IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS OF FREE PRIMARY EDUCATION STRATEGY IN KENYA (2003 – 2006)

SHISANYA JAEL PARIS

A MANAGEMENT RESEARCH SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (MBA)

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

2006

DECLARATION

I the undersigned declare that this research project is my original work and has not been submitted to any college, institution or university other than the University of Nairobi for academic purposes.

Signed_____ Date 27/11/06

JAEL SHISANYA

D61/P/8442/01

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

Signed:_____ Date: 27/11/2006

Mr JACKSON MAALU

Lecturer: Department of Business Administration

School of Business Studies, University of Nairobi.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research project to my dear parents for the foundation they laid for me.

A special dedication to my beloved husband Mararu, my children Ingahizu, Ravoga and Mbuya for their patience during the period I was constrained of time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A piece of work of this scope and magnitude is of necessity an out put come effort. Without doubt many individuals and institutions contributed in diverse ways to the success of the work although it is not possible to remember and mention all of them. All those who however participated I have the pleasure to thank them with humidity and sincerity.

I wish to extend my appreciation to my supervisor, my family (who provided me with moral support and guidance), colleague's, friends and all those who contributed tremendous input towards the completion of this research project.

Special thanks to my supervisor Mr. Maalu for his tireless assistance and support on the project supervision, experience and initiatives, which guided me through, out the entire research.

Finally to the almighty God for His Grace that was sufficient for me throughout the study period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

ASAL	Arid and Semi Arid Lands
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
DEO	District Education Officer
ERS	Economic Recovery Strategy
FPE	Free Primary Education
HIV/AIDS	Human Immuno Deficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency syndrome
KANU	Kenya African National Union
KESSP	Kenya Education Sector Support Programme
MOE	Ministry Of Education
NARC	National Rainbow Coalition
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
UPE	Universal Primary Education

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the Study was to examine the implementation process of the 2003 - 2006 Free Primary Education policy strategy and to establish factors which have influenced its implementation process.

The outcome of the study is intended to influence practical value to mangers confronted with implementation of abrupt changes in strategy in the public sector. It is hoped that the observations of actual managerial practices could form a basis for further development of knowledge by the other researchers concerning public organizations' implementing strategies.

Descriptive survey was used in the study. The population was derived from District Education Officers (DEO'S) within the Ministry of Education. This was a survey on a population of 78 District Education Officers. A total of 60 District Education Officers responded to the questionnaires.

Primary data was collected using structured questionnaires and data was analysed using percentages and weighted averages while data presentation was made both descriptively and in tables.The study findings indicate that the DEO,s regarded the implementation of Free Primary strategy at their level as being successful.

From the findings, the overall performance is rated above average. It was noted that resource allocation and expertise of the strategy developers played a crucial role in the success of FPE. Communication and interpretation of the strategy plan were critical and were well implemented at district level. The Ministry set clear objectives for implementation and again this added to its success.

There is need for the District Education Officers to go through the policy documents critically. It was evident that they were not clear on the content within the policy documents.

Further research is required on the implementation of Free Primary Policy at lower levels i.e. divisional level and school levels. These are very crucial stakeholders in the implementation of the strategy.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Overwhelming majority of the literature has been on the formulation side of the strategy and only lip service has been given to the other side of the coin, namely strategy implementation (Alexander, 1985). Consequently, organizations are still facing major difficulties during the implementation process. Organizations are likely to experience even more complex challenges in future because of changes in global economies, competition and the nature of knowledge. Morgan, (1988) say, for like surfers, managers and their organizations have to ride on a sea of change that can twist and turn with all the power of the ocean. Managers of the future would have to ride this turbulence with increasing skill, and many more competencies will be required (Morgan, 1988).

There are two approaches to consider in competitive decision-making – the science and the art. It seems easier to apply the scientific approach in strategic decision-making, but research literature tends to indicate that to make the strategies more effective, application of the art approach may be the essential one (Wu et al, 2004).

Noble, (1999) having focus on process of implementation defines strategy implementation as communication, interpretation, adoption and enactment of strategic plans. For strategy to work, studies suggested that implementation guidelines should apply to the following four areas: Linking Strategy to Performance; Communication and Incentives; Organisational Structure and lastly Tools and Techniques used to effect the transition from strategy to action.

According to Wu and colleagues (2004), strategic implementation is a process of transforming strategic interventions into actions. Implementation of the chosen strategy is by any measure one of the most vital phases in decision-making process. It embraces those actions that are necessary to put the strategy into practice (Kiruthi, 2001). Strategies

are merely statements of intend and therefore cannot lead to action. Strategies are not necessarily the result of strategic management process. They are however realised during the implementation process. It is at the implementation stage that management translates strategies and policies into actions through the development of programs, budgets and procedures (Kiruthi, 2001).

Successful implementation is as critical and difficult as the strategic choice. It needs consideration of the resources to be used, human resources requirements, the structure systems and other changes. Competency in implementation and the ability to put ideas into action can be an organizations source of competitive advantage. An alteration of existing procedures of policies is usually unavoidable during strategy implementation. It also requires a shift in responsibility from strategist to divisional and functional managers to ensure effective implementation. Those actively involved in the strategy implementation should also be actively involved in the strategy formulation to ensure ownership of the process.

Implementation of strategic change as a reaction to the influences of external changes, or in anticipation of such changes, very often fails in operational practice.

The reasons for this lack of success in implementation can be subdivided into four barriers: *management barrier* reflects the problem that the focus of management activities is dealing with daily business, not discussing new strategies; *vision barrier* arises when visions and strategies are not communicated to the employees in a comprehensible way; *resource barrier* means that resources are not purposefully deployed for the implementation of the strategy and lastly the endeavour to secure *acceptance* of changes by all employees as a whole usually fails (Pfeifer et al, 2005).

1.1.1 Public Sector Management

The history of the public sector in many different parts of the world is one of hierarchchical, bureaucracies that grew in size and scope considerably until the 1980's. The context and influences impinging on strategy in the public sector differ from those in the private sector. These include; less exposure to market pressure, a great need to conform to statutory and other formal regulations, responsibilities of managers to different stakeholders, great emphasis on net public welfare and in some cases different core objectives.

Public sector management is diverse in content. The managers are responsible of ensuring the production of both private and public value. They produce value for a more complex cast of actors within their environments. Thus public manager faces a more authorising environment than a market one, which is often turbulent (Moore, 1995). This authorising environment is normally short – term in nature because of the electoral cycle. It is also notable that the public sector management use more diverse resources. They use legitimate authority of state as well as money in order to carry out tasks (Moore, 1995). The more an organization is to vagaries of the authorising environment, the more it is difficult to establish and hold to a long-term direction especially in the context of electoral cycles. Thus government departments will be less able to maintain a long-term direction. Strategy as position or scope is affected by the 'publicness' of an organization. Core government enterprises will more likely need to look to the political environment to signal the appropriate positioning. It is the political system that determines the scope of performance. Strategy fit is conceived as whether the organization's purpose attracts permission and resources from the authorising environment. This can be achieved by internal as well external capabilities of the organization. There is often a trade off between what is valuable for the public and what is acceptable to those who have predominant influence in the political environment since the two are not necessarily

synonymous in a world of uniquely distributed wealth and power. Thus care must be taken to ensure that the value created is both politically acceptable and operationally feasible (Moore, 1995).

Logical incrementalism as a process for strategy suites the ambiguity, uncertainty and changeability of purely public situation (Johnson and Scholes 2001). It offers a lot in terms of description and prescription. If political environment changes then managers need to change track to accommodate the changes. Visions are tentative, more like drafts than final documents. Strategy development in this case is open ended.

1.1.2 Historical account of Free Primary Education in Kenya

Kenya has made significant strides in its education sector. These have been driven by the desire to harness the benefits that accrue from education. The attainment of independence in Kenya marked the beginning of bigger challenges for the new government. The pressure to provide learning opportunities for Africans was so compelling that Kenya African National Union (KANU) government made education one of its top priorities in its first manifesto. It committed itself to providing seven years of free primary education taking cue from the 1961 Addis Ababa conference which committed African countries to achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) by 1980 (Raju, 1963). Immediately a commission of inquiry was set to look into the country's education system. This was the Kenya Education Commission (Republic of Kenya 1964) under the chairmanship of Simon Ominde. This provided the policy direction for Kenya 's Education sector. This commission however emphasised on higher education. It cannot be an overstatement to state that the government thus far reneged on its promise for seven years of free primary education in the 1963 KANU manifesto.

In the 1969 election manifesto the party again re-echoed its commitment to providing seven years of free primary education. It was emphasized that it was the KANU

Government's guiding principle to give priority in educational programmes to areas which were neglected during the colonial rule so that every Kenyan could share fully both in the process of nation building and in enjoying the fruits of government labour.

In 1971, a presidential decree abolished tuition fees for the districts with unfavourable geographical conditions since these were said to make the populations in these areas poor. These included such areas as North-Eastern Province, the districts of Marsabit, Isiolo and Samburu in Rift Valley Province; Turkana, West Pokot, Baringo, Narok, Elgeyo-Marakwet and Olkejuado in Rift Valley Province, as well as Tana River and Lamu in Coast Province (Sifuna, 1990). A second presidential decree on 12 December 1973 during the celebration of the so-called "Ten Great Years of Independence" claimed to have brought the country close to achieving "universal free primary education." The directive provided free education for children in standards I-IV in all districts of the country. It went further and provided a uniform fee structure for those in standards V-VII in the whole country. This fee was Kshs. 60/- per child per annum. Subsequent directives went further and abolished school fees in primary education.

The aim of the Free Primary Education programme was to provide more school opportunities, especially for the poor communities. The argument was that the payment of school fees tended to prevent a large proportion of the children from attending school. The presidential decree providing free education in the early classes was one of the most dramatic political pronouncements of the Kenyatta era since it took planners and the public unaware. The financial implications as well as the various methods for its introduction were not subjected to close scrutiny.

In January 1974, the Ministry of Education had to rethink its priorities in order to cope with the staggering rise of pupil enrolment. Enrolment in standard one rose by a million above the estimated figure of about 400,000. The total enrolment figure for standards one

to six increased from 1.8 million in 1973 to nearly 2.8 million in January 1974.At the time of the abolition of school fees no counter measures were announced about how to replace the lost revenue. Initially, primary schools were at a loss as to what they could do about this lost revenue, and after failing to get clear directives, school management committees resorted to raising school revenue under the guise of a "building levy." Ostensibly this was aimed at putting up new facilities. With the enlarged enrolment, a countrywide building programme had to be launched to cope with extra classes. Many schools were not aware of the new places needed. In some schools as many as five extra streams came into being. The building levy varied from one district to another, but in most cases, it turned out to be higher than the school fees charged prior to the decree. This frustrated many parents who had little alternative but to withdraw their children.

Initially, in most districts, except those in the ASAL (Arid and Semi-Arid Lands), enrolments almost doubled showing a radical change during the 1973-74 period. After that the situation reverted to what it had been before. It was estimated that around one to two million school age children did not continue attending school after the decree. The explanation was that many of the children who had enrolled dropped out, following the introduction of the building levy. Enrolments, even in districts that had experienced large infusions of new children, reverted to the situation before 1973. The high drop out rates was a response, not only to the very high levies, but also to the quality of education that was being offered following the government intervention. As a result of high enrolments, there was overcrowding in classes and the supply of teaching and learning materials underwent a severe strain.

Consequently, many of the schools went without basic teaching and learning materials for a greater part of 1974. The newly instituted building fund, which was meant to be a purely spontaneous reaction to an emergency, became a permanent feature. Beyond the

recruitment of more unqualified teachers, the government played a very minor role in the implementation of "free primary education." If anything, it was quite satisfied that school committees had successfully implemented the programme with minimal cost on its part. Overall, the effect of government intervention in primary education and the implications arising out of it made primary education much more expensive than before (Sifuna, 1990) In 1978, President Moi on assuming office, abolished fees at all levels in primary schools. Gross enrolment level rose to over 100% for both boys and girls (Common wealth Education Fund – 2003). This led to the same old problem of overcrowding in the classrooms, teachers overwhelmed and teaching and learning resources overstretched thus undermining the quality of education. The structural adjustment programmes introduced in the 1980's led to drastic reduction in the enrolment of many children, especially from economically marginalized areas due to cost sharing. Thus donor policy constraints, flawed education policies and political will led to the collapse of the then 'Free Primary education'.

During the 2002 general elections, the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) made the provision of free primary education part of its election manifesto. Following its victory, on January 6, 2003 the Minister for Education (MOE) launched the Free Primary Education (FPE) to fulfil NARC's election pledge. This marked the third attempt to F.P.E in trying to achieve education for all goals by 2005. In implementing F.P.E, the government provides grants to schools for buying teaching and learning materials, repairs and maintenances besides paying for teachers' salaries (MOEST, September 2003). To provide guidance, a taskforce was set up in January 2003 to make recommendations on the FPE implementation. This was followed by a National conference on education and training in November 2003.

However, while free primary education has increased participation, it has at the same time created considerable challenges. It has exacerbated the problem of teaching and learning

facilities. As a result of the high influx of new pupils, classrooms are congested. Many of the preliminary surveys seem to show that the existing facilities make a mockery of the free education programme. Many school management committees feel that they are seriously constrained to improve the state of learning facilities due to the government's ban on school levies. At the same time, conditions laid down to request for concessions to institute levies are so cumbersome that they hesitate to embark on the process (Sifuna, 2003).

As a result of the free primary education, the situation of the teaching force in most of the districts is generally bad. Teachers complain of increased pupil teacher ratios. This does not augur well for the quality of education being delivered. Many school management committees are of the opinion that as a result on the ban of levies, they are unable to recruit extra teachers through the Parents Teachers Association (PTAs) and this has also seriously affected the pre-school units. Ironically, these problems are contributing to high school drop out rates, just as they did during the 1974 free primary education intervention.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

Education investment is an investment in human capital, which is a key determinant of economic growth. Sustainable development is only possible if there is critical mass of skilled people. Education can reduce social and economic inequality and therefore an important strategy. Government involvement in education and training is therefore justified on the basis that human capital has large social returns.

The implementation of FPE, like similar interventions by previous governments, has been a matter of political expediency rather than a well thought out and planned reform. Following the NARC intervention in January 2003, it was estimated that the Net Enrolment Ratio rose from around 6,314,726 to 7,614,326 by the end of the year,

representing a 22.3% increase nationally. It was also estimated that another 3 million children were not enrolled in school. Despite the various logistical problems that seem to be hampering a successful implementation of the FPE, the policy sounds commendable as it has meant cushioning children from poor socio-economic backgrounds, especially girls from failing to participate in primary education or dropping out of school due to lack of fees and other school levies. Overall, the policy intervention could prove determinative in the efforts to achieve Universal Primary Education and Education For All. However, while free primary education has increased participation, it has at the same time created considerable problems. It has exacerbated the problem of teaching and learning facilities. As a result of the high influx of new pupils, classrooms are congested. Many school management committees feel that they are seriously constrained to improve the state of learning facilities due to the government's ban on school levies. At the same time, conditions laid down to request for concessions to institute levies are so cumbersome that they hesitate to embark on the process (Sifuna, 2003).

As a result of the free primary education, there are several challenges relating to equity and access. The facilities are overstretched, overcrowding in schools, high pupil teacher ratio, and high cost of special equipment, diminishing community support, gender regional disparity and increased number of orphans due to HIV/AIDS. Ironically, these problems are contributing to high school drop out rates, just as they did during the 1974 free primary education intervention. They have also seriously affected the inflow of pupils in primary education in the second year of FPE implementation. Districts that registered over 20% increase in enrolment in 2003, hardly recorded more than 5% of standard one enrolment this year.

Most of the logistical problems bedevilling the implementation of free primary education intervention, such as lack of facilities and teachers, are well known to the educational administrators in the country. But due to the "culture of fear and silence" inculcated by

the former KANU regime, coupled by an inept administration at the M.O.E headquarters, the official rhetoric is that the FPE is working smoothly.

The strategy planning process in the public sector is treated with groans rather than cheers. It is seen as a chore to meet legal requirements rather than something that is to re-energise and refocus the organization. Implementation of strategy in the public sector is therefore quite challenging. Managers face an authorising environment, which is often turbulent and short lived (Moore, 1995). Thus, government departments are less able to hold on to a long-term direction and that the political system determines the scope of the strategy. There is always a trade off between what is valuable for the public and what is acceptable to those who have predominant influence in the political environment. If political environment expectations or capabilities change, then the manager needs to change to accommodate this change. Visions are tentative in the public sector and change here is more complex (Heifetz, 1994).

Studies have been carried out on the public sector. Kango'ro (1998) studied the state of management practice in the public sector organizations in Kenya concentrating on aspects of strategy formulation as opposed to strategy implementation. Koske (2003) concentrated on the implementation of strategy in a public cooperation the case of Telkom Kenya while Mwambua (2004) sort to find out factors influencing strategy implementation by international Non - governmental organizations operating in Kenya. These studies did not focus on strategy implementation in a Government Ministry.

This research project will endeavour to answer pertinent questions on strategy implementation in the public sector, specifically within a government ministry.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

I. To examine the implementation process of the 2003 Free Primary Education policy strategy.

II. To establish factors which have influenced the implementation process of the 2003 Free Primary Education strategy.

1.4 Significance of the study

- This work seeks a theory of practical value to mangers confronted with implementation of abrupt changes in strategy in the public sector.
- It is hoped that the observations of actual managerial practices can form a basis for further development of knowledge by the other researchers concerning public organizations' implementation of strategy.
- It can be of interest to stakeholders at the Ministry of Education as they will be able to understand the education activities at the district level.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Concept of Strategy

Strategies are at ends and these ends concern the purpose and objectives of the organization. They are the things that businesses do, the paths they follow and the decisions they take in order to reach certain points/ level of success (Thompson, 2001). Accordingly Mintzberg and Quinn (1998) identified four interrelated definitions of strategy as plan, perspective, pattern and position.

As *plan* it is some sort of consciously intended course of action, a guideline to deal with a situation. As a *pattern* it integrates an organizational major goals policies and actions sequences into a cohesive whole. Strategy as a *position* -it becomes a mediating force or match between the organizations and its external and internal environment. Strategy as a position looks outside the organization seeking to locate the organization in the external environment and place it in a concrete position (Mintzberg and Quinn 1998).

Strategy as a *perspective* looks at the inside of the organization. In this respect it is a concept, a perspective shared by the members through their intentions and actions.

2.2 Strategy Management

Strategic management includes understanding the strategic position, strategic choices for the future and turning strategy into action (Johnson and Scholes, 2003). Strategic management process enables an entity to predict its environment and shape its future. It has helped organizations to be more proactive than reactive in coping with changes within their external environment. Strategic management helps organizations focus on their competitive efforts, be more effective in resource allocation and identifying their key success factors. This ensures that organizations are looking at long-term implications of their plans and hence creating a culture of a learning organization.

Strategic Management is thus seen as a comprehensive and on going management process aimed at formulating and implementing effective strategies. An effective strategy is one that promotes a superior alignment between the organization and its environment and the achievement of strategic goals.

Porter (1980) ascertains the value of strategic management to any organization is to provide a central purpose to the activities of the organization, the people who work in it (internal environment) and often the world outside (external environment). This can be summarized as the organization vision, mission and objectives.

2.3 Strategy Implementation

Strategy implementation are methods by which strategies are operationalised or executed within the organization. It focuses on the process through which strategies are achieved.Implementing strategies successfully is vital for any organization, either public or private. Without implementation, even the most superior strategy is useless. Strategy implementation involves: allocation of sufficient resources (financial, personnel, time, computer system support) ;establishing a chain of command or some alternative structure (such as cross functional teams);assigning responsibility of specific tasks or processes to specific individuals or groups; managing the process which includes monitoring results, comparing to benchmarks and best practices, evaluating the efficacy and efficiency of the process, controlling for variances, and making adjustments to the process as necessary (Wu et al, 2004).

Noble, (1999) makes distinctions between structural and interpersonal process views on strategic implementation. The structural perspective focuses on formal organizational structures and control mechanism, while the interpersonal process is about understanding issues like strategic consensus, autonomous strategic behavior, diffusion perspectives, leadership and implementation styles, communication and other interaction processes.

Researchers have revealed a number of problems in strategy implementation for example: weak management roles in implementation, a lack of communication, lacking a commitment to the strategy, unawareness or misunderstanding of the strategy, unaligned organizational systems and resources, poor coordination and sharing of responsibilities, inadequate capabilities, competing activities, and uncontrollable environmental factors (Alexander, 1991; Giles, 1991; Galpin, 1998; Lares-Mankki, 1994; Beer and Eisenstat, 2000).

In reality some strategies are planned and some strategies just emerge from the actions and decisions of organizational members. Planned strategy and realizing, or emergent strategy, evolve hand-in-hand and affect each other in the process of strategy implementation, where strategies are communicated, interpreted, adopted and enacted (Noble, 1999). Implementing strategies successfully is about matching the planned and the realizing strategies, which together aim at reaching the organizational vision. The components of strategy implementation – communication, interpretation, adoption and action – are not necessarily successive and they cannot be detached from one another.

Strategy formation and implementation is an on-going, never-ending, integrated process requiring continuous reassessment and reformation. A major part of staying ahead in the new business climate will depend on organizations having the capability to create and implement strategic and structural changes (Hitt et al, 1998). Organizations effective at strategic implementation successfully manage the six strategic supporting factors of Action planning, organization structures, human resources, annual business plan, monitoring and control and linkages.(Wu et al, 2004).

2.4 Strategy Implementation Process

In their search for sources of sustainable competitive advantage, researchers and industrialists have realized that business performance depends not only on the

formulation and successful implementation of a given strategy but also on the process by which competitive positions are created or maintained. While the strategic content explains superior performance at a given moment in time, the process by which organizations formulate and implement strategies is a prerequisite for a sustainable high level of business performance.

Johnson & Scholes (2002) argue that inventing any structure without formal and informal organization processes, organizations cannot work effectively. The process used in implementation of strategy can either hinder or help to translate strategy into action.

They include: *Direct supervision*; process commonly found in small organizations or large organizations experiencing little change and where business complexity is not too great for the managers to control from the centre (Feurer & Chaharbaghi, 1995). It may also be appropriate where there is a major change in a large business threatening the survival and so calling for autocratic control through direct supervision.

Planning and control system; successful implementation of strategy is achieved through systems that plan and control the allocation of resources and monitor their utilization (Feedman, 2003). Plan covers all parts of the organization showing clearly in financial terms the level of resources allocated at each unit as well as the detailed ways in which the resources were used. This is best where the degree of change is slow.

Performance Targets; relates to organization output such as product quality, price or its profits (Johnson & Scholes, 2002). Judgement is based on organizations ability to meet the targets though with specified boundaries. Appropriate where corporate centre controls the strategies and performance of business units to ensure that corporate objectives are achieved. Performance targets are measured using performance indicators. Balance scorecards are now used to identify key variables.

Market mechanism; formalised system for contracting for resources or outputs from other parts of the organizations and for supply outputs to other parts of the organization. It has been a dominant process through which organizations relate with their external suppliers, distributors and competitors in most sectors of free market economies. A successful process for supporting innovation in the organization.

Social/cultural process; particularly important in organizations facing complex and dynamic environment because the fostering of innovation is crucial to the survival of the organization. It is quite important for organization as they approach competition. However this can also create rigidity when it comes to change strategy since resistance to change may be legitimised by cultural norms.

Self-control and personal motivation; Managers should ensure that individuals have room for interaction such as Information Technology and Communication infrastructure and that the social process created by this interaction are properly regulated to avoid rigidities. For good performance individuals need support through necessary resources such as information (Freedman, 2003).

2.5 Operationalization of Strategy

Tasks of operationalizing, institutionalising and controlling strategy signal an important phase in translation of strategic thoughts into action. Annual objectives, functional strategies and specific policies provide important means of communicating what must be done to implement the overall strategy. Koske, (2003) says annual objectives represent the basis for resource allocation and act as a mechanism for evaluating the manager therefore very important in an organization. They act as the major tool for monitoring progress and achievements of long-term objectives. Annual objectives establish the

organizations divisional and departmental priorities. They should therefore be supported by policies that are clearly stated.

Functional strategies are those short-term activities that each functional area within the firm must undertake in order to implement the grand strategy (Koske, 2003). They translate business grand strategy at the business level into action plans for organization subunits (Mumbua, 2004). They therefore must be consistent with the long-term objectives. Awino, (2000) says policies are specific guidelines, methods, rules, forms and administrative practices established to support and encourage work towards stated goals. These are instruments for strategy implementation.

2.6 Factors Influencing Strategy Implementation

Strategy content is quite important in determining the implementation. It stems from the developed strategy. Key areas to be considered are: the new strategy should be consistent with the overall strategic direction of the company; the aims of the new initiative should be clearly identified; the expertise and knowledge of strategy developers in managing change are crucial; active participation from all levels of management is recommended; the potential impact of ongoing and future projects on the new initiative should be considered; the potential impact of the new strategy on other ongoing strategic projects should be assessed (Okumus, 2003).

Strategic context is further divided into external and internal context. The former includes environmental uncertainty and the internal context includes organizational structure, culture and leadership. *Environmental uncertainty*: the degree of uncertainty and changes in the task and general environments. The main issues are: changes and developments in the general and task environments require a new strategy; the new strategy should be appropriate to the market conditions, trends and developments in the external environment until the implementation process is completed (Okumus 2003).

Internal context; Organizational structure: the shape, division of labour, job duties and responsibilities, the distribution of power and decision-making procedures within the company. Issues to be considered are: the potential changes in duties, roles, decision-making and reporting relationships due to the new strategy; whether the organizational structure facilitates the free flow of information, coordination and cooperation between different levels of management and functional areas; the potential impact of the new strategy on informal networks, politics and key shareholders; the attitude of powerful groups towards this new strategy; the potential challenges of using the existing organizational structure when using process variables including operational planning, communication and resource allocations (Okumus 2003).

Organizational culture: the shared understanding of employees about how they do things within an organization. Issues to be considered are: the company's culture and subcultures and their possible impact on the implementation process; the impact of organizational culture on communication, coordination and cooperation between different management and functional levels; the implications of the new strategy on the company's culture and subcultures; efforts and activities to change the company's overall culture and subcultures and potential challenges (Okumus, 2003).

Leadership: Leadership is crucial in using process factors and also in manipulating the internal context to create a context receptive to change. Key issues to be considered are: the actual involvement of the CEO in the strategy development and implementation process; level of support and backing from the CEO to the new strategy until it is completed; open and covert messages coming from the CEO about the project and its importance. (Okumus, 2003).

Organizational process includes operational planning, resource allocation, people, communication and control. *Operational planning* is the initiating of the project, and the

operational planning of the implementation activities and tasks. Operational planning has a great deal of impact on allocating resources, communicating, and providing training and incentives. Key issues to be considered are: preparing and planning implementation activities; participation and feedback from different levels of management and functional areas in preparing these operational plans and implementation activities; initial pilot projects and the knowledge gained from them; the time scale of making resources available and using them (Okumus, 2003).

Resource allocation is the process of ensuring that all necessary time, financial resources, skills and knowledge are made available. It is closely linked with operational planning and has a great deal of impact on communicating and on providing training and incentives. Key issues to be considered are: the procedures of securing and allocating financial resources for the new strategy; information and knowledge requirements for the process of implementing a new strategy; the time available to complete the implementation process; political and cultural issues within the company and their impact on resource allocation (Okumus 2003).

People involve recruiting new staff, providing training and incentives for relevant employees. Operational planning and resource allocation have a direct impact on this factor. Key issues to be considered are: the recruitment of relevant staff for the new strategy implementation; the acquisition and development of new skills and knowledge to implement the new strategy; the types of training activities to develop and prepare relevant managers and employees; the provision of incentives related to strategy implementation and their implications; the impact of company's overall human resource management policies and practices on implementing new strategies (Okumus, 2003).

Communication: the mechanisms that send formal and informal messages about the new strategy. The main issues are: operational plans, training programs and incentives can be

used as communication materials; the use of clear messages when informing relevant people within and outside the organization; the implications of using (or not using) multiple modes of communication (top-down, bottom-up, lateral, formal, informal, internal, external, one-time and continuous communication); the problems and difficulties related to communication and their actual causes; the impact of organizational structure, culture and leadership on selling the new strategy(Okumus, 2003).

Control and feedback: the formal and informal mechanisms that allow the efforts and results of implementation to be monitored and compared against predetermined objectives. The main issues are: formal and monitoring activities carried out during and after the implementation process; communication and operational plans are key to monitoring the process and providing feedback about its progress.

Outcome: the intended and unintended results of the implementation process, which can be tangible and intangible. Key issues to be considered are: whether the new strategy has been implemented according to the plan. If not, the reasons for this; whether predetermined objectives have been achieved. If not, the reasons for this; whether the outcomes are satisfactory to those involved in, and affected by, the process; whether the company has learned anything from the strategy implementation process (Okumus, 2003).

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study was a survey of the whole population of implementing officers at the district level (District Education Officers). It sought to examine the implementation process of the 2003 – 2006 FPE strategy and the factors that influenced that process. It was carried out at district level of the Ministry of Education administrative structure. The main reason for this level of implementation was because the Ministry of Education has decentralised its authority to the district level. Secondly implementation of Free Primary Education focused at the district level of the ministry and lastly the district level gives a national outlook of the FPE implementation process as all the districts in the country participated in the research.

3.2 Population of Study

Target population of interest in this study consisted of all district education officers within the country. The population was of 78 districts and Municipalities. This was because of the important role they play in implementation of policies in the country. Kenya Education is managed through a network that extends from the headquarters through the Provinces, District and Divisions and Zones. The DEO is the secretary to the district Education board whose functions are management of education services, teacher management; school audits; supervision of education programs; accounting for funds; quality assurance and resource mobilization. According to the Ministry of education, there are 78 districts and Municipalities

3.3 Data Collection

Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire. Research assistants were used to administer the questionnaires to the D.E.O's. This was to ensure that the questionnaires were administered to the right persons. The questionnaire was respondent to as the research assistant waited. This helped reduce incidences of none response and was to encourage clarification on the questions that were not clear.

The questionnaire consisted of four parts;

Part A – Sought to capture the respondents' profile.

Part B – Sought to determine the various strategy implementation practices.

Pat C – Sought to determine the effectiveness of various strategy implementation processes utilised in the implementation of FPE.

Part D – Sought to determine the extend to which certain factors such as strategic content and strategic context influenced the successful implementation of FPE.

Using ranges, the types of implementation processes used were measured. A likert scale was used to measure the factors that influenced the implementation process as per the table below.

Table 3.2 Measurement of factors influencing Implementation Process.

Range	Measurement
4.01 – 5.00	Well above average
3.01 – 4.00	Above average
2.01 – 3.00	About Average
1.01 – 2.00	Below average
1.00 and below	Not done

3.4 Data Analysis

Data collected in Part A was analysed using descriptive statistics. In particular tables were used to summarise respondents answers. Percentage of the respondents answers were determined to give the relative proportion of the respondents giving related answers. Section B, C and D were analysed using mean scores to determine the weighting of factor and processes. Standard deviation was used to determine statistical significance of the factors

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis, findings and discussions from the primary data that was gathered from respondents of the study.

The response rate was 77%.

4.2 Respondents Profile

In this section the profile of the respondents was noted in terms of their gender, education qualification, number of years one has been a District Education Officer and the number of years one has served as a District Education Officer in the district where the questionnaire was administered.

All these findings were analysed and presented.

4.2.1 Highest Education Level Achieved

Respondents were asked to indicate the highest education level they had achieved. This was required, as it would help the researcher understand whether success in implementation had anything to do with the level of education.

Table4. 2: Highest Education Level

Education Level	Number	Percentage
Master in Education	20	33%
Bachelor of Education	30	50%
Post Graduate Diploma In Education	10	17%
Totals	**60**	**100%**

Source: Research Information

Out of the 60 respondents 50 (83%) had a bachelor of Education degree as a base. 20 (33%) had gone ahead and acquired a Masters degree in Education. The findings reveal

that at least 100% of the respondents have the appropriate qualifications to manage the implementation of activities at the district headquarters

4.2.2 Number of years served as a D.E.O.

The researcher felt that the number of years served as a D.E.O, would have an Impact on the research findings. The respondents were required to indicate the number of years they have served in the capacity of District Education Officer.

Table 4.3: Number of Years Served as a D.E.O.

Years Served as a D.E.O (Yrs)	Number	Percentage
0 – 2	6	10%
3 – 5	42	70%
5 and Over	12	20
Total	60	100%

Source: Research Information.

From the above table it is evident that out of 60 respondents70% had served in the capacity of D.E.O for between 3- 5 years and 20% had served as D.E.O's for more than five years. It means that all the respondents are not new in their Jobs.

4.3 Implementation Process

The process by which organizations formulate and implement strategies is a prerequisite for a sustainable high level of business performance. Organizations can only work effectively with both formal and informal organizational process. Process used in implementation of strategy can either hinder or help translate strategy into action.

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which various processes were utilised in the implementation of F.P.E. The Implementation process was looked at from: Documentation of policy, contents of policy document and various implementation processes utilised. They were presented with a range in which they were to rank the

processes used in a four – point scale with 4 being very effectively utilised and 1 being not at all utilised.

4.3.1 Documentation of Policy for Implementation of FPE.

Documentation of policies supports an implementation. This is crucial for institutionalisation of the said Process and provides a road map for continuity.

Respondents were required to state whether the Ministry of education had a written policy document for implementation of F.P.E.

Results showed (100%) that there were policy documents for the implementation of F.P.E strategy. This showed that respondents were in possession of policy documents and were aware of the content there in. All the respondents (100%)were in agreement that the policy had been documented well enough. The government developed a sessional paper, which provided the legal framework for the ongoing sector reforms. This session paper provides guidelines that ensure every Kenyan has a right to education and training no matter his or her socio – economic status.

The respondents referred to the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) document as a policy document that supports the implementation of Free Primary Education. The KESSP document fits well within the broader framework of the national policy set out in the Economic recovery strategy (ERS) and domesticated in the Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005, on policy on education, Training and Research.

Each respondent (100%)said they had a copy of the KESSP document. A workshop was organised by the Ministry of Education where all DEO's were taken through the KESSP document. Other documents mentioned in support of the implementation of FPE were; the Education Sector review of September 2003, Education sector Strategic Plan of

November 2003, a report of the National Conference on Education and Training of March 2004 and National Action Plan on Education for All 2003 – 2015. This means that the Ministry of Education regards documentation, availability and possession of policy documents by implementer of the strategy as key to its success. These documents are referred to during implementation.

Asked to tick the strategic Implementation Factors covered in the policy documents; 100% of the respondents said the National Education Action Plan of 2003-2015 spells out the target objectives, strategies to be adopted in order to achieve the stated objectives, activities to be undertaken in addressing the objectives, performance indicators, implementing agencies, resources required and the time frame to work within.

The national plan of action is a departure of from the traditional way of planning for education from the centre. The plan is seen as proposing realistic, homegrown and practical interventions that will enhance the attainment of education for all goals and other international commitments in the respective districts and provinces countrywide.

4.3.2 Decision making Regarding Implementation Process

Decision on a particular process can influence the implementation.

Respondents were asked to state, who was involved in deciding the F.P.E implementation process.

100% of the respondents felt that the decision on implementation were done with consultations from development partners, senior Management team members at the headquarters and selected team members from the districts. They said that the implementation plan was participatory and was conducted through provincial, district level consultations involving stakeholders in education especially community leaders,

local NGO's, school Board of Governors, school committees, teachers, pupils/students and Education teams at District level.

Some of the respondents (70%) felt there was overwhelming influence of donors such as the World Bank in shaping the government policy agenda and therefore implementation process. However, planning and budgeting process, which is part of the implementation process, did not benefit from community and other civil society actors.

The government recognises the essence of participatory approach in decision-making. This is advantageous for strategy implementation since those implementing own the process and therefore support its success.

4.3.3 Type of Implementation Process Utilised.

Business performance not only depends on successful implementation of a given strategy but also on processes by which competitive positioning is created. Process used in implementation can either hinder or help translate strategy into action. The respondents were required to indicate the extend to which various implementation processes were utilised in implementation of F.P.E.

Table 4.4: Effective utilization of Implementation process

Implementation Process	Mean	Standard Deviation
Direct Supervision	3.75	0.437
Planning and Control	3.5	0.8
Performance Target	3.25	0.437
Market Mechanism	1.75	0.836
Social Cultural Process	2.5	0.504
Self Control and Personal Motivation	2.5	0.504

Source: Research Information.

The results showed that direct supervision scored 3.75, planning and control scored 3.5, performance targets scored 3.25, market mechanism scored 1.75, social cultural process scored 2.5 and self control and personal motivation scored 2.5. This meant that direct

supervision; planning and control and performance targets were regarded as effectively utilised. Market Mechanism with a standard deviation of 0.836 was least effectively utilised and as such was regarded as less important.

100% of the respondents felt that direct supervision as an implementation process has been utilised most in the implementation of FPE. However respondents from the Asal districts say, because of scarce resources they have not carried this out as effectively as it is supposed to be done. They say they have inadequate personnel and lack the adequate vehicles to move round doing supervision.

The respondents 100% also felt that there had been efforts implement education through planning and control. They referred to the National Action Plan on Education for All which flows from and integrates national and international efforts/goals towards achieving Education for all. This plan was developed through participatory approach from the grassroots. It provides a national approach to tackling the constraints and challenges facing the country in providing Education For All. Accordingly the plan spells out the target objectives, the strategies to be adopted in order to achieve stated objectives in the plan, activities to be undertaken in addressing the objectives, the performance indicators, implementing agencies, resources required to achieve the objectives set and the time frame within which to undertake the exercises.

It is therefore clear that the Ministry of education values planning and control hence the valuable time put into this process to ensure the success of FPE.

The respondents felt that the introduction of performance contracts at the Ministry of Education also played a big role in the implementation of FPE. The respondents (100%) said signing of performance contracts forced one to deliver accordingly hence the successful implementation of FPE.

Majority of respondents (90%) said they did not quite understand market mechanism. *Market mechanism* is a formalised system for contracting for resources or outputs from other parts of the organizations and for supply outputs to other parts of the organization. It has been a dominant process through which organizations relate with their external suppliers, distributors and competitors in most sectors of free market economies. In a country like Kenya where the Ministry of education is still a monopoly in the provision of education, this process has not been effectively utilised in the implementation of free primary education.

4.4 Factors that Have Influenced Implementation Process

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which various factors have influenced the implementation process of F.P.E. They were presented with a range in which they were to rank the factors in a point scale with 4 being very serious and 1 being not at all serious.

Table4. 5. Factors that have influenced implementation of FPE

Factors	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation
Expertise of Implementers	3.7	0.462
Active participation of Partners	2.8	0.75
Other ongoing projects	2.2	0.605
Environmental uncertainty	1.2	0.403
Organizational structure	3.5	0.504
Organizational Culture	3.5	0.460
Leadership	2.6	0.494
Operational planning	3.7	0.462
Resource allocation	4.0	0
Staffing/training	3.8	0.43
Control and feedback	2.7	0.462
Communication	3.4	1.21

Source: Research Information

Results showed that expertise of Implementers scored 3.7, Active participation of partners 2.8, other ongoing projects 2.2, Environmental uncertainty 1.2, Organizational culture 3.5, Organizational structure 3.5 Leadership 2.6, Operational planning 3.7, resource

allocation 4, Staffing/training 3.8, Control and feedback 2.7 and Communication 3.4.Communication, staffing and training, operational planning, organizational culture and expertise of developers were rated as having very seriously influenced the implementation of FPE. This meant that the Ministry of Education recognizes that these factors are important for the success of F.P.E and hence the need to consider them critically.

Strategy implementation of FPE therefore involved: allocation of sufficient resources (financial, personnel, time, computer system support) ;establishing a chain of command or some alternative structure (such as cross functional teams);assigning responsibility of specific tasks or processes to specific individuals or groups; managing the process which includes monitoring results, comparing to benchmarks and best practices, evaluating the efficacy and efficiency of the process, controlling for variances, and making adjustments to the process as necessary (Wu et al, 2004).

The government instituted capacity building programmes to ensure that education personnel and managers handling added responsibilities had adequate capacity in terms of managerial skills and facilitation tools to facilitate implementation of FPE. Headteachers and school committee members were trained on book keeping, procurement, text book selection and accounting systems. However acording to the respondents (80%) felt that the trainings concentrated on on financial issues but did not icooperate curriculum management. The main issues identified in relation to capacity building revolved around limited funding, capacity and commitment of implementers and training strategies. Capacity building efforts were scanty and inconsistent. The MOE made little effort to encourage coherance and synergy in various training programmes undertaken by different stakeholders, leading to duplication of efforts and resources.

Resource allocation is key to a succeful implementation of any strategy.Government expenditure increased by 20.8% due to the implementation of FPE and teachers salaries.

The manner in which the government collaborated with development partners to finance FPE programme, on the whole seemed quite commendable with a distinct break from the past, by the allocation of a sum of Kshs. 300 million for administering and monitoring its progress and implementation. This approach to a great extent encouraged the donor community to come to its aid in assisting in the financing of the programme. The World Bank, for instance, provided a grant of Kshs. 3.7 billion in June, 2003, while the British Government through its Department of International Development (DFID) gave a grant of Kshs. 1.6 billion to boost the programme. Other donors included, the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), which provided Kshs. 1.2 billion, the Swedish Government Kshs. 430 million, and UNICEF Kshs. 250 million among others (Commonwealth Education Fund and Elimu Yetu Coalition, 2003). The government capitation grant has made implementation abit easier.Currently the MOE gives Ksh. 1,020 per child per year to every school. However, this is not adequate. A survey carried out by the North Eastern Provincial directorate of education in 2003 to determine the unit cost of providing quality education revealed that the unit cost per child at Kshs 1020 is inadequate. An average of Kshs 1820.10 was found appropriate (Ngome 2006). This unit cost is much higher due to high poverty index, nomadism of inhabitants, vast distances between schools and urban areas, long spells of drought, poor infrastructure and scarce teaching and learning resources. The lower user charge grant is compromising education in these areas.

100% of the respondents felt that FPE needs more resources for additional teaching learning materials and physical facilities like classrooms, desks, and toilets. Urban areas in ASAL districts are overcrowded because they have better facilities than the rural schools. The most pertinent issue therefore is how to raise additional resources to support FPE programme putting in mind that the MOE gets the highest allocation of national resources; donors are already supporting the programme. Currently, the shortage of teachers to effectively manage FPE is one of the biggest challenges facing FPE programme. Respondents from Turkana, Wajir and Ijara districts said there was an acute shortage of teacher's and hence very low enrolment. This was attributed to the harsh climatic and deprived socio-economic environment that characterises ASAL districts.

It has been estimated that about 45, 000 additional teachers are required to manage the programme. However, since the introduction of FPE the MOE have employed only additional 12,000 teachers. The argument has been that the salary bill for the ministry is too high and has to come down. However, the dilemma is how to balance the cost of teachers, and the recurrent budget in general, and the requirement of teachers in primary schools.

To cope with the strain on the existing resources, the government of Kenya has actively encouraged the participation of the business community and other stakeholders in supporting the expansion of schools. The MOE has established a Universal Primary Education fund into which donations can be remitted.

Asked to comment on the KESSP coordination structures, 80% of them felt that this structure has facilitated sector wide stakeholders coordination through an education stakeholders forum and a national advisory council; Government coordination is

enhanced through inter-ministerial committees on education and training; Development partner coordination through a consultative GOK/partners committee; Ministry wide coordination through a KESSP steering committee and provincial and district coordination through provincial education boards and district education Boards

Lack of adequate information, education and communication of strategy was identified as a major hindrance to the success of FPE at district level. Respondents (60%), especially those from North Eastern, Eastern and Coast province felt there were inadequate policy documents at the district level. The process of communicating the key objectives and elements of UPE was characterised by issuance of conflicting circulars and Memos whose overall effect was confusion on the part of implementers (OxfamGB and ANCEFA, 2005).

However 100% of the respondents were in agreement that major stakeholders in Education in this case, parents teachers and school management committee members were first informed about FPE in the media during political campaigns for the 2002 general elections.30% of the respondents said the teachers in paticular learned of FPE from education officials and circulars issued by the MOE. Information provided however was vague on roes and responsibilities of various stakeholders

Interpretation of FPE to stake holders has remained a challenge. 100% of the respondents felt that although teachers, parents and pupils knew what FPE was all about, there was still confusion about the facts. Respondents from Municipalities/urban settings said parents were unwilling to contribute in any way to the education of their children yet the capitation of Kshs1020 was inadequate. The respondents felt that this in the long run would hinder the growth and redefinition of

the concept of free. With this misconception it will be difficult to mobilise resources from parents in favour of their children's education and the running of schools (UNESCO Assessment Report 2005).

100% of the respondents felt that FPE had been put into action. They were all in agreement that enrolment had increased tremendously especially at the beginning of 2003.

Asked to comment on the organizational culture as having influenced FPE implementation, 80% of the respondent felt the culture at the MOE has changed a lot for the better. The introduction of performance contracts has made the staff more responsive to issues within their mandates. However there was a general feeling that there is little coherence between various departments. Relationships between departments were marked by a sense of aloofness with some departments enjoying a considerable share of education ministry resources while others are continually under-funded. The uneven resource allocation tended to create tension within the various departments.

Control and feedback was rated as having mildly affected the implementation process of FPE. Lack of clear policies and legislations regarding the roles and responsibilities of school management committees, parents teachers associations and other stakeholders limits this factor. About 60% of the respondents said that although the governments systems of accountability and control for use of education funds were commendable, incidences were reported of head teachers who manipulated their SMCs into misappropriation of funds. In the ASAL districts respondents said that school committees did not understand government circulars and policies and therefore unable to provide strategic direction to schools.

As was noted earlier, monitoring and inspections was largely under funded, thus most schools were rarely inspected to promote accountability. Even when inspections are carried out, the reports were rarely shared with school committees and almost never with wider local community. Thus quality assurance and control do not encourage community participation in the affairs of the schools. The respondents felt that FPE is still dominated with government bureaucracy.

Leadership is crucial for the success of any policy. The leaders must be convinced that what they are implementing is viable and can work. The respondent (100%) felt that leadership at the headquarters of the MOE was superb. At the district level, District Education Board (DEB) manages the education activities with the District Commissioner heading the DEB and the District education officer as the secretary. 80% of the respondents felt that it made no sense to have an administrator such as the District Commissioner to head the DEB when he or she had little knowledge about education and only chairs the committee by reason of being the representative of the president in the district. Instead they felt Mayors and heads of county councils who are representatives of the people in a local authority should chair DEB's. 100% of respondents felt that the need to have professionalism in educational leadership even at the institutional level is crucial for the success of FPE implementation strategy. Educational development in Kenya has been a partnership between the government and communities, parents, international bilateral and multilateral donors, NGO's and private sector institutions. 60% of the respondents' felt that these partnerships have to a certain extent affected the implementation of FPE strategy. Respondent from North Eastern Province mentioned organizations such as Oxfam GB, UNICEF, and USAID among others as having plaid major roles in supporting government to achieve Education For All by 2015. In practice different partners sign memorandum of

understanding with MOE for their participation in specific projects. Respondents felt that there is need for the Education Act to entrench these representations in policy making and implementation institutions. This will give official recognition to the non-state providers/stakeholders in the education system.

Among other ongoing projects, school feeding programme in the ASAL district was mentioned as having sustained enrolment and school participation. 40% of the respondents (all from the ASAL districts) felt that FPE would not be successful without the school-feeding programme. A study by Ngome(2002) in Kajiado showed that the school feeding programme has been instrumental in inducing enrolment and sustaining participation particularly in the arid parts of the districts inhabited by nomadic pastoralists.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of the findings, discussions and conclusions drawn from the study. The chapter also provides interpretation of the results by comparing the theoretical background presented in chapter two. Limitations of the study, recommendations for further research and recommendations for policy and practice are also highlighted.

The results of the study were summarised in relation to two research objectives. The first objective was to examine the implementation process of the 2003 -2006 Free Primary Education policy strategy. And the second was to establish factors, which have influenced the implementation process of the 2003-2006 Free Primary Education strategy.

5.2 Implementation Process of 2003 -2006 F.P.E Strategy

Insight was drawn from availability of strategy implementation documents. From the results 100% of the respondents clearly indicated that the availability of several policy documents but in their draft form offer a lot of prescription on what should be done. According to Johnsn and Scholes (2001) Logical incrementalism as a process for strategy suites the ambiguity, uncertainty and changeability of purely public situation. It offers a lot in terms of description and prescription. If political environment changes then managers need to change track to accommodate the changes. Visions are tentative, more like drafts than final documents. Strategy development in this case is open ended.

Implementation of strategy in the public sector is quite challenging as managers face an authorising environment, which is often turbulent and short lived (Moore, 1995). Awino, (2000) says policies are specific guidelines; methods, rules, forms and administrative practices established to support and encourage work towards stated goals. These are instruments for strategy implementation. Documentation thus helps in perpetuation of the

strategy being implemented. This has a positive impact on the implementation of the Free Primary Education Strategy. It demonstrates ownership of the implementation process and minimises resistance.

The respondents were quite clear on the various implementation processes utilised in the implementation of F.P.E. Direct supervision had the highest mean of 3.70. This is true with the public sector. According to Heifetz (1994) change in the public sector is complex and he calls it a managerial task of 'mobilizing adaptive work'. It entails challenging others to confront uncomfortable realities, framing issues and providing environment within which deliberations can occur. They must therefore be supervised directly to ensure success.

Planning and control had the second highest mean of 3.50. This concurs with the argument that successful implementation of strategy is achieved through systems that plan and control the allocation of resources and monitor their utilization (Feedman, 2003).

Performance Targets had a mean score of 3.25, which is among the top three most effectively utilised by the Ministry of Education. This was recently introduced at the Ministry of Education where staff signed performance contracts with clearly spelt out deliverables. This concurs with Johnson and Scholes(2002) who state that this is appropriate where corporate centre controls the strategies and performance of business units to ensure that corporate objectives are achieved. Performance targets are measured using performance indicators.

The low rating of market mechanism (1.75) as a process may be explained by the fact that the M.O.E assumes monopoly in the provision of education and as such do not see the need of utilising this process effectively. It may be that Market mechanism has not been

well understood in the public sector. There is more concentration in areas that are clearly understood like direct supervision, planning and control.

Factors influencing the implementation process of F.P.E were drawn from respondents' own experience. Expertise of Implementers (3.7), Organizational culture (3.5), Organizational structure (3.5), Operational planning (3.7), Resource allocation (4.0) staffing and training (3.8) and communication (3.4) are seen as the factors that have had the greatest influence on the implementation process of FPE strategy. These factors are greatly interlinked that one affects the other. This is in agreement with (Okumu's 2003) that operational planning has a great deal of impact on allocating resources, communicating, and providing training and incentives and that the expertise and knowledge of strategy developers and implementers in managing change are crucial.

Strategy implementation involves: allocation of sufficient resources (financial, personnel, time, computer system support) ;establishing a chain of command or some alternative structure (such as cross functional teams);assigning responsibility of specific tasks or processes to specific individuals or groups; managing the process (which includes monitoring results, comparing to benchmarks and best practices, evaluating the efficacy and efficiency of the process, controlling for variances, and making adjustments to the process as necessary (Wu et al, 2004).

The Ministry of Education was aware that the organizational structure available was likely to hinder successful implementation of the strategy. It was on this strength that a lot of decentralisation was undertaken. The district headquarters have been empowered to implement FPE strategy with guidance from the Education headquarters' Jogoo House.

FPE's ability to match its resources, reward systems, policies, procedures and support systems with its strategic plans has led to its success. Operated under the NARC government, prevailing situation places the Ministry of Education under very lucrative position to be able to meet expectations in complex environment.

Koskei (2003) observed that the corporations in complex environments are more unpredictable and less stable. Objectives are ambiguous and less distinguishable and fluctuate in their order of priority depending on governments ever changing political agenda. In this case NARC has been committed to the success of FPE strategy.

5.3 Conclusion

Strategy implementation, no doubt appears to be the most difficult part of strategic planning process and many strategies fail at the implementation stage. It is clear that for an organization to successfully implement its strategy it must ensure the existence and alignment of all strategy supportive aspects of the organization. Alignment should not be done in piecemeal but wholesome.

Factors likely to affect strategy implementation are well covered in the policy document and therefore were factored into the implementation process.

The study has unearthed the attributes of strategy implementation process considered very important by implementers at the district level of the Ministry of Education. Resource allocation came out as the single factor most seriously affecting the implementation of FPE followed by staffing and training. Among the processes utilised in the implementation process, direct supervision emerged as best utilised.

It also revealed areas that respondents did not attach a lot of importance such as Environmental uncertainty (1.2). They felt that this factor has not greatly influenced the implementation of FPE. Market mechanism as a process was not effectively utilised with

the FPE implementation process. This could be attributed to greater political goodwill and leadership

5.4 Recommendations for Policies and Practices

For successful implementation of strategy in the public sector, there is need for implementers to understand the various implementation processes and when they can be appropriately utilised. It is also necessary for the public departments to understand the different factors that influence strategy implementation to ensure success.

5.5 Limitation of the study.

The DEO's were reluctant to respond to the questionnaire as they are playing it safe in their current positions. It made me make individual calls to convince them to respond to the questionnaire. This affected the quality and validity of some responses. Some DEO's did not return the questionnaires even after the telephone conversation.

5.6 Suggestions For Further

Although the research carried out an in-depth study of the implementation of FPE strategy in general at district level, it is important for further research to look at implementation at the school level. This may reveal different findings thus providing researchers with more information at that level.

A survey on the same could be conducted after this parliamentary period.

REFERENCES

Alexander, L.D (1985), "Successfully implementing strategic decisions", Long Range Planning, Vol. 18 No.3, pp.91-7.

Alexander, L.D (1991), "Strategy implementation: nature of the problem", International Review of Strategic Management, Vol. 2 No.1, pp.73-91.

Ansoff, H.I. and McDonnell E. J, (1990). Implementing Strategic Management, (Second Edition): Prentice Hall

Beer, M., Eisentat, R.A., Spector, B. (1990), "Why change programs don't produce change", Harvard Business Review, pp.158-66.

Beer, M, Eisenstat, R (2000), "The silent killers of strategy implementation and learning", Sloan Management Review, Vol. 41 No.4, pp.29-40.

Flynn, N. (1997). Public sector management. Prentice Hall, 1st Edition

Galbraith, J.R (1980), Strategy Implementation: The Role of Structure and Process, West Publishing Co, St Paul, MN,.

Galpin, T.J (1998), "When leaders really walk the talk: making strategy work through people", Human Resource Planning, Vol. 21 No.3, pp.38-45.

Giles, W.D (1991), "Making strategy work", Long Range Planning, Vol. 24 No.5, pp.75-91.

Hakes, C. (1999) The Public Sector Excellence handbook, Bristol Quality centre

Heifetz, R. (1994) Leadership without Easy Answers. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press

Hitt, A.M., Ricart, E.J., Nixon, D, R (1998) New Managerial Mindset: Organizational transformation and strategy implementation ISBN

Johnson, G and Scholes, K (2002). Exploring Public sector Strategy. London: Prentice Hall

Johnson, G and Scholes, K (1999) Exploring Corporate Strategy, 5th edn, London: Prentice Hall

Kangoro V (1999) The state of strategic management practices in the public sector orgs in Kenya. Unpublished MBA Project University of Nairobi

Kiruthi, J.N. (2001) The state of strategic Management practices in not- for- profit organizations. The case of public membership clubs in Nairobi
Unpublished MBA Project University of Nairobi

Koske, F. K. (2003) Strategy implementation and its challenges in public corporation: the case of Telkom Kenya limited, Unpublished MBA project University of Nairobi

Lares-Mankki, L (1994), *Strategy Implementation Bottlenecks: Identification, Analysis and Removal*, Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta,

Mbogo, M. (2003),A study of strategic Management Process in the Hybrid Private-Public organizations: The case of Kenya commercial Bank Limited. Unpublished MBA project, University of Nairobi

Mintzberg, H. and Quinn J.B. (1998) Reading Strategy process 3rd edn, Prentice hall Inc, Englewood Cliffs N. J.

Morgan, G. (1988) Riding the waves of change, Josey –Bass, Sanfrancisco, CA.

Moore, M (1995) Creating Public Value: Strategic management in Government, Cambridge, Harvard University Press M.A.

Mumbua, J. M. (2004) Factors influencing strategy implementation by International NGOs operating in Kenya Unpublished MBA project, University of Nairobi

NARC (2002): NARC Manifesto; Democracy and Empowerment, Nairobi

Noble, C.H (1999), "The eclectic roots of strategy implementation research", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 45 No.2, pp.119-34.

Okumus, F. (2003) "A framework to Implementation Strategies in Organizations," Management Decisions Vol.41, pp9, MCB University Press

Pfeiffer, Schmitt, Voigt, T. "Managing Change: Quality oriented design of Strategic Change process" TQM Magazine, Vol 17 number 4 2004 pp 297-308

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

Republic of Kenya (2004). National Action Plan on Education For all *(2003-2005)*, government printers, Nairobi

Thompson, J.L. (1996), Strategic management: Awareness and change, 2nd edn, Chapman publications, London

Whittington, R. (2001), What is strategy and does it matter? Thomson Learning, London.

Wu et al, (2004) 'A Strategy Implementation as expressed through Sun Tzu's principles of war,' Industrial Management and Data Systems Vol. 104 No. 5, pp396 - 408

ANNEX 1

DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer this question with respect to this district.

Name and address of the district headquarters:

_____

_____

A. YOUR PERSONAL DETAILS

A1. GENDER: Male___1 Female___2

A2. What is your highest education qualification? _____

A3. Please state how many years you have been a District Education Officer *(If less than 1 year, put 0)*: _____years

A4. Please state how many years you have been a District Education Officer in this District *(If less than 1, put 0)*:_____years

B. STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES

B1. Does the Ministry of Education Science and Technology have a written policy document for implementation of Free Primary Education?

Yes___1 No ___2 Don't Know ___3

If No or don't know please go to question B2

If Yes,

a) Do you have access to this document?

Please tick one box

Yes, have my own copy	___1
Yes, at the Ministry headquarters'	___2
Have seen it but do not know where it is kept	___3
Have never seen it	___4
Other reply, Please specify	___5

_____

b) What strategic Implementation factors does it cover?

Please tick in one box in each row

	Yes	No	Don't Know
1. Action planning	___1	___2	___3
2. Organization structure	___1	___2	___3
3. Human Resources	___1	___2	___3
4. Annual Business Plan	___1	___2	___3
5. Budgets	___1	___2	___3
6. Monitoring and Control	___1	___2	___3
7. Linkage	___1	___2	___3
8. Other issues	___1	___2	___3

Please specify:

_____

_____

c) Does the current policy adequately support the organization strategic plan of free primary education?

Yes_____1 No _____2 Don't Know _____3

Please explain:

_____

_____

B2. Who was involved in deciding the Free Primary Implementation strategy?

Please tick one box in each row

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Senior Management team	___1	___2	___3
2. Selected team at the headquarters	___1	___2	___3
3. Consultants	___1	___2	___3
4. Development partners	___1	___2	___3
5. Other, Please specify	___1	___2	___3

_____

B3. Does the Ministry of Education Science and Technology have set out annual objectives for implementation of free primary education?

Yes_____1 No _____2 Don't know _____3

If No or don't know, please go to B4.

If yes, who was involved in the development of the objectives?

Please tick one box in each row

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Senior management	____1	___2	___3
2. Selected team at the headquarters	____1	___2	___3
3. Consultants	____1	___2	___3
4. Development Partners	____1	___2	___3
5. Other Please specify	____1	___2	___3

_____

_____

B4. Does the Ministry of Education Science and Technology have a functional strategy for implementation of free primary education?

Yes _____1 No ____2 Don't know ____3

If No or don't know, please go to B5.

a) If yes, where was it derived from?

Please tick one box in each row

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Organization strategic plan	___1	___2	___3
2. Stakeholder feedback	___1	___2	___3
3. Management teams	___1	___2	___3
4. Development partners directives	___1	___2	___3
5. Other Please specify	____1	___2	___3

_____

b) Does the Ministry refer to strategic plans when planning and executing activities for free primary education?

Yes _____1 No ____2 Don't know ____3

C. STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

C1. How effective have the following process been used in the implementation of free primary education strategy?

Please tick one box in each row

	Not at all	mild	moderate	very effective
1. Direct supervision	___1	___2	___3	___4

2. Planning and control	___1	___2	___3	___4
3. Performance targets	___1	___2	___3	___4
4. Market mechanisms	___1	___2	___3	___4
5. Social cultural process	___1	___2	___3	___4
6. Self-control and personal Motivation	___1	___2	___3	___4

D. FACTORS AFFECTING STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

D1. How well have the following components of strategy implementation been articulated in free primary education?

Please tick one box in each row

	Well Above average	Above average	About average	Below average	Not done
1. Communication	___5	___4	___3	___2	___1
2. Interpretation	___5	___4	___3	___2	___1
3. Adoption	___5	___4	___3	___2	___1
4. Action	___5	___4	___3	___2	___1

D2. Please indicate whether or not the following factors have influenced the implementation of free primary education and how serious they are.

Please tick one box in each row

	Not at all	Mild	Fairly serious	Very serious
Strategy content				
1. Expertise of developers	___1	___2	___3	___4
2. Active participation Of developers	___1	___2	___3	___4
3. Other ongoing projects	___1	___2	___3	___4
Strategy Context				
4. Environmental uncertainty	___1	___2	___3	___4
5. Organizational culture	___1	___2	___3	___4
6. Leadership	___1	___2	___3	___4
Organizational process				
7. Operational planning	___1	___2	___3	___4
8. Resource allocation	___1	___2	___3	___4

9. Staffing/Training ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4

10. Control and feedback___1 ___2 ___3 ___4

D.3 How would you rate the seriousness of these problems in the implementation of free primary education?

Please tick one box in each row

	Not a Problem	Mild problem	Fairly serious	Very serious Problem
1. Poor leadership style	___1	___2	___3	___4
2. Wrong org structure	___1	___2	___3	___4
3. Unsupportive org culture	___1	___2	___3	___4
4. Inadequate capabilities	___1	___2	___3	___4
5. Lack of essential resources	___1	___2	___3	___4
6. Unawareness of strategy	___1	___2	___3	___4
7. Development partners Interference	___1	___2	___3	___4
8. Poor management of resources	___1	___2	___3	___4
9. Global trends in education	___1	___2	___3	___4
10. Government interference and regulations	___1	___2	___3	___4
11. Unclear responsibilities being fixed for implementation	___1	___2	___3	___4
12. Lack of support from Senior management	___1	___2	___3	___4
13. Poor definition of acitivities	___1	___2	___3	___4
14. Overall goals not understood by employees	___1	___2	___3	___4
15. Resistance from				

Lower levels	___1	___2	___3	___4
16. Lack of stakeholder Commitment	___1	___2	___3	___4
17. Inadequate/ lack of Communication	___1	___2	___3	___4
18. Lack of understanding Of strategy by stakeholders	___1	___2	___3	___4
19. Insufficient flexibility Of strategy	___1	___2	___3	___4
20. Other problems, Please specify:	___1	___2	___3	___4

_____

D4. How would you rate the general level of implementing the free primary Education strategy?

	Please tick one box
Excellent, well above average	___1
Above average	___2
Average	___3
Below Average	___4
Don't know	___5

Please add below any comments you may wish to make regarding the implementation of free primary education in schools.

_____

_____

ANNEX 2

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
FACULTY OF COMMERCE
MBA PROGRAMME – LOWER KABATE CAMPUS

Telephone
Telegrams: "Varsity", Nairobi
Telex 22095

P.O.BOX 30197
Nairobi Kenya

Date: _____

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

The bearer of this letter_____Registration No. _____is a Master of business and Administration student at the university of Nairobi.

He/She is required to submit as part of his/her course work assessment,a research project report on some management issues with the introduction of Free Primary Education at District level of the Ministry of Education .

We would like the student to do the research on real problems affecting the District Education Officers in Kenya. We would therefore appreciate if you responded to the questionnaire presented to you for the research.

Thank You

Jackson Maalu
Lecturer MBA Programme
University Of Nairobi.