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 27 No.1, pp.25-41.
- Hart, S. (1992). "An integrative framework for strategy-making processes", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17 pp.327-51.
- Hewlett, C.A. (1999). "Strategic planning for real estate companies", *Journal of Property Management*, Vol. 64 No.1, pp.264.
- Hofer, C.W., & Schendel, D. (1978). *Strategy formulation: Analytical concepts*. West Publishing
- Hooley, G.J., Lynch, J.E., Jobber, D. (1992). "Generic marketing strategies", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 9 pp.75-89.
- In Aosa, E. (Eds). *An Empirical Investigation of Aspects of Strategy Formulation and Implementation within Large, Private Manufacturing companies in Kenya*. Unpublished PHD Thesis, University of Strathclyde (Scotland),
- Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (2002). *Exploring corporate strategy (6th Edition)*. Prentice-Hall: New Delhi
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2010). *The National Population Census for 2009*. Report Published by the Ministry of Planning. Nairobi: Government Press.
- Kimenyi, Mwangi S. (2002). *Ethnicity, Institutions of Governance and Conflict Avoidance*. Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis Discussion paper No.23. Nairobi:KIPPRA
- Kothari, C. R. (1990). *Research Methodology: Methods & Techniques*. Wishwa:Prakashan.

- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Age International.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London:Sage Publications.
- Laibuta, M. (2013). *Implementing devolution in Kenya: challenges and opportunities two months on*. Constitution Net.
- Lamb, Robert, & Boyden (1984). *Competitive strategic management*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall,
- Li, Y. Sun, G. and Eppler, M. (2008). *Making Strategy Work: A Literature Review on the Factors influencing Strategy Implementation*. Institute of Corporate Communication, University of Lugano (USI).Switzerland.
- Lyles, M.A., Baird, I.S., Orris, J.B., Kuratko, F.F. (1993). "Formalised planning in small business: increasing strategic choices", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 31 No.2, pp.38-50.
- Maloney, W.F. (1997). "Strategic planning for human resource management in construction", *Journal of Management in Engineering*, Vol. 13 No.3, pp.49-56.
- Michaela, P. and Adriana, N (2010). *Effective Strategic Action: From Formulation to Implementation*. International Conference on Economics, Business and Management, Manila Philippines.
- Miller, D. (2002). *Successful change leaders: what makes them? What do they do that is different?* *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 2 No.4, pp.359-68.
- Miller, S and Wilson, D., Hickson, D. (2004). *Beyond planning strategies for successfully implementing strategic decisions*, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 37 No.1, pp.201-18.

- Mintzberg, H. & Waters, J. (1994). *Of strategies deliberate and emergent*. In De-Wit, B. Meyer. R. (Eds). *Strategy Process, Content, Context*. West Publishing Co.
- Mintzberg, H. (1987). "*Crafting strategy*", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 87 No.4, pp.66-75.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The Fall and Rise of Strategic Planning*. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Mintzberg, H. Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategy Safari*. New York: The Free Press.
- Moorman, C and Miner, A.S. (1998). The convergence of planning and execution: improvisation in new product development, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62 pp.120.
- Muia, D.M. (2008a). Devolution of Governance to Districts in Kenya: A Case study. In Kibua, T.N and Mwabu, G. eds 2008 *Decentralization and Devolution in Kenya: New Approaches*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi Press, pp. 77-133
- Nachmias, C.V and David Nachmias, D. (1996). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. St. Martin's Press.
- Nairobi City County (2013). *Finance and Economic Planning Sector*. Retrieved
- Ndulo, M. (2006a). *Decentralization: Challenges of Inclusion & Equity in Governance*. In: Ndulo ed.2006 *Democratic Reform in Africa: It's Impact on Governance & Poverty Alleviation*. United Kingdom: James Currey Ltd. Pp. 79-98
- Nickols, F. (2011). *Strategic Thinking: Three forms of Strategy*. Unpublished, India. Retrieved from http://www.nickols.us/strategy_definition.htm.

- Noble, C.H. (1999). *"Building the strategy implementation network (implementation is a vital and often neglected, phase of strategic planning)"*, Business Horizons, Vol. 42 No.6, pp.19.
- Noble, C.H. (1999). The eclectic roots of strategy implementation research, Journal of Business Research, Vol. 45 No.2, pp.119-35.
- Noble, C.H., Mokwa, M.P. (1999). Implementing marketing strategies: developing and testing a managerial theory, Journal of Marketing, Vol. 63 pp.57-73.
- North, D. Syreth, S. & Etherington, D. (2007). Devolved governance and the economic problems of deprived areas. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Nutt, P.C. (1983). Implementation approaches for project planning, Academy of Management Review, Vol. 8 No.4, pp.600-11.
- Nutt, P.C. (1995). Implementation style and use of implementation approaches, International Journal of Management Science, Vol. 23 No.5, pp.469-84.
- Okumus, F. (1999). Strategy implementation: a study of international hotel groups, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford., unpublished PhD thesis, .
- Okumus, F., Roper, A. (1998). Great strategy, shame about the implementation!, Proceeding of the 7th Annual Hospitality Research Conference (CHME), Glasgow, 14-16 April, pp.218-36.
- Oloo, A. (2006). Devolution and Democratic Governance: Options for Kenya. Nairobi:IPAR
- Oloo, M. (2012). Challenges of strategy implementation in public corporations in Kenya. An MBA Project submitted to the University of Nairobi.

- Olson, E.M. Slater, S.F., & Hult, G.T.M. (2005). *The importance of structure and process to strategy implementation*. Business Horizons, Vol. 48 pp.47-54
- O'Regan, N., Ghobadian, A. (2002a). "Effective strategic planning in small and medium sized firms", Management Decision, Vol. 40 No.7, pp.663-71.
- Otley, D. (2001). Extending the boundaries of management accounting research: developing systems for performance management, British Accounting Review, Vol. 33 pp.243-61.
- Ouedraogo, H.M.G. (2003). Decentralization and local governance: experiences from Francophone West Africa. Journal of Public Administration and
- Parsa, H.G. (1999). Interaction of strategy implementation and power perceptions in franchise systems: an empirical investigation, Journal of Business Research, Vol. 45 pp.173-85.
- Pearce, J.A. and Robinson, R.B. (2007). Strategic Management: Strategy Formulation and Implementation. Third Edition, Richard D. Irwin Inc
- Pilkington, A. (1998). "Manufacturing strategy regained: evidence for the demise of best practice", California Management Review, Vol. 41 No.1, pp.31-42.
- Porter, M.E. (1985). Competitive Advantage, The Free Press, New York, 1985.
- Procter, T. (1997). "Establishing a strategic direction", Management Decision, Vol. 35 No.2, pp.143-54.
- Pun, K.F., Chin, K.S., White, A.S., Gill, R. (2004). "Determinants of manufacturing strategy formulation: a longitudinal study in Hong Kong", Technovation, Vol. 24 No.2, pp.121-37.
- Quinn, J. (1980). Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism. R.D. Irwin (Homewood, Ill.)

- Quinn, J. (1978). Strategic change: logical incrementalism. *Sloan Management Review*, Vol.20 (1): 7-21
- Reed, R. and Buckley, R.M. (1988). "Strategy in action: techniques for implementing strategy", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 21 No.3, pp.67-74.
- Richmond, Virginia, April 17, 1999. Wales Audit Office (2005). *Regeneration: A Simpler Approach for Wales*. Cardiff: Wales Audit Office.
- Robert, B. and Lajtha, C. (2002). A New Approach to Crisis Management. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 10: pp 181–191.
- Scott, A. (1999). *The Legal Theory of European Integration*, Blackwell Publishers.
- Speed, S. (1993). Maximizing the potential of strategic typologies for marketing strategy research, *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 1 pp.171-88.
- Sterling, J. (2003). Translating strategy into effective implementation: Dispelling the myths and highlighting what works. *Strategy and Leadership*. Vol 31 No.3.
- Swamidass, P.M., Darlow, N., Baines, T. (2001). "Evolving forms of manufacturing strategy development: evidence and implications", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 21 No.10, pp.1289-304.
- Swenson, D. (1999). "Federal Aid to State Governments and its Impact on State Revenues and State Spending: Devolution or Convolution?" Paper presented at the Southern Regional Science Association meetings,
- Tavakoli, I and Perks, K.J. (2001). "The development of a strategic control system for the management of strategic change", *Journal of Strategic Change*, Vol. 10 pp.297-305.

- Waruhiu H.K. (2004). Issues in strategy formulation and implementation in international collaborative research & development. a case study of research based institutions. Unpublished MBA project, University of Nairobi.
- Wesonga et al. (2012). Challenges Facing the Implementation of Performance Contracts in State Corporations in Kenya. *Research Journal in Organizational Psychology & Educational Studies* 1(5) pp.284-288.
- Yin, R. (2013). *Applied Social Research Methods*. Fifth Edition, Sage Publications Incorporation.
- Workman, J.P. (1993). Marketing's limited role in new product development in one computer systems firm, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 30 pp.405-21.
- Yin, Robert K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and Methods*, Sage publications (CA).
- Yin, Robert K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and Methods*, Sage publications (CA).

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Introduction Letter

County Government of Bungoma
Office of H.E The Governor
Municipal Building, Moi Avenue Street
P.o Box 437 – 50200
Bungoma.
Telephone: 055-30343 Cell: +254-701964698
Email: info@bungoma.go.ke
Website: www.bungoma.go.ke

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR RESEARCH DATA

I am a postgraduate student at the University of Nairobi undertaking research in the topic; “CHALLENGES OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC DECISIONS IN BUNGOMA COUNTY, KENYA.” I would therefore highly appreciate if you could provide me with information requested in the interview guide at the earliest convenience. I wish to guarantee that the information provided would be treated confidentially. And will be used only for research purposes. I look forward to your favorable response.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Flora N Namusonge.

Appendix II: Interview Guide

Kindly answer the following questions by filling the spaces provided.

PART A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Gender.....

2. Name of department:

.....

3. What is your designation?

.....

4. What is your total work experience in years?

.....

5. What is the total number of employees in your department?

6. Does your organization have a formal documented mission and vision statements?

.....

What are the factors that cause the alteration of the company's mission and vision?

.....

.....

.....

PART B: STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

7. Which areas are of vital importance to long-term successful strategy implementation at your Organization?

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

8. How are the organizational vision, mission and key policies communicated during the strategy implementation process?

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

9. What strategic Planning Models are adopted by your company and what are their effects on Strategy Implementation?

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

10. How does your company go about implementing the formulated strategies?

.....

.....

.....

.....

11. How appropriate is the current organization structure to support the implementation of strategic initiatives?

.....

.....

.....

.....

12. In what ways do strategy implementation practices affect the success of the Organisation?

.....

.....

.....

.....

PART C: CHALLENGES TO STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

13. What are the Challenges of Strategic Decision implementations in your organization?

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

14. How does the Bungoma County government address the existing challenges?

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

15. In your opinion, what do you think are the possible solutions to the challenges affecting implementation of strategic decisions in Bungoma County?

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

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION,

GOD BLESS YOU.