

**A survey of employee perception of culture and strategy  
alignment at the Consultative  
Group on International Agricultural Research  
(CGIAR) centres in Kenya and their Associates**

By

**Ng'ang'a Elizabeth Thoni**



**A management research project submitted in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the award of Master of Business  
Administration (MBA) degree, Faculty of Commerce, University  
of Nairobi.**

**November 2003**

## DECLARATION

To my dear husband, Joseph

This project is my original work and has not been presented  
for a degree in any other University

Signed

Date

Ng'anga

9 Nov 2003

Ng'ang'a Elizabeth Thoni

This management project has been submitted for examination  
with my approval as University supervisor

Signed

Date

Maalu

9/11/03

Jackson Maalu

Lecturer

Department of Business Administration

# DEDICATION

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

To my dear husband, Joseph

DECLARATION .....	i
DEDICATION .....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED.....	vi
ABSTRACT .....	vii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	4
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY.....	5
1.4 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY.....	5
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 ORGANISATION CULTURE.....	7
2.2 IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE.....	8
2.3 RESEARCH ON ORGANIZATION CULTURE.....	10
2.4 CULTURE AND STRATEGY.....	14
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	16
3.1 FORMULATION OF STUDY.....	16
3.2 SAMPLING.....	16
3.3 DATA COLLECTION.....	17
3.4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	17
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	19
4.1 ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES.....	19
4.2 ANALYSIS OF VARIABLES IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	20
4.3 SUMMARY OF THE MEANS OF THE VARIABLES IN THE INSTITUTIONS.....	20
4.3.1 Adaptability.....	21
4.3.2 Consistency.....	22
4.3.3 Involvement.....	23
4.3.4 Mission.....	24
4.3.5 Overall for the four variables.....	25
4.4 ANALYSIS OF THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN MISSION AND THE OTHER THREE VARIABLES MEASURED SEPARATELY.....	25
4.5 ANALYSIS OF THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN MISSION AND THE OTHER THREE VARIABLES COMBINED.....	28
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	29
5.1 SUMMARY.....	29
5.2 CONCLUSION.....	30
5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	30
5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	31
5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	31
APPENDICES.....	33
QUESTIONNAIRE.....	34

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION .....	I
DEDICATION .....	II
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED.....	VI
ABSTRACT.....	VII
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	4
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY .....	5
1.4 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY.....	5
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 ORGANISATION CULTURE.....	7
2.2 IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE .....	8
2.3 RESEARCH ON ORGANIZATION CULTURE .....	10
2.4 CULTURE AND STRATEGY.....	14
<b>CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 POPULATION OF STUDY .....	16
3.2 SAMPLING .....	16
3.3 DATA COLLECTION.....	17
3.4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	17
<b>CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1 ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES .....	19
4.2 ANALYSIS OF VARIABLES IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	20
4.3 SUMMARY OF THE MEANS OF THE VARIABLES IN THE INSTITUTIONS .....	20
4.3.1 Adaptability .....	21
4.3.2 Consistency.....	22
4.3.3 Involvement.....	23
4.3.4 Mission.....	24
4.3.5 Overall for the four variables.....	25
4.4 ANALYSIS OF THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN MISSION AND THE OTHER THREE VARIABLES MEASURED SEPARATELY .....	25
4.5 ANALYSIS OF THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN MISSION AND THE OTHER THREE VARIABLES COMBINED .....	28
<b>CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 SUMMARY .....	29
5.2 CONCLUSION.....	30
5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	30
5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	31
5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH .....	31
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>33</b>
QUESTIONNAIRE .....	34

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS UNDER STUDY.....	39
RESPONDENTS' LETTER .....	40
REFERENCES.....	41
DETAILS OF DATA ANALYSIS .....	44

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.....	16
TABLE 2.....	19
TABLE 3.....	21
TABLE 4.....	22
TABLE 5.....	23
TABLE 6.....	24
TABLE 7.....	25
TABLE 8.....	26
TABLE 9.....	28

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Compilation of this report has benefited from input by a number of people and institutions whom, I would like to sincerely thank.

First to the almighty God for his gift of life full of blessings and for his protection throughout my life.

To my supervisor Mr Jackson Maalu for accepting to be my supervisor and providing me guidance throughout the study. Mr Maalu provided me with creative insights and suggestions to the study.

To the Director Generals of ILRI, ICRAF and ICIPE for allowing me to carryout this study in their respective institutions and to the staff of the institutes who kindly accepted to participate in this survey by completing the questionnaire, to my dear parents and lastly to my husband for standing by my side during the study and indeed during the entire MBA programme.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

CGIAR - Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

ICIPE – International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology

ICRAF – International Centre for Research in Agro forestry

ILRI – International Livestock Research Institute

IRS – Internationally Recruited Staff

NRS – Nationally Recruited Staff

## ABSTRACT

Culture has been defined as the 'set of, often unconsciously held beliefs, ideas, knowledge and values which shape the way things happen. Culture is shared hence a group of people in a setting whether social or formal will collectively subscribe to certain ideals.

Culture permeates most organisations including corporate companies and research institutions. Over the last 15 years, there have been rapid changes in the environments within which organisations operate. Such changes impact on the organisations internally, which causes such organisations to respond. However there is always a gap between the change in the environment, the strategic response and the internal capability of the organisation to either take advantage of the opportunities presented by the environmental change or minimise the negative impact brought about by such change.

Therefore culture is an important factor as far as strategic response for an organisation is concerned. Together with structure and resources, culture is considered as one of the three pillar of strategy implementation.

For strategy implementation to be successful therefore cultural considerations have to be at the forefront to ensure that the right cultural environment that is conducive to strategy implementation is present.

In carrying out this study, a questionnaire was employed as the data collection instrument and was administered on CGIAR centres in Kenya and their Associates.

The initial sample was 101 respondents and 75 responded to the questionnaire, which translates to a 74% response rate.

Four cultural traits namely involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission were analysed with the aim of establishing whether the institutes' employees perceived the traits to exist in the respective institutions. On average ICRAF's employees' perception on the four variables exhibited a relatively high average score, followed by ICIPE and then ILRI. This implies that ICRAF has more capacity to be flexible, open, and responsiveness to the external environment than the other two institutions.



The employees' perception on the degree of association between the mission or strategy and adaptability, consistency and involvement was measured separately for each of the institutions. The analysis demonstrated a significant degree of association between mission and the other three variables.

Further, canonical correlation analyses were carried out to measure the employees' perception on the degree of association between mission or strategy and adaptability, consistency and involvement combined. This measure provided some way of assessing whether the employees perceived some degree of alignment between mission and the other cultural variables combined. The analysis revealed a significant alignment between mission (strategy) and culture. However, the degree of association/alignment varied between the three institutions. ICIPE and ICRAF demonstrate a relatively higher alignment compared to ILRI. No institution demonstrated full alignment i.e. a score of 1. Hence there is room for improvement at ICIPE and ICRAF but a lot more is required at ILRI in order to obtain a fit between mission and the culture in the institute.

# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

According to (Ansoff, 1965) strategic management is defined as the set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve a company's objectives. It is a multi-dimensional concept that embraces all the critical activities of the firm, providing it with a sense of unity, direction and purpose, as well as facilitating the necessary changes induced by its environment.

Strategy implementation according to (Schoemaker, 1992) includes developing a strategy-supportive culture, creating an effective organizational structure, redirecting marketing efforts, preparing budgets, developing and utilizing information systems, and linking employee compensation to organizational performance. Implementing strategy also referred to as the action stage of strategic management means mobilizing employees and managers to put formulated strategies into action. Often considered to be the most difficult stage in strategic management, strategy implementation requires personal discipline, commitment, and sacrifice. Successful strategy implementation hinges upon managers' ability to motivate employees, which is more, an art than a science. Strategies formulated but not implemented serve no useful purpose.

According to (Quinn 1980), aligning the culture of institutions is crucial to the successful implementation of any strategy option that is chosen. The risk of any chosen strategy is the greatest in those situations where that strategy's fit with the culture is the poorest. The optimal choice for a leader is not to march ahead, assume the risks and hope for the best; nor manage around the cultural barrier by reformulating only the strategy, but by devising a set of plans that creates a strategy predicated upon reforming the culture, bringing both into alignment. This latter approach improves the quality of options and is more likely to create the desired future state of the institution.

Culture possesses characteristics that support or inhibit realignment externally, for customers and internally, reframing roles, processes and relationships. Unless these characteristics are understood and effectively managed, disappointment in strategy implementation will be more the norm than not. Unfortunately, few organizations have

actually realized an effective way to alter or improve those aspects of culture that are most central to an organization's change strategy (Kotter 1996).

According to (Edgar H Schein, 1992), culture has the following implications on an organisation. First, organization culture is an abstraction. Because it's an abstraction doesn't mean that it lacks enormous power in terms of impact on both employees and results. Just the opposite. It is an abstraction of the patterns for living and working in an organization. It is helpful to think of these patterns as an amalgamation of the customs, practices, values, and knowledge that lie within an organization.

Culture guides and directs the behaviour of individual employees, yet in itself, it is not behaviour. In addition, culture both creates and reflects. It shapes and forms the basis of behaviour and relationships within the organization and at the same time is a manifestation of those very same dynamics. The culture of an organization is learned directly and indirectly by its members. It is through the process of social integration that this occurs.

It's the culture that dictates the prevailing norms in an institution and sets the definition of roles. The norms established by the culture are extremely powerful; when internalised they are the dictating rules or principles that direct employee behaviour. Violating them or acting outside of them often brings sanctions, ridicule or suspicion. Roles have both rights (status) and responsibilities (obligations) and it is essentially the culture, which defines these. It is the cluster of these rights and responsibilities that create a role.

As stated by (Hofstede, 1991) culture explains why things happen the way they do, mirroring the organization's 'rules of the road'. It renders a powerful influence on what an organization can achieve and what it cannot. It has direct impact on attaining strategic objectives and whether management efforts at improvement succeed or fail. Culture drives and shapes the behaviour of individuals in the organization in a number of ways. It provides an understanding of work behaviour that is out of reach of the more traditional measures of job performance, and it has significant impact on an organization's long-term success. One way to think of culture is as the 'software dimension' of an organization's mind. When it comes to designing and implementing change, ignoring the culture simply increases the risk of failure.

Alan L. Wilkins, (1989) states that alignment for most organizations, whether external with the customer or internal among work units represents an appreciable degree of change in direction. Shaping and managing the culture so that it supports this alignment becomes increasingly important. Alignment involves a host of signals, subtleties and interconnects, which lead to a relationship where information and results flow rapidly, unimpeded by artificial boundaries and harmonic distortions. Leaders must concern themselves with two types of alignment. Externally, it is alignment with the customer. Internally, it is the alignment of resources, forces, and goals within the organization aimed at producing maximum output with minimum consumption. Externally, it is the customer who defines what value is and isn't, and to the extent that what is provided matches with what the customer wants, a value transaction occurs. It is the 'goodness of fit' or the match between 'wanted' and 'provided' that is key. Without internal alignment there can be no true external alignment. Implicit in an internally aligned organization is a state where clarity of mission, vision, and values prevail. Internal alignment creates energy and inspirits. Conditions of trust and involvement bring forth a high level of individual responsibility and personal initiative. In an internally aligned setting the intent toward excellence in the quality of relationships and all that accompanies this construct is particularly high.

In any strategic change effort, there is need to know early on whether 'what an organization wants in the future matches what it has to work with and what it has to work against'. One of the more salient elements it has to work with and has to work against is the present culture. The degree of change required in an organization's course or direction would indicate how much energy has to be invested in reshaping the culture and making the change successful. The road that leads organizations to be something they have never been or for people to do things they haven't been able to do before is a hard journey. More than random contribution on the part of employees is required. (Senge 1999).

Change requires choosing among 'risk-taking courses of action'. While it is impossible to eliminate all risk and uncertainty, the risks that are taken must be the right ones, and they must avoid stepping off into an abyss of uncertainty on the basis of wishful thinking. Actions necessary for future success are likely to take the organization outside

of present cultural boundaries and increase the level of challenge and risk. Understanding these cultural boundaries and what's involved in reframing them provides invaluable insight into determining the critical success factors for successful strategy implementation (Bridges 1991).

## 1.2 The Research Problem

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) is an association of public and private members supporting a system of 16 Future Harvest Centres that work in more than 100 countries to mobilize cutting-edge science to reduce hunger and poverty, improve human nutrition and health, and protect the environment. It was created in 1971.

The CGIAR's research agenda focuses on both strategic and applied research. This agenda includes the entire range of problems affecting agricultural productivity and links these problems to broader concerns about poverty reduction, sustainable management of natural resources, protection of biodiversity, and rural development.

More than 8,500 CGIAR scientists and scientific staff conduct research to improve the productivity of tropical agriculture around the world. The staff are internationally recruited (IRS) and nationally recruited (NRS) in the respective centres. The international staff are recruited from various countries and therefore bring together diverse cultures.

The institutes have realised that certain elements are critical for the strategy to be successful. These include team work, coordination, integration, to be beneficially focussed, need to change to new and improved ways of working, empowerment of staff and to strive to be learning organisations. At a meeting held in October 2002 at one of the institutions, the members felt that some beliefs and values may be inhibiting the success of the strategy, for instance staff being resistant to change thus inhibiting change to new and improved ways of working, some disciplines feeling more important than other disciplines hence hampering integration and staff interaction, division between staff, for instance division between the International staff and the National staff, different personnel policies and compensation schemes consequently hindering on

teamwork. Transitional Management Team (TMT) at its meeting on Thursday 10 October 2002).

These set of, often unconsciously held beliefs, ideas, knowledge and values shape the way things happen (Bate, 1994) and to a great extent define the culture in these institutions. As a result of the cultural hindrances, strategy and cultural misalignment may ensue. According to (Quinn 1980), aligning the culture of institutions is crucial to the successful implementation of any strategy option that is chosen. The risk of any chosen strategy is the greatest in those situations where that strategy's fit with the culture is the poorest.

Given that it is crucial for culture and strategy to be aligned the study aims at establishing whether employees perceive the existence or non-existence of such alignment at the CGIAR centres and their Associates in Kenya. No study has been carried out in this area for these institutions.

### **1.3 Objectives of the study**

This study had the following objective:

To determine the employee's perception of culture and strategy alignment at the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) centres in Kenya and their Associates.

### **1.4 Importance of the study**

The study hoped to assist the management and staff of the institutions to acknowledge and address the different cultural factors that have been at play during strategy implementation and which are still operative and will influence the success of the strategy implementation.

With the results of the study, these institutions will be able to benchmark with one another. Such benchmarking will form a basis for putting more effort to ensure they take corrective action at the current and during subsequent strategy formulation and implementation.

This study will also contribute academically to the existing literature on focus on cultural issues in strategy implementation in the Kenyan context. The results will hopefully stimulate and form a basis for further research in other organisations, which do not form part of the population under study.

The study would benefit strategic management practitioners and consultants to appreciate culture as a critical success factor for successful strategy implementation.

The literature of management and organizational theory. Bate (1994) provides one definition of organizational culture as the 'set of, often unconsciously held, beliefs, ideas and values which shape the way things happen and makes some courses of action untenable'. Another key feature of culture given here is that it is shared; it refers to the ideas, meanings and values people hold in common and to which they subscribe collectively. In this respect the layman's terms for organizational culture are as valid as those of the behavioural scientist.

Using a slightly more specific understanding of culture, Davies et al (1992) suggests that it is important to define an organization's culture before attempting to discuss changing it. Organizational cultures are seen to be 'made up of shared meanings, official and informal rules, about how to behave'. Organizations can be seen as systems of flux and transformation and multiple ways of looking at organizations are required to achieve better understanding of their complexities and contradictions; any single metaphor may be inadequate (Clair 1996).

The last 15 years have seen the rapid acceleration of change within all types of organizations accompanied by a publishing bonanza of texts by a plethora of management gurus. These works have had an enormous influence on corporate attitudes and cultures and the knock-on effects have spread across all spheres of industrial life (Clair 1996). Most recent shifts in organizational culture have been in the direction of greater empowerment and participation in decision-making and more open communication (Davenport, 1993). This enduring juxtaposition with flatter, less hierarchical organizational structures, as discussed for example by Hardy (1993) and Kniper (1992) has been embraced enthusiastically.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Organisation culture

There are inherent difficulties in defining organizational culture. Bate (1994) accounts for these difficulties by referring to the deeply embedded nature of culture, which forms the very foundation stone of our social and organizational lives by providing a relatively self-contained order or rationale. Definitions of organizational culture abound in the literature of management and organizational theory. Bate (1994) provides one definition of organizational culture as the 'set of, often unconsciously held, beliefs, ideas knowledge and values which shape the way things happen and makes some courses of action unthinkable'. Another key feature of culture given here is that it is shared, it refers to the ideas, meanings and values people hold in common and to which they subscribe collectively. In this respect the layman's terms for organizational culture are as valid as those of the behavioral scientist.

Using a slightly more specific understanding of culture, Davies et al (1992) suggests that it is important to define an organization's culture before attempting to discuss changing it. Organizational cultures are seen to be 'made up of shared meanings, official and informal rules, about how to behave'. Organizations can be seen as systems of flux and transformation and multiple ways of looking at organizations are required to achieve better understanding of their complexities and contradictions; any single metaphor may be incomplete (Clegg 1994).

The last 15 years have seen the rapid acceleration of change within all types of organizations, accompanied by a publishing bonanza of texts by a plethora of 'management gurus'. These works have had an enormous influence on corporate structures and cultures and the knock-on effects have spread across all spheres of institutional life (St Clair 1996). Most recent shifts in organizational culture have been in the direction of greater empowerment and participation in decision-making and more open communications (Davenport, 1993). This enduring preoccupation with flatter, less hierarchical organizational structures, as discussed for example by Handy (1993) and Kanter (1992), has been embraced enthusiastically.



## 2.2 Importance of organizational culture

Organizational culture is a type of organizational analysis that is borrowed from the field of anthropology. It was first described as an organizational unit of concern in 1979. In a short time, culture has become relevant to organizational systems. To date, no single universally accepted definition exists; however, the term organizational culture generally is accepted as referring to the shared meanings, beliefs, and understandings held by a particular group or organization about its problems, practices, and goals.

The concept of organizational culture often is misunderstood and confused with the related concepts of climate, ideology, and style. Culture can be defined in terms of: overt organizational behaviour, organizational ideology and philosophy, group and organizational norms, espoused organizational values, policies, procedures, and rules of socialization and climate (Denison, 1990).

When considered in conjunction with members' interaction patterns, language, themes of everyday conversation and rituals of daily routine, these definitions seem to reflect elements of organizational culture. But culture is less conscious; it exists at a deeper level. None of these definitions describe the 'essence of culture' itself. The essence of culture is the basic assumptions and beliefs that are invented, discovered, or developed by all members of a group as it copes with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration and which are taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Denison, 1990).

Organizational cultures evolve from the social practices of members of organizations and are, therefore, socially created realities that exist in the heads and minds of organizational members as well as in the formal rules, policies, and procedures of organizational structures. Culture is an ongoing process of reality construction, providing a pattern of understanding that helps members of organizations to interpret events and to give meaning to their working worlds.

Thus, culture is an evolutionary and dynamic process that incorporates changing values, beliefs, and underlying assumptions regarding:

The nature of the relationship between organization and environment (whether the organization controls, is controlled by or coexists with the environment). The nature of reality and truth (what is right or wrong in terms of acquisition and use of information, time perspectives, physical environments and social environments). The human nature (intrinsic nature and basic instincts of human beings). The nature of human activity (active, passive, or in-between) and the nature of human relationships (the proper way for people to relate to one another).

The above are fundamental assumptions about core and global realities that result in cultural predispositions which subsequently drive the more superficial cultural manifestations such as overt behavior, norms, espoused values, and the like.

Organizational cultures initially are created by the founders of organizations and subsequently are maintained by the founders' chosen leaders. Founders form organizations based on personal beliefs about how to interact with the environment and about the natures of reality, people, activities, and relationships. They make presumptions about what should or should not be, what works or does not work and what constitutes appropriate or inappropriate organizational activity. Founders' goals, assumptions, and visions of reality come to be shared by others in their organizations, particularly the leaders. Over time, shared realities evolve into consensually validated organizational cultures that become the 'correct' ways of solving organizational problems related to survival and adaptation to the external environment and to integration of the internal processes required to ensure survival and adaptation (Edgar 1992).

Thus, organizational culture becomes a normative glue that structures the organization and makes it possible for people to derive meaning from their work, to work comfortably with others, and to focus on key organizational tasks.

Corporate cultures are mini-societies that manifest distinct patterns of thought, behaviour, and belief. Similarly, organizational cultures are highly visible in that they facilitate adaptation to the external environment as well as integration of internal processes. Adaptation and integration imply differences in environmental conditions and

a degree of organizational-environmental fit. Culture can limit strategic options significantly and, consequently, can restrict the organization's ability to assess and to adapt to certain environments—so much so that it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate strategic change from cultural change. These facts once again support the need to bridge the existing endeavour with higher-level activities, which must be driven from the top down (Edgar 1992).

It is clear that organizations must analyse their cultures and manage within their cultural boundaries. If the fit between culture and environment is inappropriate, organizations must change their cultures. Yet in order to manage effectively within boundaries or to change cultures, leaders and managers must learn to perceive the types of systems with which they are working. Successful leadership depends on an ability to create or to maintain a shared reality, as cohesive groups evolve from shared reality and meaning. Shared reality and meaning will be created or maintained only when leadership and management is symbolically consistent with some desired direction. In other words, culture cannot be controlled; it can only be influenced by leadership and managerial behaviour (Edgar 1992).

### **2.3 Research on organization culture**

To the extent that members of an organization share the same sets of values, thought processes, and languages, they will have similar mind-sets and behaviours as they integrate their efforts inside the organization and adapt to environmental changes. Research has documented a variety of outcomes that are related to organizational culture. For example, organizational culture has been found to relate to firm growth (Calori & Sarnin, 1991) and firm performance (Denison, 1990; Denison & Mishra, 1995; Kotter & Heskett, 1992). Other studies have shown that its effect can be observed directly at the individual level, in outcomes such as commitment, resource allocation decisions, retention and perceived attractiveness of a firm. (O'Reilly et al, 1991).

Given the dramatic changes in both the external environment and the internal structures of firms, firms that emphasize cultural values that relate to external adaptation and internal integration should be more effective than those that do not. Organizational researchers have developed typologies of organizational culture values to describe

successful firms (Denison & Mishra, 1995, O'Reilly et al., 1991). O'Reilly et al. (1991) developed the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) using the Q-sort method on 54 value statements identified through an extensive literature review. They identified seven dimensions of organizational culture, including innovation, outcome orientation, and respect for people, team orientation, stability, aggressiveness, and attention to detail. Denison and Mishra (1995) proposed a four-category typology of organizational culture based on two factors: the extent to which the competitive environment requires flexibility or stability and the extent to which the strategic focus and strength is internal or external. Using these two factors, Denison and Mishra (1995) identified these dimensions of culture: employee involvement and participation, consistency, adaptability of organizations and mission/goal-oriented culture.

According to Denison and Mishra (1995) a high level of involvement and participation create a sense ownership and responsibility. Out of this ownership grows a greater commitment to the organisation and a growing capacity to operate under conditions of autonomy. Increasing the input of organisational members is also seen as increasing the quality of decisions and their implementation.

On consistency or the degree of normative integration, Denison and Mishra (1995) stated that an implicit control system, based on internalised values, can be a more effective means of achieving coordination and integration than external control systems relying on explicit rules and regulation.

Also, Denison and Mishra (1995) contend that adaptability or the capacity for internal change in response to external conditions, refer to the capacity to redefine the underlying character in response to large-scale change. As such effective organisations must develop norms and beliefs that support its capacity to receive and interpret signals from its environment and translate this into internal cognitive, behavioural and structural changes.

Finally Denison and Mishra (1995) stated that organisations are effective as a result of pursuing a mission or a long-term vision that combined economic and non-economic objective, which provided meaning and direction to organisational members. In their study they felt that a sense of mission provides two major influences on an

organisation's functioning: First that a mission provides purpose and meaning, and a host of non-economic reasons why the organisation's work is important. Second, that a sense of mission defines the appropriate course of action for the organisation and its members. These factors reflected and exemplified the key values of an organisation.

These dimensions correspond to O'Reilly and colleagues' (1991) innovation, outcome orientation, supportiveness, and team orientation. In his extended study of organizational culture, Hofstede (1991) reported six dimensions of organizational cultures: process oriented versus results oriented, employee oriented versus job oriented, parochial versus professional, open system versus closed system, loose control versus tight control, and normative versus pragmatic. The six dimensions proposed by Hofstede are not prescriptive: no position on one of the six dimensions is intrinsically good or bad. Each position relates to an organization's strategic choice.

The theme of Noel M. Tichy's book in, understanding the culture of an organization, Tichy (1983) focuses on the alignment of three dynamics: technical, political, and culture. Defining these, Tichy (1983) states that they are, respectively, associated with technical aspects of work, power and values. Tichy proposes that a researcher can identify the nature of these poles with: 'radar scan-diagnosis, which entails a quick and somewhat superficial diagnosis of the organizational components and their alignments and also a symptom diagnosis, which entails significant analysis of organizational components felt to relate to the symptom in addition to an in-depth diagnosis'.

Howard Schwartz and Stanley M Davis (1981) contend that distinguishing, changing, and improving an organizational culture is possible.

Their steps for identifying culture include defining the relevant cultures and subcultures in an organization. Defining manager's tasks and relationships. Assessing the risks that the culture has to the realization of the company's goals and lastly focusing attention on those aspects that are not supportive of goals and support those areas that promote the values and ideas of the company.

Further Schwartz and Davis (1981) provide pertinent points that organizational leaders need to address. The authors state that structure, systems, people, and culture are the

four points of an organization, and 'no organization will perform well in a competitive environment unless these four dimensions of organization are internally consistent and fit the strategy. The authors state that two questions need to be asked: 'what specific behavior is the organizational approach designed to encourage? How is the behavior linked to critical success factors?'

Shifting from identification and prognosis, Edgar Krau states why he thinks organizations are a reflection of a larger whole. (Krau's, 1998) point is that macro conceptions and micro conceptions are inextricably intertwined. Organizations are designed around the values of the macro conceptions and micro operations reinforce macro conceptions. The four types of values, with associations made to countries, identified are: Collectivist-Authoritarian/Russia, Liberal-Individualistic/United States, Collectivist with Participation in Decision Making/Japan and Cultural Pluralism within an Individualistic Society/Europe. The reason for studying these different styles is to understand how these four styles influence and affect society in the organization and society as a whole.

Shifting from the influence of macro conceptions and their impact on local operations, Tatiana Kostova (1999) examines the difficulty of working across a multi-cultural, multi-regional setting in terms of disseminating company practices. 'That is, the transfer process does not end with the adoption of the formal rules describing the practice but continues until these rules become internalized at the recipient unit'. In other words, they become part of the recipient culture.

Kostova (1999) combines the social, organizational, and relational contexts and the successful transfer of practices to three strata: country, organization, and individual. She states that if organizational practices are transferred across different organizations within a Multi-National Corporation (MNC), then failure may occur because of incongruent environments. 'There is a possibility that these practices may not be consistent with the institutional environments into which they are transferred, and they may even be in conflict with them. This, in turn, may affect the ultimate success of the transfer'.

## 2.4 Culture and strategy

Strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long term: ideally, which matches its resources to its changing environment, and in particular its markets, customers or clients so as to meet stakeholder expectations (Johnson & Scholes 1994). Strategic management is concerned with those long run, fundamental and often-irreversible decisions about the company's mission, scale of operations and spread of activities (Greenly, 1989). Strategy formulation is the development of long range plans for the effective management of environmental threats and opportunities in the light of corporate strengths and weaknesses (Wheelen & Hunger 1995).

Today, strategic management is widely accepted as a process that comprises three phases, namely formulation, implementation and evaluation as well as control of strategy. In the strategy implementation phase, the firm is required to translate its strategies and policies into action through the development of specific budgets and procedures. In this phase, the necessary changes are also made within the organisational culture, structure (divisions, departments, products), resources (capabilities) and the relationships between these elements and the managerial levels (the top, middle and lower levels of the organisation) Storich (1982).

The strategic management process also emphasises on the importance of gathering and the use of environmental information. The environmental information, which is collected through situational analysis, can assist an organisation in identifying and understanding the factors that can contribute to its ability to develop effective strategy as well as achieve its objectives efficiently and effectively.

Strategic management is about winning and it consists of formulation, implementation and evaluation. An appropriate change management programme is necessary so as to deal with the inherent cultural issues, which have the potential to derail strategy implementation. Successful strategy implementation requires an embracing and accommodating culture.

In the event of the culture being 'hostile', then the strategy even when implemented will lead to less than optimal performance. It is therefore of utmost importance that strategy implementers focus on these factors to ensure the success of the strategy.

The population of study consisted of staff from research institutions that are based in Kenya under the auspices of the 'Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research' (CGIAR) and their Associates. These institutions are - International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), World Agro forestry Centre (WAC) also referred to as International Centre for Research in Agro forestry (ICRAF) and International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE). ICIPE is a close Associate of the CGIAR various in that by a decision of the international donor community of the CGIAR, a special Sponsoring Group for ICIPE (SGI) was created in November 1980. A Governing Council exercises the powers conferred by the Charter upon ICIPE. The Governing Council is responsible for financing of ICIPE through the SGI and other supplementary sources.

### 3.2 Sampling

The employees of the institutions were stratified by the various major departments namely Directorate, Communications and partnership, Finance, Human resources and Research departments. Others are computing and operations. A proportionate sample was randomly selected from the departmental staff listings from each department in the respective institutions as follows.

Department	Institution - ILRI Total staff (Sample)	Institution - ICRAF Total staff (Sample)	Institution - ICIPE Total staff (Sample)
Administration	14 (2)	19 (3)	17 (3)
Communications and Partnership	6 (2)	5 (1)	5 (2)
Finance	15 (3)	11 (3)	14 (3)
Human Resources	9 (3)	7 (3)	8 (3)
Research	285 (16)	143 (17)	176 (15)
Operations	8 (2)	6 (2)	7 (2)
Computing	28 (7)	50 (6)	62 (6)
Total	316 (35)	248 (32)	291 (34)



## CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Population of study

The population of study consisted of staff from research institutions that are based in Kenya under the auspices of the 'Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research' (CGIAR) and their Associates. These Institutions are – International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), World Agro forestry Centre (WAC) also referred to as International Centre for Research in Agro forestry (ICRAF) and International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE). ICIPE is a close Associate of the CGIAR centers in that by a decision of the international donor community of the CGIAR, a special Sponsoring Group for ICIPE (SGI) was created in November 1980. A Governing Council exercises the powers conferred by the Charter upon ICIPE. The Governing Council is responsible for financing of ICIPE through the SGI and other supplementary sources.

### 3.2 Sampling

The employees of the institutions were stratified by the various major departments namely Directorate, Communications and partnership, Finance, Human resources and Research departments. Others are computing and operations. A proportionate sample was randomly selected from the departmental staff listings from each department in the respective institutions as follows.

<b>Department</b>	<b>Institution – ILRI Total staff (Sample)</b>	<b>Institution – ICRAF Total staff (Sample)</b>	<b>Institution - ICIPE Total staff (Sample)</b>
Directorate	14 (2)	10 (2)	13 (3)
Communications and partnership	6 (2)	5 (1)	5 (2)
Finance	15 (3)	11 (3)	14 (3)
Human resources	9 (3)	7 (3)	8 (3)
Research	186 (16)	141 (15)	176 (15)
Computing	8 (2)	6 (2)	7 (2)
Operations	78 (7)	60 (6)	68 (6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>316 (35)</b>	<b>240 (32)</b>	<b>291 (34)</b>

### 3.3 Data collection

A self-reporting, structured questionnaire was used to gather data. A sample of the questionnaire is attached in the appendix. The drop and pick method was used to drop and pick the questionnaires from the respondents. The questionnaire was directed to staff, to identify what cultural issues they have to grapple with in their respective institutes, which have had an impact on the institutes' strategy.

Four indices of organisational culture as proposed by Denison and Mishra (1995) were each broken down into three specific categories, which were rated by five measurable items. Measurement was based on an ordinal scale in the range 1 to 6. Where 1 implies strongly agree, 2 agree, 3 somewhat agree, 4 disagree, 5 strongly disagree and 6 I don't know. This ordinal scale was thought to address as much as possible all possible experiences by the respondents.

### 3.4 Data analysis

The completed questionnaires were edited for completeness and consistency. A rank index for each scale per questionnaire was calculated as follows:

For each item, the lowest score (1) was given a rank of six (6) and the highest score (6) was given a rank of one (1). It was assumed that each observation is a respondent and thus given a questionnaire identity (QID). For every QID, the sum of ranks for the number of items scored was calculated. The realized sum was divided by the product of the number of items and the highest possible score (6). The resulting value is thought to measure the level of weight a respondent attaches to a given scale. The argument is that if respondents give high score for items that they are asked to evaluate then the corresponding weight shall be small and vice versa. Thus to evaluate the rating for a given scale say Empowerment, by members of a given institution, the average values was checked across the institutions. The division by the highest possible score is for standardising purposes. For the summarized data, with corresponding rankindex for each respondent descriptive statistics and central tendencies measure such the mean and median was used to analyse the responses to the questionnaires.

Four measurement models for each variable (Involvement, Consistency, Adaptability, Mission) were estimated separately according to Denison and Mishra (1995). This is an item-level analysis where 15 items in each variable were analyzed.

Spearman's rank correlation has been used to obtain pair wise correlations between Mission and the other three variable namely, Involvement, Consistency and Adaptability. All combinations were separately statistically analysed and tested for significance of dependence.

A separate analysis for each CGIAR centre and associate was also carried out. Canonical correlation, which provides a dependence relation between sets of variables in a multivariate data set, was applied. This has been used to summarise the dependence relation between Mission and other variables combined thus providing some way of gauging strategy alignment.

	83	54	100
ICRAF	21	66	100
ICRPE	25	74	100
Total	75	94	100

Source: Research data

From the summary of 100 questionnaires returned from the three research institutions, 75 questionnaires out of the total 101 distributed were successfully completed. This represents 74% of the total questionnaires distributed and were considered sufficient to facilitate the completion of the study. Of the 101 questionnaires distributed 26 (26%) respondents did not respond at all.

Out of the overall response rate of 75 (74%), 29 (39%) responses came from ICRP, 21 (28%) from ICRAF and 25 (33%) came from ICIRP. This response rate was considered

## CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, data from the completed questionnaires is summarised and presented in the form of tables.

### 4.1 Analysis of responses

The first step in the analysis was to give an overview of the data. This involves the tabulation of the responses as presented in Table 2 below:

<b>Institutes</b>	<b>Successfully completed</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>ILRI</b>	29	83	35	100
<b>ICRAF</b>	21	66	32	100
<b>ICIPE</b>	25	74	34	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research data

From the summary of the questionnaires returned from the three research Institutions, 75 questionnaires out of the total 101 distributed were successfully completed. This represents 74% of the total questionnaires distributed and were considered sufficient to facilitate the completion of the study. Of the 101 questionnaires distributed 26 (26%) respondents did not respond at all.

Out of the overall response rate of 75 (74%), 29 (83%) responses came from ILRI, 21 (67%) from ICRAF and 25 (74%) came from ICIPE. This response rate was considered good.

## 4.2 Analysis of the variables in the questionnaire

A rank index for each variable per questionnaire was calculated as follows:

For each item, the lowest score (1) was given a rank of six (6) and the highest score (6) was given a rank of one (1). It was assumed that each observation is a respondent and thus given a questionnaire identity (QID). For every QID, the sum of ranks for the number of items scored was calculated. The realized sum was divided by the product of the number of items and the highest possible score (6). The resulting value is a measure of the level of weight a respondent attaches to a given scale. The argument is that if respondents give high score for items that they are asked to evaluate, then the corresponding weight shall be small and vice versa. Thus to evaluate the rating for a given scale say Empowerment, by members of a given institution, the average values was checked across the institutions. The division by the highest possible score is for standardising purposes. Four measurement models for each variable (Involvement, Consistency, Adaptability, Mission) were estimated separately according to Denison and Mishra (1995). This is an item-level analysis where 15 items in each variable were analyzed. For the summarized data, with corresponding rank index for each respondent, the averages were obtained for each variable at the respective institutions. The maximum rank index is 1.2 and the minimum is 0.2.

## 4.3 Summary of the means of the variables in the Institutions

Over leaf is a summary of the average score of the employees' perception for each of the four variables namely adaptability, consistency, involvement and mission. Under each variable three items were measured and an average score obtained for each of the three institutions.

### 4.3.1 Adaptability

Variables	Items	ICIPE	ICRAF	ILRI
Adaptability	Creating change	0.64	0.69	0.63
	Customer focus	0.60	0.71	0.62
	Organisational learning	0.68	0.70	0.63
	All	0.64	0.70	0.63

Adaptability or the capacity for internal change in response to external conditions refers to the capacity to redefine the underlying character in response to large-scale change. As such effective organisations must develop norms and beliefs that support their capacity to receive and interpret signals from the environment and translate this into internal cognitive, behavioural and structural changes Denison and Mishra (1995).

Under adaptability three items were measured namely, creating change, being customer focused and striving to be a learning organization (Table 3).

At ICIPE, employees perceived organisation learning to be more prevalent than the ability to create change and being customer focused. The employees perceive failure as an opportunity for learning and improvement and innovation and risk-taking are encouraged and rewarded by the Institute.

In ICRAF the employees perceived creating change, being customer focused and a learning organization fairly uniformly. However, customer focus had a relatively higher average. Beneficial comments, input and recommendations from customers often lead to change. The employees perceived themselves to understand what the customer wants and needs. Direct contact with the customers is encouraged.

At ILRI the employees' perceptions on creating change, customer focus and organizational learning had approximately similar averages. Creating change and organizational learning were perceived the same. The employees relatively perceive

themselves to be flexible, to be fairly responsive to competition and other changes in the business environment. In addition, employees perceive failure as an opportunity for learning and improvement and innovation and risk-taking are encouraged and rewarded by the Institute.

Across the three institutions ICRAF's employee perception on adaptability had a relatively higher average compared to ICIPE and ILRI.

### 4.3.2 Consistency

Variables	Items	ICIPE	ICRAF	ILRI
Consistency	Agreement	0.66	0.67	0.61
	Coordination and integration	0.62	0.69	0.59
	Core values	0.70	0.73	0.60
	All	0.66	0.70	0.60

This focuses on how widely shared the values of an organisation are. It is a test on how well the organisation communicates the values that employees should aspire to have. Three items were measured namely, agreement within the institutes, coordination and integration and core values (Table 4).

At ICIPE and ICRAF core values averaged relatively higher than the two items. The employees perceived their leaders and managers as those who 'practice what they preach', they also perceived a distinct set of management practices and a clear and consistent set of values that govern the way they work and that there is an ethical code that guides their behaviour.

In ILRI the employees perceived the three items on average to be fairly the same. Overall across the three institutions ICRAF had a relatively higher average, followed by ICIPE and then ILRI.

### 4.3.3 Involvement

Variables	Items	ICIPE	ICRAF	ILRI
Involvement	Capability development	0.59	0.68	0.60
	Empowerment	0.69	0.76	0.71
	Team orientation	0.69	0.75	0.65
	All	0.66	0.73	0.66

Involvement and participation create a sense ownership and responsibility. Out of this ownership grows a greater commitment to the organisation and a growing capacity to operate under conditions of autonomy. Increasing the input of organisational members is also seen as increasing the quality of decisions and their implementation Denison and Mishra (1995). The three items measured under involvement were capacity development, empowerment and team orientation (Table 5).

At ICIPE and ICRAF, employees' perception on empowerment and team orientation averaged approximately the same while capability development had a relatively low score. This implies that the employees do not perceive the institute to be adequately investing in their skills in order to improve them. This subsequently has an impact on the ability of the employees to act on their own.

In ILRI, employees' perception on empowerment had a relatively higher average. The employees perceive themselves to be committed to their work and they believe that their work makes a positive contribution to the institute. They feel that decisions are made at the level where the best information is available, and that information is widely shared and perceive some degree of involvement in planning.

Across the three institutions ICRAF had a relatively higher average score on involvement while ICIPE and ILRI had the same average.



#### 4.3.4 Mission

**Table 6 - Summary of means**

Variables	Items	ICIPE	ICRAF	ILRI
Mission	Goals and objectives	0.70	0.73	0.66
	Strategic direction and intent	0.69	0.73	0.58
	Vision	0.65	0.70	0.68
	All	0.68	0.72	0.64

Organisations are effective as a result of pursuing a mission or a long-term vision that combine economic and non-economic objective, which provide meaning and direction to organisational members. Mission provides two major influences on an organisation's functioning: First that a mission provides purpose and meaning – a statement of intent, and a host of non-economic reasons why the organisation's work is important. Second, that a sense of mission defines the appropriate course of action for the organisation and its members. These factors reflect and exemplify the key values of an organisation Denison and Mishra (1995). The three items measured under this variable were goals and objectives, strategic direction and intent and vision (Table 6).

At ICIPE and ICRAF, the employees' perception on goals and objectives and strategic direction and intent of the institution had a relatively higher average score than ILRI. This implies that the employees perceive there to be a clear strategy for the future of the institute, a clear mission that gives meaning to their work and that there is a long term purpose and direction for the respective institutes. Also employees perceive there to be an agreement about the institute's goals, that the goals are ambitious but realistic, progress is continuously tracked and that they understand what needs to be done in order to succeed in the long run.

In ILRI employees' perception on the institute's vision, goals and objectives had a relatively higher average score than strategic direction and intent. This implies that the employees perceive themselves to have a shared vision of what the institute will be like

in the future, they feel that the leaders have a long-term view and that the vision creates excitement and motivation for staff. Also employees perceive there to be an agreement about the institutes goals, that the goals are ambitious but realistic, progress is continuously tracked and that they understand what needs to be done in the in order to succeed in the long run.

Across the three institutions ICRAF had a relatively higher average score on mission compared to ICIPE and ILRI.

#### 4.3.5 Overall for the four variables

Variables	Items	ICIPE	ICRAF	ILRI
Overall	All	0.66	0.71	0.63

Overall, the employees' perception for all the four variables namely adaptability, consistency, involvement and Mission, ICRAF had a relatively higher average, followed by ICIPE and then ILRI (Table 7).

#### 4.4 Analysis of the degree of association between Mission and the other three variables measured separately

The analysis entailed pair wise correlation between mission and the other three variables namely, adaptability, consistency and involvement. The aim was to assess whether the employees perceived there to be any association between Mission and the other three cultural variables separately. Spearman rank correlation was used to carry out these analyses. It was used to compare two independent random variables. Spearman's rank correlation works on ranked (relative) data. The Spearman's  $r_s$  coefficient indicates relative degree of association between variables. A value of  $r_s$  near one indicates perfect association; a value near zero, poor association.

The analyses over leaf are a measure of the employees' perception on the degree of association between mission and the other three variables namely adaptability, consistency and involvement measure separately for the three institutions.

**Table 8 - Spearman Correlation Coefficients, N = 75**

	<b>Adaptability</b>	<b>Consistency</b>	<b>Involvement</b>
<b>ICIPE - Mission</b>	0.42 ***	0.47***	0.35 **
<b>ICRAF - Mission</b>	0.25 *	0.31 *	0.45 ***
<b>ILRI - Mission</b>	0.26 *	0.33 **	0.25 *

**Key**

\*\*\* Represents a  $P < 0.001$

\*\* Represents a  $P < 0.01$

\* Represent a  $P < 0.05$

The correlation coefficient measures the degree of association between variables. P refers to probability and is an indicator of the significance level.

By analysing the four variables, two contrasts exist, that is between internal integration and external orientation and the contrast between change and stability. Involvement and consistency focus on the dynamics of internal integration while mission and adaptability address the dynamics of external orientation. According to Scheins (1990) organisations learn to cope with the dual problem of external orientation and internal integration. In addition, involvement and adaptability describe traits related to an organisation's capacity to change, while consistency and mission contribute to an organisation's capacity to remain stable and predictable over time (Table 8).

From the table above it can be deduced that employees perceive there to be a significant association between mission and the other three variables namely, adaptability, consistency and involvement measured separately.

At ICIPE and ILRI there is a relatively high association between Mission and Consistency than with adaptability and involvement. This implies that the employees perceive the institutions to have the capacity to remain stable and predictable over time as a result of changes in the environment.

There is also a relatively low association between Mission and Involvement at the two institutions, which implies that the employees perceive meaning and direction established through the institution's mission might have limited the involvement of some employees.

At ICRAF and ILRI the degree of association between mission and adaptability is perceived to be low. This implies that employees perceive internal consistency to be an obstacle to adaptation, or to a redefinition of their underlying mission.

In ICRAF employees perceive the degree of association between mission and involvement as relatively high. This implies that the employees perceive themselves to be involved in the meaning and direction established through the institution's mission. Also, employees perceive themselves to be involved in the direction the Institute is taking and as such have some understanding of the strategic direction and intent, the goals and objectives and vision of the Institute.

Overall, although there is a significant association between the mission and the other three variables, the degree of association is considered weak as the correlations are all less than 0.48.

#### 4.5 Analysis of the degree of association between Mission and the other three variables combined

### CHAPTER 4 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In order to establish the degree of association between mission and the other three cultural variables combined, canonical correlation computation was carried out. Canonical correlation provides a dependence relation between sets of variables in a multivariate data set. This was used to summarize the dependence relation between Mission and the canonical variate of the three variables. This gives an indication of the alignment between strategy or mission and culture.

**Table 9 – Degree of association between Mission and the other three variables combined for the three institutes**

Institute	ICIPE	ICRAF	ILRI
Canonical correlation between mission and other three variables combined	0.65***	0.55***	0.34*

**Key**

\*\*\* Represents a  $P < 0.001$

\*\* Represents a  $P < 0.01$

\* Represent a  $P < 0.05$

For the three institutions, as seen from the table above, the employees perceive there to be a significant association between Mission and a combination of the other three cultural variables. That is the institutes' employees perceive there to be a significant relationship between the institutes' long-term vision or mission (strategic direction) and Involvement, Consistency (the degree of normative integration) and Adaptability (the capacity for internal change in response to external conditions). This indicates that the employees perceive some degree of alignment between the respective Institute's Mission and Culture.

Comparing the three Institutions, the employees' perception at ICIPE and ICRAF exhibit a relatively higher canonical relationship between mission and culture alignment as compared to ILRI. This also implies that the degree of association/alignment between Mission and Culture is perceived to be relatively higher for ICIPE and ICRAF compared to ILRI.

## CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarises the findings of the study in relation to the main questions raised in the objectives. It also includes conclusions drawn from the study, recommendations, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

### 5.1 Summary

On the whole, the average employee perception on the four variables namely, adaptability, consistency, involvement and mission was fairly uniform across the three institutions. Three items were measured under adaptability namely, creating change, being customer focused and striving to be a learning institution. Across the three institutions ICRAF's employee perception on adaptability had a relatively higher average score while employees at ICIPE and ILRI on average perceived them to be relatively the same.

In the case of consistency the three items measured were agreement, coordination and integration and core values. On average ICRAF's employees perception on consistency was relatively high compared to ICIPE and ILRI.

Under involvement the three items measured were capability development, empowerment and team orientation. Compared to ICIPE and ILRI, on average the employees' perception at ICRAF was relatively high.

Finally in the case of mission the three items measured were goals and objectives, strategic direction and intent and vision. The employees' perception on mission at ICRAF was relatively high compared to the two institutions.

An analysis was also carried out to measure the employees' perception on the degree of association between mission and the other three variables namely adaptability, consistency and involvement measure separately and combined for the three institutions.

## 5.2 Conclusion

In conclusion, the employees perceive a significant association between the mission and the other three variables measured separately, the degree of association is considered weak as the correlations are all less than 0.48.

The canonical correlation analysis was used to measure the degree of association between mission and adaptability, consistency and involvement combined. The analysis revealed a significant association/alignment between mission or strategy and culture. However, the degree of alignment varies between the three institutions. ICIPE and ICRAF demonstrate a relatively higher alignment compared to ILRI (0.65, 0.55 and 0.34 respectively). No institution demonstrated full alignment between mission and culture i.e. a score of 1. Hence there is room for improvement at ICIPE and ICRAF but a lot more is required at ILRI in order to obtain a fit between mission and the culture in the institutes.

## 5.3 Recommendations

Strategy implementation is critical for any organisation since it leads to realisation of the organisational objectives. Successful strategy implementation is hard to come by if culture considerations are ignored. Culture revolves around people. Change management is about people. Without the people, the objectives may not be achieved, and therefore an organisation will end up with a sub-optimal strategy.

It is therefore imperative for ILRI, ICRAF and ICIPE to re-evaluate their focus on culture and give it a more prominent role during strategy implementation. Lack of sufficient focus on culture has led to sub-optimal strategies.

It is recommended that there should be more teamwork, more coordination and integration. The institutes should be more customer focused, they need to change to new and improved ways of working, the staff need to be more empowered and their capabilities developed and last but not least the institutions should strive to be learning organisations.

This will ensure more effective operations in the institutes, as the institutes will emphasize cultural values that relate to external adaptation and internal integration given the dramatic changes in both the external environment and the internal structures in the institutions.

To expand the scope of this study additional variables could be used to measure other strategy and cultural traits for instance the age of staff and duration of service of the employees. Also a distinction between the perception of NRS and the IRS could be made in the analysis and be analysed further.

#### **5.4 Limitations of the study**

Clearance to carry out the study was required from the Director Generals of the respective institutions. There was however delays from some of the institutions in obtaining this clearance, which in turn delayed completion of this study.

In addition the staff in one of the institutions who was assigned the distribution and collection of the questionnaires delayed in paying this facilitation role. This led to delay in finalising this report.

Some of the respondents declined to respond to the questionnaire. Also due to time and financial constraints, the survey was focused on CGIAR centres and their associates. However the study could be replicated in other research institutions.

The variables identified for this study were by no means exhaustive. An example of an additional variable that can be used is the age of staff and duration of service. Also in the analysis, no distinction was made between responses from NRS and those of IRS. This is because the researcher had undertaken not to reveal the identity of the respondents.

#### **5.5 Recommendations for further research**

As already mentioned culture is one of the pillars of strategy implementation. The other key pillars are resources and organisational structure. For the three institutions it would be worthwhile to study these factors in relation to strategy implementation.



The study could be replicated in other environments such as the NGO sector in Kenya. All quoted companies at the NSE, the central government, the local government and other sector such as finance, manufacturing, commercial and services among others.

## APPENDICES

# QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for accepting to complete this questionnaire. It has been designed to ensure that you spend minimal time. The questionnaire is targeted to all staff of each Institute. A sample of the staff to complete this questionnaire has been selected to ensure that all sections/departments are fully represented.

Please respond to each question below by marking the scale number that most accurately reflects your perception of your institute.

- 1. Strongly agree
- 2. Agree
- 3. Somewhat agree
- 4. Disagree
- 5. Strongly disagree
- 6. I don't know

## APPENDICES

Item	Scale	Item	1	2	3	4	5	I do not know
Empowerment		Most employees are highly committed to their work.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Decisions are usually made at the level where the best information is available.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Information is widely shared so that everyone can get the information he or she needs when it's needed.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Everyone believes by their work that he or she can have a positive impact on the institute.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Planning in the institute is ongoing and involves everyone in the process to some degree.	1	2	3	4	5	

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for accepting to complete this questionnaire. It has been designed to ensure that you spend minimal time. The questionnaire is targeted to all staff of each Institute. A sample of the staff to complete this questionnaire has been selected to ensure that all functions/departments are fully represented.

Please respond to each question below by marking the scale number that most accurately reflects your perception of your institute.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Somewhat agree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. I don't know

Index	Scale	Item	1	2	3	4	5	I do not know
Involvement	Empowerment	Most employees are highly committed to their work.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Decisions are usually made at the level where the best information is available.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Information is widely shared so that everyone can get the information he or she needs when it's needed.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Everyone believes by their work that he or she can have a positive impact on the institute.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Planning in the institute is ongoing and involves everyone in the process to some degree.	1	2	3	4	5	

Team Orientation	Cooperation across different departments of the institute is actively encouraged.	1	2	3	4	5	
	People work like they are part of a team.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Teamwork is used to get work done, rather than hierarchy.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Teams are the primary building blocks of the institute.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Work is organized so that each person can see the relationship between his or her job and the goals of the institute.	1	2	3	4	5	
Capability Development	Authority is delegated so that people can act on their own.	1	2	3	4	5	
	The capability of staff is constantly improving.	1	2	3	4	5	
	There is continuous investment in the skills of employees.	1	2	3	4	5	
	The capabilities of people are viewed as an important source of competitive advantage.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Problems often arise because staff of the institute do not have the skills necessary to do the job.	1	2	3	4	5	
Consistency	Core Values	The leaders and managers 'practice what they preach'.	1	2	3	4	5
		There is a characteristic management style and a distinct set of management practices.	1	2	3	4	5
		There is a clear and consistent set of values that govern the way we work.	1	2	3	4	5
		Ignoring core values of the institute will get you in trouble.	1	2	3	4	5

		There is an ethical code that guides our behaviour and tells us right from wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Agreement	When disagreements occur, we work hard to achieve 'win-win' solutions.	1	2	3	4	5	
		It is easy to reach consensus, even on difficult issues.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Staff often have trouble reaching agreement on key issues.	1	2	3	4	5	
		There is a clear agreement about the right way and the wrong way to do things.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Coordination and Integration	Our approach to work is very consistent and predictable.	1	2	3	4	5	
		People from different departments of the institute share a common perspective.	1	2	3	4	5	
		It is easy to coordinate projects across different departments of the institute.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Working with someone from another department of the institute is like working with someone from a different organization.	1	2	3	4	5	
		There is good alignment of goals across all levels/cadres of staff.	1	2	3	4	5	
Adaptability	Creating Change	The way things are done is very flexible and easy to change.	1	2	3	4	5	
		We respond well to competitors and other changes in the business environment.	1	2	3	4	5	
		New and improved ways to do work are continually adopted.	1	2	3	4	5	

	Goals & Objectives	Attempts to create change usually meet with resistance.	1	2	3	4	5	
Customer Focus		Beneficial comments and recommendations often lead to changes.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Customer input directly influences our decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	
		All members have a deep understanding of customer wants and needs.	1	2	3	4	5	
		The interests of the customer often get ignored in our decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	
		We encourage direct contact with customers by our people.	1	2	3	4	5	
Organizational Learning		We view failure as an opportunity for learning and improvement.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Innovation and risk taking are encouraged and rewarded.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Lots of things 'fall between the cracks'.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Learning is an important objective in our day-to-day work.	1	2	3	4	5	
		We make certain that the 'right hand knows what the left hand is doing.'	1	2	3	4	5	
Mission	Strategic Direction & Intent	There is a long-term purpose and direction for the institute.	1	2	3	4	5	
		Our strategy leads other organizations to change the way they compete.	1	2	3	4	5	
		There is a clear mission that gives meaning and direction to our work.	1	2	3	4	5	
		There is a clear strategy for the future of the institute.	1	2	3	4	5	
		The institute's strategic direction is unclear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	

Goals & Objectives	There is widespread agreement about the institute's goals.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Leaders set goals that are ambitious, but realistic.	1	2	3	4	5	
	The leadership has 'gone on record' about the objectives we are trying to meet.	1	2	3	4	5	
	We continuously track our progress against our stated goals.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Staff understand what needs to be done for us to succeed in the long run.	1	2	3	4	5	
Vision	We have a shared vision of what the institute will be like in the future	1	2	3	4	5	
	Leaders have a long-term viewpoint.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Short-term thinking often compromises our long-term vision.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Our vision creates excitement and motivation for staff.	1	2	3	4	5	
	We are able to meet short-term demands without compromising our long-term vision.	1	2	3	4	5	

## LIST OF INSTITUTIONS UNDER STUDY

1. International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
2. World Agro forestry Centre (WAC) also referred to as International Centre for Research in Agro forestry (ICRAF)
3. International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)

I am a postgraduate student undertaking a Master of Business Administration degree at the Faculty of Commerce, University of Nairobi. I am currently conducting research in the area of 'strategy' as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the Master of Business Administration degree.

The title of my research is 'A survey of employee perception of culture and strategy alignment at Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) centres in Kenya and their Associates'.

Your institute is one of the CGIAR centres or an Associate and I would like to request for your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire.

The information you will provide in this survey is classified and will be treated with strict confidence and used only for this particular survey.

In my survey report and presentation, I undertake not to refer to your name or that of your organisation directly.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Na'ang'a Elizabeth I

MBA student

Jackson Masilo

Supervisor

Dept of Business Administration



## RESPONDENTS' LETTER

Date

Dear Respondent

I am a postgraduate student undertaking a Master of Business Administration degree at the Faculty of Commerce, University of Nairobi. I am currently conducting research in the area of 'strategy' as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Master of Business Administration degree.

The title of my research is '*A survey of employee perception of culture and strategy alignment at Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) centres in Kenya and their Associates*'

Your institute is one of the CGIAR centres or an Associate and I would like to request for your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire.

The information you will provide in this survey is classified and will be treated with strict confidence and used only for this particular survey.

In my survey report and presentation, I undertake not to refer to your name or that of your organisation directly.

Thanking you in advance

Yours faithfully

Ng'ang'a Elizabeth T  
MBA student

Jackson Maalu  
Supervisor  
Dept of Business Administration

## REFERENCES

- Alan L. Wilkins, 'Developing Corporate Character: How to Successfully Change an Organization Without Destroying It'. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1989
- Ansoff, H. Igor (1965), 'Corporate Strategy', New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bate, P. (1994), 'Organizational culture'. In R. Armson and R. Paton, *Organizations: cases, issues, and concepts*. (London: Paul Chapman).
- Bridges, William and Associates, Inc (1991) 'Managing Transitions: Making the most of change', Perseus books
- Burns, T and Stalker, G.M. (1961), 'The Management of Innovation' London: Tavistock.
- Calori, R., & Sarnin, P. 1991. 'Corporate culture and economic performance: A French study'. *Organization Studies*, 12(1): 49-74.
- Clegg, C. (1994). 'Psychology and information technology: the study of cognition in organizations'. *British Journal of Psychology* 85 449-477.
- Davenport, T.H. (1993), 'Process innovation: reengineering work through information technology'. Boston, USA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Davies, A., Kirkpatrick, I. and Oliver, N. (1992) 'The organisational culture of an academic library: implications for library strategy'. *British Journal of Academic Librarianship* 7 (2) 69-89.
- Denison, D. R. 1990, 'Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness'. New York: Wiley.
- Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. H. 1995, 'Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness'. *Organization Science*, 6: 204-223.
- Edgar H Schein, 'Organization Culture and Leadership', second edition. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1992

- Greenly, Gordon E. (1989). 'Strategic Management', London: Prentice Hall International.
- Handy, C. (1993), Understanding organizations (4th edition) Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hofstede, G. 1991, Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Berkshire, NJ: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, Gerry and Scholes, Kevan (1988), 'Exploring Corporate Strategy', London: Prentice Hall.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1983. 'Change masters and the intricate architecture of corporate culture change.' *Management Review*. 72(10):October 1983.
- Kanter, R.M. (1992). The change masters: corporate entrepreneurs at work. (London: Routledge).
- Kostova, Tatiana. 1999. 'Transnational Transfer of Strategic Organization Practices: A Contextual Perspective.' *Academy of Management Review*. 24(2).
- Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. 1992. Corporate culture and performance. New York: Free Press.
- Kotter, P John and Cohen, Dan S 'The heart of change: Real life stories of how people change their organizations', Harvard business school publishing (2002)
- Kotter, P John 'Leading change', Harvard business school publishing (1996).
- Krau, Edgar. 1998. Social and Economic Management in the Competitive Society. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mintzberg, Henry (1990), 'The Design School: Reconsidering the Basic Premises of Strategic Management', *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol.11: 171-195.
- Mintzberg, Henry and Quinn, James Brian (1991), 'The Strategy Process', 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International.

Ohmae, Kenichi (1982), 'The Mind of the Strategist', New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. 1991, People and organizational culture: A profile comparisons approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 487-516.

Paul J Storich, ed, 'Implementing Strategy: Making Strategy Happen', Management Analysis Center, Inc., Cambridge, Ma., Ballinger Press, 1982

Peter F. Drucker, 'Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices', New York, Harper & Row, 1973, p. 125.

Porter, Michael E. (1985), 'Competitive Advantage', New York: The Free Press.

Quinn, James Brian (1980), 'Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism', Illinois: Richard D. Irwin Inc.

Senge, Peter M et al 'The dance of change: The challenge of sustaining momentum in learning organizations', Doubleday Publisher (1999)

Schoemaker, Paul J. H (1992), 'How to Link Strategic Vision to Core Capabilities?' *Sloan Management Review*. Fall: 67-81.

Schwartz, Howard and Stanley M. Davis, 1981. 'Matching Corporate Culture and Business Strategy.' *Organizational Dynamics*. Summer: 30-48.

St Clair, G. (1996). Entrepreneurial librarianship: the key to effective information services management. (East Grinstead: Bowker-Saur).

Tichy, Noel M. 1983. Managing Strategic Change: Technical, Political, and Cultural Dynamics. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Wheelen, Thomas L. and Hunger, David J. (1996), Strategic Management and Business Policy, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Wren, Daniel A. (1994), 'The Evolution of Management Thought', 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Scale	Item	N	RANK INDEX			
			Average Index	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	CV
Adaptability	Creating change	25	0.64	0.03	0.023	17.58
	Customer focus	25	0.60	0.03	0.020	24.33
	Organizational learning	25	0.63	0.03	0.021	15.13
	All	75	0.64	0.03	0.015	19.77
Consistency	Agreement	25	0.60	0.03	0.024	18.29
	Coordination and integration	25	0.62	0.03	0.023	18.24
	Core values	25	0.70	0.02	0.021	17.38
	All	75	0.64	0.03	0.017	28.12
Involvement	Flexibility	25	0.59	0.04	0.021	17.11
	Empowerment	25	0.62	0.03	0.022	16.65
	Team orientation	25	0.69	0.02	0.023	23.23
	All	75	0.64	0.03	0.018	20.45
Mission	Clear direction	25	0.63	0.03	0.021	23.77
	Clear intent	25	0.66	0.03	0.024	27.05
	Vision	25	0.63	0.03	0.021	17.98
	All	75	0.64	0.03	0.016	28.51
Flexibility	Creating change	25	0.64	0.03	0.020	18.92
	Customer focus	25	0.71	0.03	0.019	12.10
	Organizational learning	25	0.70	0.04	0.019	17.33
	All	75	0.70	0.03	0.014	34.83
Consistency	Agreement	25	0.67	0.03	0.027	22.90
	Coordination and integration	25	0.62	0.03	0.025	18.22
	Core values	25	0.73	0.02	0.021	13.33
	All	75	0.70	0.03	0.017	17.38

**DETAILS OF DATA ANALYSIS**

# Summary for rank index

The SAS system  
16:30 wednesday, September 10, 2003

INSTITUTE	INDEX	SCALE	RANKINDEX				
			Persons	Average index	Variance	Std. error	CV
ICIPE	Adaptability	SCALE					
		Creating change	25	0.64	0.01	0.023	17.98
		Customer focus	25	0.60	0.02	0.030	24.83
		Organizational learning	25	0.68	0.01	0.021	15.13
		All	75	0.64	0.02	0.015	19.72
	Consistency	SCALE					
		Agreement	25	0.66	0.01	0.024	18.09
		Coordination and integration	25	0.62	0.01	0.023	18.21
		Core values	25	0.70	0.02	0.025	17.88
		All	75	0.66	0.01	0.014	18.42
	Involvement	SCALE					
		Capability development	25	0.59	0.01	0.021	17.33
		Empowerment	25	0.69	0.01	0.023	16.65
		Team orientation	25	0.69	0.03	0.032	23.28
		All	75	0.66	0.02	0.016	20.45
	Mission	SCALE					
		Goals and objectives	25	0.70	0.03	0.033	23.77
		Strategic direction and intent	25	0.69	0.01	0.024	17.05
		Vision	25	0.65	0.01	0.023	17.96
		All	75	0.68	0.02	0.016	19.95
ICRAF	Adaptability	SCALE					
		Creating change	21	0.69	0.02	0.029	18.91
		Customer focus	21	0.71	0.01	0.019	12.52
		Organizational learning	21	0.70	0.01	0.019	12.25
		All	63	0.70	0.01	0.013	14.65
	Consistency	SCALE					
		Agreement	21	0.67	0.01	0.017	11.80
		Coordination and integration	21	0.69	0.01	0.016	10.92
		Core values	21	0.73	0.01	0.021	13.22
		All	63	0.70	0.01	0.011	12.38

(Continued)

INSTITUTE	INDEX	SCALE	RANKINDEX				
			Persons	Average index	variance	std. error	CV
ICRAF	Involvement	Capability development	21	0.68	0.01	0.026	17.55
		Empowerment	21	0.76	0.01	0.022	13.56
		Team orientation	21	0.75	0.02	0.030	18.39
		All	63	0.73	0.02	0.016	16.98
	Mission	SCALE					
		Goals and objectives	21	0.73	0.01	0.027	16.82
		Strategic direction and intent	21	0.73	0.01	0.026	16.52
		Vision	21	0.70	0.02	0.029	18.87
		All	63	0.72	0.02	0.016	17.23
ILRI	Adaptability	SCALE					
		Creating change	29	0.63	0.01	0.021	17.81
		Customer focus	29	0.62	0.02	0.025	21.64
		Organizational learning	29	0.63	0.01	0.022	18.50
		All	87	0.63	0.01	0.013	19.16
	Consistency	SCALE					
		Agreement	29	0.61	0.03	0.030	26.96
		Coordination and integration	29	0.59	0.01	0.022	19.66
		Core values	29	0.60	0.01	0.022	19.60
		All	87	0.60	0.02	0.014	22.18
	Involvement	SCALE					
		Capability development	29	0.60	0.01	0.020	17.86
		Empowerment	29	0.71	0.01	0.020	15.00
		Team orientation	29	0.65	0.02	0.024	19.62
		All	87	0.66	0.01	0.013	18.60
	Mission	SCALE					
		Goals and objectives	29	0.66	0.03	0.033	26.67
		Strategic direction and intent	29	0.68	0.01	0.021	16.72
		Vision	29	0.58	0.02	0.025	23.11
All		87	0.64	0.02	0.016	23.13	

**Summary for rank index**

INSTITUTE	RANKINDEX				
	Persons	Average index	variance	std. error	CV
ICIPE	300	0.66	0.02	0.008	19.69
ICRAF	252	0.71	0.01	0.007	15.52
ILRI	348	0.63	0.02	0.007	20.98
All	900	0.66	0.02	0.004	19.58

Data analysis				
Computation of the Rank Index for each variable per questionnaire for each Institution				
INSTITUTE	QID	INDEX	SCALE	RANKINDEX
ICIPE	1	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICIPE	2	Adaptability	Creating change	0.8750
ICIPE	3	Adaptability	Creating change	0.8750
ICIPE	4	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICIPE	5	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ICIPE	6	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5417
ICIPE	7	Adaptability	Creating change	0.3333
ICIPE	8	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ICIPE	9	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ICIPE	10	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ICIPE	11	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6250
ICIPE	12	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ICIPE	13	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6250
ICIPE	14	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICIPE	15	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ICIPE	16	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ICIPE	17	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ICIPE	18	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICIPE	19	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ICIPE	20	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICIPE	21	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICIPE	22	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICIPE	23	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ICIPE	24	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5417
ICIPE	25	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ICIPE	1	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ICIPE	2	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7000
ICIPE	3	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ICIPE	4	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6000
ICIPE	5	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ICIPE	6	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ICIPE	7	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.2333
ICIPE	8	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ICIPE	9	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICIPE	10	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICIPE	11	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ICIPE	12	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7000
ICIPE	13	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5333
ICIPE	14	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICIPE	15	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5000
ICIPE	16	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.2667
ICIPE	17	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ICIPE	18	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICIPE	19	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICIPE	20	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICIPE	21	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ICIPE	22	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7000
ICIPE	23	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.2333
ICIPE	24	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7000
ICIPE	25	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7667
ICIPE	1	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICIPE	2	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7667
ICIPE	3	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8667
ICIPE	4	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICIPE	5	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICIPE	6	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5667
ICIPE	7	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5667
ICIPE	8	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICIPE	9	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICIPE	10	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5000
ICIPE	11	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICIPE	12	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8667
ICIPE	13	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8000
ICIPE	14	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.9000
ICIPE	15	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5667
ICIPE	16	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICIPE	17	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6333
ICIPE	18	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7333
ICIPE	19	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICIPE	20	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICIPE	21	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICIPE	22	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICIPE	23	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICIPE	24	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICIPE	25	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICIPE	1	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ICIPE	2	Consistency	Agreement	1.0000
ICIPE	3	Consistency	Agreement	0.8750
ICIPE	4	Consistency	Agreement	0.5417
ICIPE	5	Consistency	Agreement	0.5417
ICIPE	6	Consistency	Agreement	0.5000
ICIPE	7	Consistency	Agreement	0.4167



ICIPE	8	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICIPE	9	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICIPE	10	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ICIPE	11	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICIPE	12	Consistency	Agreement	0.7500
ICIPE	13	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICIPE	14	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICIPE	15	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ICIPE	16	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ICIPE	17	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICIPE	18	Consistency	Agreement	0.7917
ICIPE	19	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICIPE	20	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICIPE	21	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ICIPE	22	Consistency	Agreement	0.7500
ICIPE	23	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICIPE	24	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICIPE	25	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ICIPE	1	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ICIPE	2	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.9000
ICIPE	3	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICIPE	4	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5333
ICIPE	5	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICIPE	6	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5000
ICIPE	7	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.3667
ICIPE	8	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ICIPE	9	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICIPE	10	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.4000
ICIPE	11	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICIPE	12	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ICIPE	13	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ICIPE	14	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICIPE	15	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ICIPE	16	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ICIPE	17	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.4667
ICIPE	18	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICIPE	19	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICIPE	20	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ICIPE	21	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6000
ICIPE	22	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICIPE	23	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICIPE	24	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6000
ICIPE	25	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7667
ICIPE	1	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ICIPE	2	Consistency	Core values	1.0000
ICIPE	3	Consistency	Core values	0.8000
ICIPE	4	Consistency	Core values	0.8000
ICIPE	5	Consistency	Core values	0.6667
ICIPE	6	Consistency	Core values	0.4000
ICIPE	7	Consistency	Core values	0.4667
ICIPE	8	Consistency	Core values	0.6667
ICIPE	9	Consistency	Core values	0.6667
ICIPE	10	Consistency	Core values	0.6000
ICIPE	11	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ICIPE	12	Consistency	Core values	0.7667
ICIPE	13	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICIPE	14	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICIPE	15	Consistency	Core values	0.5667
ICIPE	16	Consistency	Core values	0.8333
ICIPE	17	Consistency	Core values	0.8333
ICIPE	18	Consistency	Core values	0.8000
ICIPE	19	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICIPE	20	Consistency	Core values	0.6000
ICIPE	21	Consistency	Core values	0.7333
ICIPE	22	Consistency	Core values	0.7667
ICIPE	23	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ICIPE	24	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICIPE	25	Consistency	Core values	0.8000
ICIPE	1	Involvement	Capability development	0.5333
ICIPE	2	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ICIPE	3	Involvement	Capability development	0.8000
ICIPE	4	Involvement	Capability development	0.6667
ICIPE	5	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ICIPE	6	Involvement	Capability development	0.4667
ICIPE	7	Involvement	Capability development	0.4333
ICIPE	8	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ICIPE	9	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ICIPE	10	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ICIPE	11	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ICIPE	12	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ICIPE	13	Involvement	Capability development	0.5000
ICIPE	14	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ICIPE	15	Involvement	Capability development	0.4667
ICIPE	16	Involvement	Capability development	0.5333
ICIPE	17	Involvement	Capability development	0.4667
ICIPE	18	Involvement	Capability development	0.8000

ICIPE	19	Involvement	Capability development	0.5000
ICIPE	20	Involvement	Capability development	0.6667
ICIPE	21	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ICIPE	22	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ICIPE	23	Involvement	Capability development	0.5000
ICIPE	24	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ICIPE	25	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ICIPE	1	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ICIPE	2	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ICIPE	3	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7333
ICIPE	4	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ICIPE	5	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICIPE	6	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6667
ICIPE	7	Involvement	Empowerment	0.4667
ICIPE	8	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8333
ICIPE	9	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7333
ICIPE	10	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ICIPE	11	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6667
ICIPE	12	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8333
ICIPE	13	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ICIPE	14	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ICIPE	15	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ICIPE	16	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICIPE	17	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ICIPE	18	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICIPE	19	Involvement	Empowerment	0.5000
ICIPE	20	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6333
ICIPE	21	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6333
ICIPE	22	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ICIPE	23	Involvement	Empowerment	0.5000
ICIPE	24	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ICIPE	25	Involvement	Empowerment	0.9333
ICIPE	1	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6000
ICIPE	2	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9667
ICIPE	3	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9667
ICIPE	4	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6000
ICIPE	5	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9333
ICIPE	6	Involvement	Team orientation	0.4667
ICIPE	7	Involvement	Team orientation	0.3333
ICIPE	8	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICIPE	9	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8333
ICIPE	10	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6000
ICIPE	11	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7667
ICIPE	12	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8000
ICIPE	13	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6333
ICIPE	14	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICIPE	15	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5000
ICIPE	16	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6000
ICIPE	17	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5333
ICIPE	18	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7333
ICIPE	19	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5333
ICIPE	20	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICIPE	21	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICIPE	22	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICIPE	23	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6333
ICIPE	24	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICIPE	25	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9333
ICIPE	1	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ICIPE	2	Mission	Goals and objectives	1.0000
ICIPE	3	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8667
ICIPE	4	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6667
ICIPE	5	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8667
ICIPE	6	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6000
ICIPE	7	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.1667
ICIPE	8	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ICIPE	9	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6667
ICIPE	10	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6333
ICIPE	11	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ICIPE	12	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.9667
ICIPE	13	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6333
ICIPE	14	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ICIPE	15	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.5000
ICIPE	16	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ICIPE	17	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.4667
ICIPE	18	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ICIPE	19	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ICIPE	20	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6333
ICIPE	21	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ICIPE	22	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ICIPE	23	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6667
ICIPE	24	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ICIPE	25	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8667
ICIPE	1	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICIPE	2	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8667
ICIPE	3	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICIPE	4	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000

ICIPE	5	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6000
ICIPE	6	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.5667
ICIPE	7	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.3667
ICIPE	8	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICIPE	9	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6333
ICIPE	10	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6333
ICIPE	11	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICIPE	12	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8000
ICIPE	13	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.9000
ICIPE	14	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8333
ICIPE	15	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICIPE	16	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6333
ICIPE	17	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICIPE	18	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICIPE	19	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ICIPE	20	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICIPE	21	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7333
ICIPE	22	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICIPE	23	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.4667
ICIPE	24	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6000
ICIPE	25	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICIPE	1	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICIPE	2	Mission	Vision	0.8000
ICIPE	3	Mission	Vision	0.8667
ICIPE	4	Mission	Vision	0.6333
ICIPE	5	Mission	Vision	0.5333
ICIPE	6	Mission	Vision	0.5667
ICIPE	7	Mission	Vision	0.4333
ICIPE	8	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ICIPE	9	Mission	Vision	0.5000
ICIPE	10	Mission	Vision	0.5667
ICIPE	11	Mission	Vision	0.6333
ICIPE	12	Mission	Vision	0.8667
ICIPE	13	Mission	Vision	0.5333
ICIPE	14	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ICIPE	15	Mission	Vision	0.5667
ICIPE	16	Mission	Vision	0.8000
ICIPE	17	Mission	Vision	0.7667
ICIPE	18	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICIPE	19	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICIPE	20	Mission	Vision	0.4333
ICIPE	21	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICIPE	22	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ICIPE	23	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICIPE	24	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICIPE	25	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ICRAF	1	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ICRAF	2	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ICRAF	3	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ICRAF	4	Adaptability	Creating change	0.8333
ICRAF	5	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ICRAF	6	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7917
ICRAF	7	Adaptability	Creating change	0.9167
ICRAF	8	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ICRAF	9	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ICRAF	10	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ICRAF	11	Adaptability	Creating change	0.3750
ICRAF	12	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ICRAF	13	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ICRAF	14	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ICRAF	15	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7917
ICRAF	16	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7917
ICRAF	17	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ICRAF	18	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ICRAF	19	Adaptability	Creating change	0.8333
ICRAF	20	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ICRAF	21	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ICRAF	1	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ICRAF	2	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7000
ICRAF	3	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8000
ICRAF	4	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8000
ICRAF	5	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8000
ICRAF	6	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7667
ICRAF	7	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7667
ICRAF	8	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8333
ICRAF	9	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICRAF	10	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ICRAF	11	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5000
ICRAF	12	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ICRAF	13	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICRAF	14	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ICRAF	15	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6000
ICRAF	16	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ICRAF	17	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7667
ICRAF	18	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ICRAF	19	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8000

ICRAF	20	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ICRAF	21	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7667
ICRAF	1	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8000
ICRAF	2	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICRAF	3	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8333
ICRAF	4	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8667
ICRAF	5	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7333
ICRAF	6	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICRAF	7	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICRAF	8	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ICRAF	9	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7333
ICRAF	10	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICRAF	11	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.4667
ICRAF	12	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICRAF	13	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICRAF	14	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICRAF	15	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICRAF	16	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICRAF	17	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICRAF	18	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ICRAF	19	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6333
ICRAF	20	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7667
ICRAF	21	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ICRAF	1	Consistency	Agreement	0.8333
ICRAF	2	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ICRAF	3	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICRAF	4	Consistency	Agreement	0.7500
ICRAF	5	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ICRAF	6	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICRAF	7	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ICRAF	8	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICRAF	9	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ICRAF	10	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICRAF	11	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ICRAF	12	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICRAF	13	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ICRAF	14	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ICRAF	15	Consistency	Agreement	0.5417
ICRAF	16	Consistency	Agreement	0.5417
ICRAF	17	Consistency	Agreement	0.7500
ICRAF	18	Consistency	Agreement	0.7500
ICRAF	19	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ICRAF	20	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ICRAF	21	Consistency	Agreement	0.7917
ICRAF	1	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ICRAF	2	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ICRAF	3	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICRAF	4	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ICRAF	5	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICRAF	6	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICRAF	7	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ICRAF	8	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.8333
ICRAF	9	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICRAF	10	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ICRAF	11	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICRAF	12	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6000
ICRAF	13	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ICRAF	14	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ICRAF	15	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICRAF	16	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ICRAF	17	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.8333
ICRAF	18	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ICRAF	19	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ICRAF	20	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ICRAF	21	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.8000
ICRAF	1	Consistency	Core values	0.6667
ICRAF	2	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ICRAF	3	Consistency	Core values	0.8000
ICRAF	4	Consistency	Core values	0.8333
ICRAF	5	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICRAF	6	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ICRAF	7	Consistency	Core values	0.8667
ICRAF	8	Consistency	Core values	0.8000
ICRAF	9	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICRAF	10	Consistency	Core values	0.7333
ICRAF	11	Consistency	Core values	0.6667
ICRAF	12	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICRAF	13	Consistency	Core values	0.7667
ICRAF	14	Consistency	Core values	0.5667
ICRAF	15	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ICRAF	16	Consistency	Core values	0.9000
ICRAF	17	Consistency	Core values	0.9000
ICRAF	18	Consistency	Core values	0.8000
ICRAF	19	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ICRAF	20	Consistency	Core values	0.7333
ICRAF	21	Consistency	Core values	0.6000

ICRAF	1	Involvement	Capability development	0.7667
ICRAF	2	Involvement	Capability development	0.8333
ICRAF	3	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ICRAF	4	Involvement	Capability development	0.8667
ICRAF	5	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ICRAF	6	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ICRAF	7	Involvement	Capability development	0.7333
ICRAF	8	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ICRAF	9	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ICRAF	10	Involvement	Capability development	0.6667
ICRAF	11	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ICRAF	12	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ICRAF	13	Involvement	Capability development	0.5333
ICRAF	14	Involvement	Capability development	0.5333
ICRAF	15	Involvement	Capability development	0.4000
ICRAF	16	Involvement	Capability development	0.7667
ICRAF	17	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ICRAF	18	Involvement	Capability development	0.7333
ICRAF	19	Involvement	Capability development	0.7667
ICRAF	20	Involvement	Capability development	0.6667
ICRAF	21	Involvement	Capability development	0.9000
ICRAF	1	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8667
ICRAF	2	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ICRAF	3	Involvement	Empowerment	0.9667
ICRAF	4	Involvement	Empowerment	0.9000
ICRAF	5	Involvement	Empowerment	0.5000
ICRAF	6	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICRAF	7	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ICRAF	8	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICRAF	9	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICRAF	10	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8333
ICRAF	11	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ICRAF	12	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICRAF	13	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ICRAF	14	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ICRAF	15	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6667
ICRAF	16	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ICRAF	17	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8667
ICRAF	18	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ICRAF	19	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ICRAF	20	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ICRAF	21	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7333
ICRAF	1	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9333
ICRAF	2	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICRAF	3	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9000
ICRAF	4	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8667
ICRAF	5	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6333
ICRAF	6	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7333
ICRAF	7	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9333
ICRAF	8	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ICRAF	9	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7333
ICRAF	10	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7333
ICRAF	11	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5000
ICRAF	12	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7667
ICRAF	13	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5333
ICRAF	14	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7667
ICRAF	15	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5667
ICRAF	16	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9333
ICRAF	17	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8667
ICRAF	18	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8000
ICRAF	19	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5667
ICRAF	20	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6333
ICRAF	21	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8667
ICRAF	1	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8333
ICRAF	2	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6000
ICRAF	3	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8333
ICRAF	4	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.9000
ICRAF	5	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.4000
ICRAF	6	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ICRAF	7	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8000
ICRAF	8	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8000
ICRAF	9	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6667
ICRAF	10	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ICRAF	11	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.5000
ICRAF	12	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6667
ICRAF	13	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ICRAF	14	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ICRAF	15	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6667
ICRAF	16	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8667
ICRAF	17	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8000
ICRAF	18	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ICRAF	19	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ICRAF	20	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8667
ICRAF	21	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ICRAF	1	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8000
ICRAF	2	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8333

ICRAF	3	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8000
ICRAF	4	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8667
ICRAF	5	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.4333
ICRAF	6	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICRAF	7	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8333
ICRAF	8	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ICRAF	9	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICRAF	10	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8667
ICRAF	11	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.4333
ICRAF	12	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICRAF	13	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7333
ICRAF	14	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6000
ICRAF	15	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ICRAF	16	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICRAF	17	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7333
ICRAF	18	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8667
ICRAF	19	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICRAF	20	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICRAF	21	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ICRAF	1	Mission	Vision	0.8000
ICRAF	2	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICRAF	3	Mission	Vision	0.7667
ICRAF	4	Mission	Vision	0.8000
ICRAF	5	Mission	Vision	0.4333
ICRAF	6	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICRAF	7	Mission	Vision	0.7667
ICRAF	8	Mission	Vision	0.8000
ICRAF	9	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICRAF	10	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ICRAF	11	Mission	Vision	0.4333
ICRAF	12	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICRAF	13	Mission	Vision	0.7667
ICRAF	14	Mission	Vision	0.6333
ICRAF	15	Mission	Vision	0.4667
ICRAF	16	Mission	Vision	0.9000
ICRAF	17	Mission	Vision	0.7667
ICRAF	18	Mission	Vision	0.9333
ICRAF	19	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ICRAF	20	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ICRAF	21	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ILRI	1	Adaptability	Creating change	0.4583
ILRI	2	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ILRI	3	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ILRI	4	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ILRI	5	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ILRI	6	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ILRI	7	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ILRI	8	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6250
ILRI	9	Adaptability	Creating change	0.3750
ILRI	10	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ILRI	11	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ILRI	12	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ILRI	13	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ILRI	14	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ILRI	15	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ILRI	16	Adaptability	Creating change	0.4583
ILRI	17	Adaptability	Creating change	0.8750
ILRI	18	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ILRI	19	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5000
ILRI	20	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ILRI	21	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ILRI	22	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ILRI	23	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ILRI	24	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6250
ILRI	25	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7083
ILRI	26	Adaptability	Creating change	0.7500
ILRI	27	Adaptability	Creating change	0.5833
ILRI	28	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6250
ILRI	29	Adaptability	Creating change	0.6667
ILRI	1	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ILRI	2	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.1667
ILRI	3	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ILRI	4	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6000
ILRI	5	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.4667
ILRI	6	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ILRI	7	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8000
ILRI	8	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ILRI	9	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5333
ILRI	10	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.4333
ILRI	11	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ILRI	12	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5333
ILRI	13	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ILRI	14	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8000
ILRI	15	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ILRI	16	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6333
ILRI	17	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.8667

ILRI	18	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ILRI	19	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ILRI	20	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ILRI	21	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6000
ILRI	22	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5333
ILRI	23	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ILRI	24	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5333
ILRI	25	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7667
ILRI	26	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.5667
ILRI	27	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ILRI	28	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.7333
ILRI	29	Adaptability	Customer focus	0.6667
ILRI	1	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5000
ILRI	2	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.2333
ILRI	3	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ILRI	4	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5333
ILRI	5	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ILRI	6	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6333
ILRI	7	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ILRI	8	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ILRI	9	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ILRI	10	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ILRI	11	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ILRI	12	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ILRI	13	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7333
ILRI	14	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8000
ILRI	15	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ILRI	16	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5333
ILRI	17	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8000
ILRI	18	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6333
ILRI	19	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5333
ILRI	20	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.8333
ILRI	21	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5333
ILRI	22	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5667
ILRI	23	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7000
ILRI	24	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.5333
ILRI	25	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ILRI	26	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6000
ILRI	27	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ILRI	28	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.7667
ILRI	29	Adaptability	Organizational learning	0.6667
ILRI	1	Consistency	Agreement	0.7500
ILRI	2	Consistency	Agreement	0.2083
ILRI	3	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ILRI	4	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ILRI	5	Consistency	Agreement	0.2917
ILRI	6	Consistency	Agreement	0.8333
ILRI	7	Consistency	Agreement	0.5000
ILRI	8	Consistency	Agreement	0.7083
ILRI	9	Consistency	Agreement	0.3333
ILRI	10	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ILRI	11	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ILRI	12	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ILRI	13	Consistency	Agreement	0.7917
ILRI	14	Consistency	Agreement	1.0000
ILRI	15	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ILRI	16	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ILRI	17	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ILRI	18	Consistency	Agreement	0.8333
ILRI	19	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ILRI	20	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ILRI	21	Consistency	Agreement	0.4167
ILRI	22	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ILRI	23	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ILRI	24	Consistency	Agreement	0.5000
ILRI	25	Consistency	Agreement	0.7500
ILRI	26	Consistency	Agreement	0.5833
ILRI	27	Consistency	Agreement	0.6667
ILRI	28	Consistency	Agreement	0.5417
ILRI	29	Consistency	Agreement	0.6250
ILRI	1	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ILRI	2	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.2333
ILRI	3	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ILRI	4	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ILRI	5	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.4667
ILRI	6	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ILRI	7	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6333
ILRI	8	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ILRI	9	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.4000
ILRI	10	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ILRI	11	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ILRI	12	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ILRI	13	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ILRI	14	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.8000
ILRI	15	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5333
ILRI	16	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5333

ILRI	17	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7667
ILRI	18	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6667
ILRI	19	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ILRI	20	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5000
ILRI	21	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7333
ILRI	22	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5333
ILRI	23	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5667
ILRI	24	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5333
ILRI	25	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.5333
ILRI	26	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ILRI	27	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6000
ILRI	28	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.7000
ILRI	29	Consistency	Coordination and integration	0.6000
ILRI	1	Consistency	Core values	0.5667
ILRI	2	Consistency	Core values	0.8333
ILRI	3	Consistency	Core values	0.5667
ILRI	4	Consistency	Core values	0.7333
ILRI	5	Consistency	Core values	0.3333
ILRI	6	Consistency	Core values	0.8333
ILRI	7	Consistency	Core values	0.5000
ILRI	8	Consistency	Core values	0.5000
ILRI	9	Consistency	Core values	0.4333
ILRI	10	Consistency	Core values	0.5667
ILRI	11	Consistency	Core values	0.5667
ILRI	12	Consistency	Core values	0.5000
ILRI	13	Consistency	Core values	0.6000
ILRI	14	Consistency	Core values	0.6000
ILRI	15	Consistency	Core values	0.8667
ILRI	16	Consistency	Core values	0.6000
ILRI	17	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ILRI	18	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ILRI	19	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ILRI	20	Consistency	Core values	0.6000
ILRI	21	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ILRI	22	Consistency	Core values	0.5333
ILRI	23	Consistency	Core values	0.5333
ILRI	24	Consistency	Core values	0.4667
ILRI	25	Consistency	Core values	0.7000
ILRI	26	Consistency	Core values	0.5333
ILRI	27	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ILRI	28	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ILRI	29	Consistency	Core values	0.6333
ILRI	1	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ILRI	2	Involvement	Capability development	0.3000
ILRI	3	Involvement	Capability development	0.6667
ILRI	4	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ILRI	5	Involvement	Capability development	0.4667
ILRI	6	Involvement	Capability development	0.6667
ILRI	7	Involvement	Capability development	0.6667
ILRI	8	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ILRI	9	Involvement	Capability development	0.7333
ILRI	10	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ILRI	11	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ILRI	12	Involvement	Capability development	0.4667
ILRI	13	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ILRI	14	Involvement	Capability development	0.7667
ILRI	15	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ILRI	16	Involvement	Capability development	0.4667
ILRI	17	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ILRI	18	Involvement	Capability development	0.5000
ILRI	19	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ILRI	20	Involvement	Capability development	0.5667
ILRI	21	Involvement	Capability development	0.7333
ILRI	22	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ILRI	23	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ILRI	24	Involvement	Capability development	0.6000
ILRI	25	Involvement	Capability development	0.6333
ILRI	26	Involvement	Capability development	0.5333
ILRI	27	Involvement	Capability development	0.7000
ILRI	28	Involvement	Capability development	0.5333
ILRI	29	Involvement	Capability development	0.8333
ILRI	1	Involvement	Empowerment	0.9000
ILRI	2	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ILRI	3	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7333
ILRI	4	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6667
ILRI	5	Involvement	Empowerment	0.5667
ILRI	6	Involvement	Empowerment	0.9333
ILRI	7	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ILRI	8	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8333
ILRI	9	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ILRI	10	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ILRI	11	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6667
ILRI	12	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ILRI	13	Involvement	Empowerment	0.5667
ILRI	14	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8333
ILRI	15	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7333



ILRI	16	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ILRI	17	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ILRI	18	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ILRI	19	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6667
ILRI	20	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ILRI	21	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ILRI	22	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ILRI	23	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ILRI	24	Involvement	Empowerment	0.6000
ILRI	25	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8000
ILRI	26	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7000
ILRI	27	Involvement	Empowerment	0.7667
ILRI	28	Involvement	Empowerment	0.8333
ILRI	29	Involvement	Empowerment	0.5000
ILRI	1	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8000
ILRI	2	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6667
ILRI	3	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ILRI	4	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6000
ILRI	5	Involvement	Team orientation	0.3333
ILRI	6	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8000
ILRI	7	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6333
ILRI	8	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5667
ILRI	9	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5000
ILRI	10	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6000
ILRI	11	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7667
ILRI	12	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6667
ILRI	13	Involvement	Team orientation	0.4000
ILRI	14	Involvement	Team orientation	0.9333
ILRI	15	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5333
ILRI	16	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6667
ILRI	17	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6667
ILRI	18	Involvement	Team orientation	0.8333
ILRI	19	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7000
ILRI	20	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5667
ILRI	21	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6000
ILRI	22	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5333
ILRI	23	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7333
ILRI	24	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6667
ILRI	25	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6667
ILRI	26	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7333
ILRI	27	Involvement	Team orientation	0.7667
ILRI	28	Involvement	Team orientation	0.6667
ILRI	29	Involvement	Team orientation	0.5333
ILRI	1	Mission	Goals and objectives	1.0000
ILRI	2	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.4333
ILRI	3	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.1667
ILRI	4	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ILRI	5	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.5333
ILRI	6	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8667
ILRI	7	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ILRI	8	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ILRI	9	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.3333
ILRI	10	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.5333
ILRI	11	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ILRI	12	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6333
ILRI	13	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8000
ILRI	14	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7333
ILRI	15	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6667
ILRI	16	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.5000
ILRI	17	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ILRI	18	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.9000
ILRI	19	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6333
ILRI	20	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6000
ILRI	21	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.8667
ILRI	22	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6333
ILRI	23	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ILRI	24	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.6333
ILRI	25	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ILRI	26	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7000
ILRI	27	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.5333
ILRI	28	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.7667
ILRI	29	Mission	Goals and objectives	0.4667
ILRI	1	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ILRI	2	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6333
ILRI	3	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.3333
ILRI	4	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7333
ILRI	5	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.5000
ILRI	6	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.9000
ILRI	7	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ILRI	8	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ILRI	9	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ILRI	10	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ILRI	11	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6333
ILRI	12	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.5333
ILRI	13	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7333
ILRI	14	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8000

ILRI	15	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8000
ILRI	16	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ILRI	17	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ILRI	18	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7333
ILRI	19	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.5667
ILRI	20	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ILRI	21	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ILRI	22	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.5667
ILRI	23	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ILRI	24	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ILRI	25	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.8667
ILRI	26	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6667
ILRI	27	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7000
ILRI	28	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.7667
ILRI	29	Mission	Strategic direction and intent	0.6000
ILRI	1	Mission	Vision	0.7667
ILRI	2	Mission	Vision	0.3000
ILRI	3	Mission	Vision	0.1667
ILRI	4	Mission	Vision	0.3667
ILRI	5	Mission	Vision	0.5333
ILRI	6	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ILRI	7	Mission	Vision	0.5333
ILRI	8	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ILRI	9	Mission	Vision	0.4333
ILRI	10	Mission	Vision	0.6000
ILRI	11	Mission	Vision	0.6333
ILRI	12	Mission	Vision	0.5000
ILRI	13	Mission	Vision	0.6333
ILRI	14	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ILRI	15	Mission	Vision	0.6333
ILRI	16	Mission	Vision	0.5667
ILRI	17	Mission	Vision	0.6000
ILRI	18	Mission	Vision	0.8333
ILRI	19	Mission	Vision	0.6000
ILRI	20	Mission	Vision	0.5333
ILRI	21	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ILRI	22	Mission	Vision	0.6000
ILRI	23	Mission	Vision	0.7000
ILRI	24	Mission	Vision	0.6000
ILRI	25	Mission	Vision	0.6667
ILRI	26	Mission	Vision	0.5667
ILRI	27	Mission	Vision	0.6000
ILRI	28	Mission	Vision	0.6333
ILRI	29	Mission	Vision	0.5667